



# City of Hudson, Ohio

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

*Sarah Norman, Chair*  
*Angela Smith, Vice Chair*  
*Fred Innamorato*  
*Chelsea McCoy*  
*David Nystrom*  
*Jessie Obert*  
*Matt Romano*

---

Monday, June 9, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall  
27 East Main Street

---

### I. Call To Order

Chair Norman 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:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

**Absent:** 2 - Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

### III. Swearing In

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

### IV. Approval of Minutes

#### A. [PC 5-12-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: May 12, 2025

**Attachments:** [PC Meeting Minutes May12, 2025](#)

**A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Obert, that the May 12, 2025, Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

### V. Public Discussion

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Discussion on any topic not on the agenda. There was no Public Discussion.

### VI. Correspondence

Chair Norman noted a recent appeal of a PC decision to BZBA. Chair Norman then suggested that following a hearing, the final decision be deferred to the subsequent meeting, in order to give time for the complete Finding of Fact. After discussion the Commissioners ultimately decided not to make changes to the process and decisions would be formalized by the Chair following the meeting, who would work with staff.

**VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)****A. [PC 2025-231 Contd](#) A Conditional Use and Major Site Plan request of an artificial turf field and restroom building for Christ Community Chapel.**

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Applicant Responses](#)  
[Site Plans](#)  
[Elevations/Floor Plan](#)  
[Interior Landscaping Plan](#)  
[Turf information](#)  
[Wetland Delineation Report](#)  
[Trip Generation Analysis](#)  
[Stormwater Management Report](#)  
[SWPPP](#)  
[Engineering Review](#)  
[Supplemental Documents](#)  
[Public Comment for June Meeting](#)  
[Previous Public Comments](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application, which was continued from the April 14, 2025 meeting, detailed the various items of the project, noted additional documentation from the applicant per the request of PC, and reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Matthew Sutter, Sol Harris/Day, Architecture, was present for the meeting.

Reverend Zach Weihrauch, Lead Pastor, Christ Community Chapel (CCC), noted the purposes of the project: 1) Transforming the existing athletic field, which is used frequently, to be more attractive and usable. 2) Recognizing the aesthetics of this location as an entrance to Hudson. 3) To break down perceived barriers between the community and attendees of the church, so this becomes a welcoming space for families, whether or not they attend CCC.

Mr. Sutter detailed the three requests of CCC: 1) The existing soccer field be changed from grass to synthetic turf 2) The walking path with lighting to connect the playground and soccer field. 3) That a restroom facility be constructed, which will be available to those playing on the playground or field.

Mr. Sutter noted the previous approval for a church at this location and stated how he believes the requested items satisfy the LDC requirements: The closest house is 750 feet from the field, that the field is 14 feet below street level, that no speakers or scoreboard will be installed, that a sample of the artificial turf was presented to the Board, a safety study which showed no difference between a professional grass field and artificial turf, that no professional turf field exists in Hudson, and discussed anticipated noise from the improvements related to noise generated by existing traffic along 303 and Terex.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: The MKSK plans which are marked as the landscaping plans, that bleachers will not be used, that the doors to the building have been left unlocked for public restroom use, that

porta-johns have currently been used for larger events - mainly on the south side of the property, that a variance will be requested for the restroom in the side yard, that if the variance is not given it is unknown where the relocated placement would be, that temporary chain link fence will be around the entire limit of disturbance, and that the temporary staging will be placed away from the residences - near W. Streetsboro Street,

Mr. Jimmy Kozy, CCC Executive Director of Operations, noted the playground is open to the public, that all programming is open to the public, and that a meeting with nearby resident has been announced for June 24, 2025.

The Board also inquired about the installation of temporary bleachers, Mr. Sutter noted that a natural slope exists for viewing of events, that no leagues which produce revenue for CCC exist, that no profit for CCC is produced by any event, that the plan is not to open the field for outside organizations, that no new uses for the field are envisioned, that a permanent decorative fence on the north and west sides of the fields is in the plans, that sufficient daylight exist for the sports and nothing is planned for night events, that emergency access to the field is off Terex Road with a marked access concrete pad, that the plan has been reviewed by the fire department, that the Conditional Approval was during the Township years, and that the soccer sound readings were done at another soccer game on a similar field,

Staff stated when the project would still be reviewed as major development, despite the stage being removed from the proposal. Staff gave a brief history of the application process, noted the reasoning on page 5 of the staff report of why a sidewalk was not required, and reviewed the fencing allowances.

The Board discussed whether this is a residential or commercial development and the implications for what fence may be constructed. Mr. Sutter noted the Ohio Building Code recognizes residential and non-residential, that if the Board denies the 6-foot fence, a variance could be requested from BZBA, that PC requested the fence at the last meeting, and that the applicant is willing to have a 4-foot fence.

The Board and staff discussed: If the field is a front yard or a side yard which will determine if a fence is allowed, the number of accessory uses on the property, that the code sets an accessory buildings limit of 4, that 1207 B 2 discusses landscaping if visible from the road - and how this is determined for this application, that the restrooms will be locked after hours, and that turf is counted as impervious surface.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Discussion.

Mr. Nate Bailey, 123 E. Streetsboro Street, noted his work in Hudson as an architect and his belief this project will be a positive place for Hudson and appreciates the playground which is an investment for the community, as will be the soccer field, drinking fountain, and restrooms.

Seeing no one else coming forward to speak, Chair Norman closed Public Discussion.

The Commission, applicant, and staff discussed: The revised budget, which was included in the packet, the scale in the drawings being incorrect, and that the field will not be rented or leased to third parties.

The Commissioners discussed: That there is little change of function in the application and the field will be more attractive, that eliminating the stage from the application makes it more acceptable to the Commissioners, that all the Commissioners requests were done by the applicant, that the Commissioners need to give clear instruction regarding what it wants with regard to a fence, and the Commissioners appreciation for beautifying the field.

The Commissioners then discussed the staff recommendations and any additional recommendations .

Staff noted a 4-foot fence is permitted by code, that the Board may make the decision at this meeting, and the Findings of Facts be approved at a subsequent meeting. The Commissioners discussed the negatives of delaying a vote and causing a delay for the applicant.

The City Solicitor stated he believes a decision is to be made based on the Findings of Facts .

The Commissioners discussed their Findings of Facts, and Mr. Sugar informed the Commissioners how staff currently writes a Decision prior to the Chair signing the Decision.

**Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission on June 9, 2025, that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use and Site Plan Request for the Christ Community Chapel turf field and restroom building, according to plans received March 14, 2025.**

**The Planning Commission decision shall be subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Planning Commission approval is conditional upon a variance request being submitted to and granted by the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals to locate the restroom building within a side yard.**
- 2. The design of the restroom building and fencing shall be reviewed by the AHBR.**
- 3. Revise the landscaping plans, sheets L1.0 and L1.1, per the following:**
  - o Incorporate additional evergreens along the Terex Road frontage.**
  - o Widen the landscape buffer along the Terex Road frontage to maintain a consistent 50 ft width.**
- 4. The comments of Assistant City Engineer David Rapp shall be addressed per the June 2, 2025 correspondence.**
- 5. The applicant shall install silt fencing and/or polypropylene fencing to mark and protect the approved clearing limits, which shall be maintained by the applicant.**
- 6. Satisfaction of the above conditions prior to scheduling of a preconstruction meeting with City Officials and no clearing or construction of any kind shall commence prior to the issuance of a Zoning Certificate.**
- 7. If the applicant seeks a fence higher than 4 ft, a variance shall be sought from the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals.**

Aye: 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

## **VIII. New Business (including public hearings)**

- A. [PC 2025-229](#) A Major Site Plan request for Laurel Lake Retirement Community. The request would construct seven villa duplex buildings.**

**Attachments:**    [Staff Report](#)  
[Submittal letter](#)  
[Civil Plans](#)  
[Landscaping Plan](#)  
[Lighting Plan](#)  
[Elevations - Floor Plan](#)  
[Cost Estimates](#)  
[Stormwater Management Report](#)  
[Trip Generation Report](#)  
[Wetland Delineation](#)  
[Engineering Review](#)  
[Supplemental Documents](#)  
[PC Decision 2024](#)  
[BZBA Decision - Conditional Use Appeal](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing the major site plan for seven villas, noting that approval was given for a major site plan with three of the seven buildings removed from the proposal, that the applicant appealed the denial of the three buildings near the pond, and that the denial was overturned. Mr. Sugar stated this review is for the site plan, outlined the changes from the previous submission, and reviewed the staff analysis.

Chair Norman clarified that a de novo hearing on the site plan was previously held, and this review is for only the three additional buildings. Solicitor Pitchford stated the prior site plan decision is in place.

Mr. Jeff Jardine, Riverstone Company, described the changes made to buildings 1, 2, and, 5.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed: The addition of one living unit in this application and how it relates to the BZBAs decision, whether it nullifies their decision. Solicitor Pitchford recommended the application be held to the BZBA decision.

The applicant described reasons for changing the application to make one unit a duplex, and other details of the project: To meet the need of the 40 applicants waiting for a Villa, that the economics for Laurel Lake are better with the additional unit, that the building greenspace will not drain directly into the lake, the new utilities are the reason some of the trees around the basin are being removed, and how the LDC applies to tree removal.

The Commissioners and applicant discussed: That the BZBA approval did not require encroachment variances, that the LDC requires a 50-foot setback while BZBA approved with a 43-foot setback, that confusion exists as to what type of body of water is in question, that the Comprehensive Plan discourages increasing the number of living units in large scale living facilities for the sake of safety services, that the Hudson Fire Department has stated no objections regarding fire access, the distances of the units from Laurel Lake Drive, that sidewalks and curbs will not be added, how pedestrian safety was addressed when there are more driveways interfacing with the road, how the existing pavilion area will be affected by a building unit, that the units have been designed to meet current requirements in consultation with Laurel Lake residents, and that this type of unit is unique to Laurel Lake,

Ms. Donna Anderson, Laurel Lake, stated 275 independent living units exist at Laurel Lake, that this proposal

does not increase the total number of living units because of combining single bedroom units into larger units, that the speed limit is 20 mph, that there are many walkers and stop signs along Laurel Lake Drive, that the Barlow Picnic Pavilion generally has the picnic tables inside with others on the lake side, that Laurel Lake is unique in Hudson in offering units for sale, and that it is a Type A Lifecare facility, and that Laurel Lake pays approximately \$1,000,000 per year in taxes,

Ms. Eileen Nacht, RDL Architects, stated the proposed units are similar to the existing units, that AHBR has reviewed the proposed units with generally positive comments, that the addition of the duplexes is harmonious with the existing units, and that AHBR preferred the proposed units have front facing garages - like the existing units,

Staff stated the number of retirement community housing units in Hudson is 8379, and that 785 housing units exist in all the facilities.

Mr. Anthony Berardi, CEO of Laurel Lake, noted Laurel Lake, with 411 living units, representing 5% of Hudson's total living units, justifies asking for more units by noting, because of combining units, there are actually less total units than originally approved. Mr. Berardi also noted that Laurel Lake has a wait list for larger units and open small units.

PC and staff discussed the timeline and steps of the application, those present at the pre-application meeting, that the pre-application meeting was done prior to the BZBA meeting and decision, and that BZBA determined the 50-foot setback does not apply to this application,

The Commissioners, staff, and applicant, discussed: The protection of the topographical features of the property when building the units, the setback analysis being difficult because of a private drive verses a public road, that staff recommends landscaping on the west side of the property near Boston Mills Road, that the front facing garages were designed to match the existing units, that sidewalks are not included in the plans and the applicant is to submit the cost for constructing sidewalks, that Hudson is planning a sidewalk along Boston Mills Road, that when the entire parcel is considered - the impervious coverage after construction - goes from 23.18 acres coverage to 23.93 acres, that preservation is being maintained as much as possible while developing their property, the number of trees to be removed for each building, that the retention pond does not have signage, that alternatives to a retention pond were explored by Laurel Lake but would require extra space - which is not available in this situation, that the area is not in a flood zone, the well-head protection area was discussed and it's implication for this proposed project, and that the traffic study does not include Laurel Lake's use for special events,

Mr. David Rapp, City of Hudson Engineering, described the stormwater plan and his recommendations.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comment. There were no Public Comments.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed: If the new units could be changed to smaller units if market conditions change, that combining apartments has continued since the last meeting, that the waiting list for large units continues to grow while the open small units continue to have openings, that the Hudson area offers many smaller housing units, if Laurel Lake is willing to move forward with a redesign if PC requests less density and intrusion into the setbacks, the financial impact on each villa if one unit is denied, the conflicts in the LDC regarding Wetlands Delineations, and that Laurel Lake is not in financial distress.

Mr. Jardine, noted the LDC definition of wetlands does not apply to the pond at Laurel Lake, how the IEI

applies to the pond in question, that Summit Soil and Water will require plans be submitted describing how the proposal affects the lake, that the IEI does not say work cannot be done - only that it be minimized, that the pond is not a wetland, and that Laurel Lake is a 36-year old business that desires growth.

The Commissioners discussed that BZBA did not approve buildings in the IEI area or six units, that a new application will need to be submitted for six units, the concerns regarding the setbacks, that the Comprehensive Plan is opposed to additional senior living housing, the well head protection as a concern, that only the site plan and IEI is being evaluated not the wetlands. PC also discussed that the applicant be asked when plans for five units, that do not encroach in the IEI, can be submitted, and that the applicant may wish to request a continuance of the meeting to consider their options.

The applicant requested a continuance to the August PC meeting.

**A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Mr. Romano, that at the request of the applicant, the application be tabled, due back to Planning Commission on 7/14/2025. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

**B. [PC 2025-507](#) A Conditional Use and Major Site Plan request for an addition for Hudson High School serving as an orchestra room.**

**Attachments:**     [Staff Report](#)  
[Conditional Use Letter](#)  
[Site Plans](#)  
[Elevation and Floorplan](#)  
[Stormwater report](#)  
[Traffic Letter](#)  
[Engineering Review](#)  
[Site Photos](#)  
[Supplemental Documents](#)

The Commissioners and applicant discussed tabling the application due to time constraints.

**A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. McCoy, that this Staff Report be tabled to Planning Commission, due back on 6/23/2025. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

**C. [PC 2025-561](#) A Text Amendment request to amend certain administrative appeal processes within the city.**

**Attachments:**     [Staff Report](#)  
[Proposed Amendment](#)  
[Ordinance No. 25-85](#)

Mr. Hannan introduced the text amendment regarding the review of decisions.

The Commissioners discussed the language of the text amendment, what new information might be brought to the reviewing body, edits to the proposed text amendment, notice to the body below, prior to the appeal taking place,

and representation from the lower board at the appeal.

Solicitor Pitchford also noted that BZBA will become the board of appeals for site plans and conditional use reviews.

**A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. McCoy, that this Staff Report be recommended for approval City Council with the discussed changes to be incorporated. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

## **IX. Other Business**

### **A. [PC Public Hearing Update](#) Update for Order and Rules of Public Hearings**

**Attachments:**     [Staff Memo](#)  
                                 [Ordinance 25-21](#)

Mr. Sugar reviewed City Council's mandated Public Hearing Update agenda. Chair Norman requested time limits (where applicable), public comment rules be included in the agenda.

**This matter was discussed**

## **X. Staff Update**

There were no staff updates.

## **XI. Adjournment**

**Ms. Norman adjourned the meeting at 11:33 p.m..**

---

**Sarah Norman, 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.*

\* \* \*