

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ● 1140 Terex Road ● Hudson, Ohio 44236 ● (330) 342-1790

Date: September 14, 2023

To: City Council

From: Greg Hannan, Community Development Director

CC: Thomas J. Sheridan, Asst City Manager, Nick Sugar, City Planner

Re: LDC Text Amendment – Residential blending

The Planning Commission completed the public hearing and review of the proposed text amendment at the meeting of September 11, 2023.

Review Step	Date
Council Workshop	June 20, 2023
Council First Reading	July 11, 2023
Council Workshop	July 11, 2023
Council Second Reading and referral	July 18, 2023
Planning Commission Public Hearing	September 11, 2023
Council Workshop	September 26, 2023
Council Public Hearing, Third reading and possible action	October 17, 2023

The Planning Commission passed a unanimous recommendation to approve the text amendment with three recommendations.

- 1. Research accessory dwelling unit regulations to not permit excessive accessory dwelling unit development for new development proposals.
- 2. Regarding Open Space Conservation Subdivisions, recommend applying the 100 foot development boundary to the outer perimeter of the proposal rather than excluding open space.
- 3. Provide guidance on the administration of the proposed text including the comparison to abutting portions of adjacent neighborhoods rather than a single average.

Please see the following comments related to each condition:

1. Research accessory dwelling unit regulations to not permit excessive accessory dwelling unit development for new development proposals.

Planning Commission discussed a possible concern of an applicant proposing a significant number of accessory dwelling units (ADU) in an attempt to increase density beyond the permitted. Staff does note that the ADU standards are fairly focused and limited to a maximum of 850 sq ft. Due to the limited size permitted,

staff does not feel there is an appreciable risk with this item. Applicants for subdivisions and townhomes could be requested to document any ADUs, which would be anticipated. If excessive this could be further reviewed by the Planning Commission as a compatibility issue through the conditional use process.

2. Regarding Open Space Conservation Subdivisions (OSCS), recommend applying the 100 foot development boundary to the outer perimeter of the proposal rather than excluding open space.

Planning Commission did discuss how the draft text would reduce the ability for OSCS to be considered on smaller parcels going forward. Staff did note Council discussion regarding the desire to have housing density transition, even if the open space separated existing units from proposed. The Planning Commission did note the proposed reductions in maximum density will also help to respond to this item.

3. Provide guidance on the administration of the proposed text including the comparison to abutting portions of adjacent neighborhoods rather than a single average.

The draft text does have two points related to administration which would be helpful to document. The following text, part for Council consideration, will help provide guidance to staff and the Planning Commission:

- i. How to count proposed units within the 100 foot boundary: When the 100 foot boundary is applied to development proposals, the measurement may fully cross over some sublots/units; however many sublots/units would be partially within the 100 foot. Staff proposed and Planning Commission confirmed with the concept that all sublot/units that are fully or partially within the 100 foot should be considered as part of the density comparison.
- ii. How to measure the existing density for surrounding development: Planning Commission discussed that adjacent development may have varied existing densities along different portions of the proposed project. Planning Commission noted it would be appropriate to apply the comparison to each portion of a development rather than taking one average of all surrounding development.