



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

David Nystrom, Chair
Sarah Norman, Vice Chair
Andrew Furbee
Melissa Jones
Matt Romano
Ronald Stolle
Erik Vaughan

Greg Hannan, Community Development Director
Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
Marshal Pitchford, Acting City Solicitor & Special Counsel

Monday, July 8, 2024

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call To Order

Chair Nystrom called to order the meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Hudson at 7:30 p.m., in accordance with the Sunshine Laws of the State of Ohio, O.R.C. Section 121.22.

II. Roll Call

Present: 4 - Norman, Nystrom, Romano and Stolle

Absent: 2 - Vaughan and Jones

III. Swearing In

Chair Nystrom placed everyone under oath who would be giving testimony during the meeting.

IV. Correspondence

Mr. Sugar noted an email which is attached to the agenda. There were no additional items.

A. [PC-Public Comment 7.8.24](#)

Attachments: [Public Comment](#)

V. Public Discussion

There was no Public Discussion for items not on the Agenda.

VI. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 4-25-24](#) Minutes of Previous joint City Council/Planning Commission Meeting: April

25, 2024

Attachments: [Pc Meeting Minutes 4.25.24](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Norman, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the April 25, 2024, Minutes be approved. Since there were not enough Ayes to approve the motion, it will be continued to the next regular meeting of the PC.

Aye: 2 - Ms. Norman and Mr. Romano

Abstain: 2 - Mr. Stolle and Mr. Nystrom

B. [PC 5-13-24](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: May 13, 2024

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes 3.13.24](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Stolle, seconded by Ms. Norman, that the May 13, 2024, Meeting Minutes be approved with edits. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Romano and Mr. Nystrom

VII. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

VIII. Public Hearings

A. [PC 2023-676 Prelim](#) Preliminary Subdivision Plat request for Canterbury Crossing, a 34-lot, single-family open space conservation subdivision

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Comparison Exhibit](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Conditional Use Responses](#)
[Revised Wetland Map from site visit from the Army Corp of Engineers](#)
[Trip Generation Report](#)
[Tree Inventory](#)
[Geotechnical Report](#)
[Public Comments](#)
[Engineering Dept. Review Comments](#)
[Hudson Fire Dept. Review Comments](#)
[House Renderings](#)
[Declaration of Easements Covenants Restrictions-DRAFT](#)
[Previous Wetland Delineation from Compatibility Review](#)
[Owner Affidavits](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting: This is a preliminary subdivision review which is the second of three steps in the process, changes in the revised plans which were submitted by the developer, and the staff comments.

Mr. Chris Brown, representing Kuchar LLC and Mr. George Vizmeg, noted the revisions to the plans from the previous conceptual review and the staff comments contained in the staff report. Mr. Brown noted, when the preliminary plan was submitted, it did not include accurate depictions of wetlands on the property.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed The anticipated timeline of the build, phasing of the project, the compatibility standards, utility connections, tree clearing, storm water, open space conservation subdivision design, lighting standards, and lot design.

Mr. David Rapp, City of Hudson Engineer, and the Commissioners discussed storm water management.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff continued discussion regarding: Project budgets, cluster home definitions and design, water flow modeling, incomplete documentation of ecological resources, and grading/fill/mounding, flooding and wetland concerns. During the discussion of flooding and wetland concerns, Mr. Brown acknowledged the submitted plans depicted a design that would direct emergency overflows directly on adjacent properties. Mr. Brown also acknowledged the submitted Engineered drawings did not depict any of the wetland the applicant was proposing to fill.

The Commissioners and staff discussed the timing of environmental studies and when they are to be presented to the Commissioners.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: The water table, the location of underground utilities, test boring to take place, and flooding concerns.

Chair Nystrom opened the meeting for Public Discussion.

Ms. Betty Moon, 277 Ravenna Street, questioned the traffic increase on Ravenna Street and if a traffic analysis has been conducted.

Mr. Skyler Sutton, 2243 Ravenna Street, raised an objection to the approval process. Mr. Sutton also stated his objections to the proposed plan including: The potential for the pond overflowing and flooding onto his property, that discharge pipes, as planned, will discharge directly onto his property, that the density standards are not being followed, that sufficient stormwater ponds are not included on the proposal, and other objections which were submitted to the Commissioners in the form of a letter.

Mr. Matt Miller, 310 Ravenna Street, noted he submitted photos to Community Development for PC consideration, described the water runoff that is directed onto his property, and his concerns if this application is approved.

Mr. Joshua Manley, 2078 Ravenna Street, noted his concerns regarding: Enhancing the rural character of the area, that the history of the homebuilder should not be considered, a desire to take into account the survey recently completed by the Comprehensive Plan Review Committee concerning new residential development - which show little desire for the proposed type of development, the increased traffic which this development will create, and the increased storm water problems the development will create.

Mr. Dana Zahuranec, 2161 Ravenna Street, questioned who will pay for the extension of the sewer lines, stated the proposed signage will not enhance the rural character of the neighborhood, expressed concern regarding the removed dirt, asked if the ponds will always have water and if so will aeration will be done, and expressed concern over storm water drainage.

Mr. Chris Cosma, 2242 Ravenna Street, read the letter he submitted to the Planning Commission that was included in the agenda.

Mr. John Slagter, 950 Main Ave, Cleveland, OH, attorney for the developer, noted: He reviewed the proposal in regard to compatibility and sent his opinion to the City of Hudson, the agreement to remove lot 13, and the applicants agreement to prepare declarations regarding the homeowners rights. Mr. Slater also stated that a traffic study has been completed, that stormwater issues would be addressed, that significant disturbance will and has taken place on the farmland through the years, that the LDC Standards for Open Space Approval will be complied with, and that the LDC seems to have ambiguities.

Mr. John Russell, Prestige Builder Group, spoke to the desire for a diversity of housing, the types of housing selling today which is not what sold in previous years, that it would take five or six years to build out the development, and the rising cost of construction.

Seeing no one else come forward to speak, Chair Nystrom closed Public Comments.

Mr. Brown noted the eight staff comments would be addressed as the process moves forward, and that the wetlands and density studies would take the most time to address.

The Commissioners discussed: The stormwater drainage issues on the western side of the development, that the Open Space Conservation requirements have not been addressed, that innovative ideas were not used in developing the plan, the large amount of earth to be moved, that the existing zoning requirements cannot be violated by the use of the Open Space Conservation opportunity, and that the proposed design is not sensitive to the area.

Ms. Norman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, based on the evidence presented and the representations made to the Commission, that the Planning Commission DENY the Preliminary Subdivision Request for Canterbury Crossing, in Case 2023-676.

In doing so, the Planning Commission makes the following Findings of Fact:

- 1. The proposal is incompatible with existing residential development within 1,000 feet.**
- 2. The project maximizes land disturbance and barely provides significant open space in violation of the Land Development Codes rules for subdivisions.**
- 3. The project has failed to incorporate the significant allowances and the open space conservation subdivision provisions through the clustering of homes on sub-sized lots.**
- 4. The project does nothing to prevent development to the maximum extent feasible within environmentally sensitive areas in violation of the Land Development Code.**
- 5. The project is not low density, but is, at best, regular density.**
- 6. The project does not include environmentally sensitive innovative design techniques but rehashes prevalent, typical, suburban, and high-priced development in derogation of the Land Development Code and the existing Comprehensive Plan.**
- 7. The project fails to provide compact and contiguous open space which the Land Development Code requires for open space conservation subdivision development.**
- 8. The project does not evoke a small, rural village ambiance or appearance as is preferred by the Land Development Code.**
- 9. The project destroys existing natural features. Most importantly, this project flies in the face of the spirit and intent of Hudson's Land Development Code as enumerated in these purposes, specifically that the project does not advance the city's interest in securing the safety of property from the risk of flood, nor does it secure open space.**
- 10. This project does not conserve or stabilize property values by assuring the most appropriate uses of land in relation to one another.**
- 11. The project does not preserve or protect existing agricultural land, stream corridors, and wetlands from adverse impacts.**
- 12. The project does not engage innovative residential development with a variety of type,**

design, or layout of housing options while conserving open space.

13. The proper management of the overall community growth, including population growth and the orderly development of the City of Hudson requires us to reject a project that would derogate the basic district regulations of a rural residential zone so egregiously.

14. Further the Planning Commission finds the conditional use approval moot given the denial of the preliminary subdivision request.

The motion to DENY was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Norman, Nystrom, Romano and Stolle

- B.** [PC 2024-221](#) **A Conditional Use and Site Plan request for Laurel Lake, a continuing care retirement community, to construct seven (7) additional duplex buildings, for a total of fourteen (14) units.**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
 [Conditional Use Letter](#)
 [Site/Improvement Plans](#)
 [Landscaping and Lighting Plans](#)
 [Wetland Delineation](#)
 [Elevations](#)
 [Stormwater Management Report](#)
 [Traffic Report](#)
 [NOI Letter](#)
 [Public Comments](#)
 [PC Decision from 11.28.22](#)
 [Fire Dept. Review](#)
 [Engineering Dept. Review](#)
 [State License](#)
 [Owner Affidavit](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application which received Conditional Use Approval on November 28, 2022, with conditions. However, the time has lapsed for the Conditional Use Approval, and this review is for Conditional Use and Site Plan approval. Mr. Sugar then reviewed the project, the location, and the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Jeff Jardine, Riverstone Company, representing Laurel Lake, described the seven proposed duplexes, commented on the staff report issues, and the five items in the staff report to discussed including: 1) The pond and setbacks. 2) Reducing the tree clearing around the pond and the trees Laurel Lake is planting. 3 & 4) The concerns regarding building 5, its 87-foot setback from the road, and the wetlands around it. 5) The light pole height which will be revised as needed..

Ms. Donna Anderson, Laurel Lake Director of Marketing, discussed the occupancy rate at Laurel Lake, the size of the proposed villas, and the overall financial health of Laurel Lake.

The Commissioners and applicant discussed the number of apartments that have been combined in the main building, pricing of units, that the units will not be LEED certified, and disturbance near the pond.

Ms. Eileen Nacht, RDL Architects, stated the current plan is adjusted from the previous plans to minimize disturbances. The applicants discussed the economic impact of building less villas, the last five years of finances, and the existing nature path near the pond.

The Commissioners and staff discussed the number of senior living units that exist now in Hudson, and that the licenses for Laurel Lake must be renewed and delivered to the City on a yearly basis. Also discussed were: The lack s bump-out on building #3, the omission of the community shelter on the drawings, and the location of building #2.

Ms. Anderson discussed meetings and communications with the residents of Laurel Lake.

Mr. David Oster, Laurel Lake, noted the total estimated construction cost.

Chair Nystrom opened the meeting for Public Comments.

Ms. Mimi Becker, Laurel Lake resident, noted residents are concerned about: The traffic survey which did not consider all the traffic, vehicle headlights which will be directed onto unit 5, and the water runoff and contaminates which need a water quality study.

Seeing no one else coming forward Chair Nystrom closed Public Comments.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: The past and future development and property purchases by Laurel Lake, staff's level of concern regarding the city's Ecological Index map, the anticipated impacts to the pond, and determinations of jurisdictional wetlands as they relate to the Land Development Code.

The Commissioners discussed: Questions regarding building #5 which will need to be addressed with Mr. Sugar commenting that a 50-foot setback should be required, and concerns regarding building 1, 2, and 5, which are not in harmony with the rest of the development. Also discussed: The stakes needing to be reset, the needed slope study and further review by city staff and the applicant. The Commissioners also noted the number of senior adult institutional housing units in Hudson.

A motion was made by Mr. Stolle, seconded by Ms. Norman, that this Public Hearing be tabled to the August 21, 2024, Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Romano and Mr. Nystrom

IX. Other Business

X. Staff Update


Mr. Sugar reviewed the Comprehensive Plan process and upcoming meetings.

This matter was discussed

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Stolle, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:27 p.m.. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Romano and Mr. Nystrom



David Nystrom, Chair



Joe Campbell, Executive Assistant

Upon approval by the Planning Commission, this official written summary of the meeting minutes shall become a permanent record, and the official minutes shall also consist of a permanent audio and video recording, excluding executive sessions, in accordance with Codified Ordinances, Section 252.04, Minutes of Architectural and Historic Board of Review, Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, and Planning Commission.

* * *