



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

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

Monday, July 14, 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: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

Absent: 3 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 6-9-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: June 9, 2025

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes June 9, 2025](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Smith, that the June 9, 2025, Minutes be approved as edited. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano and Ms. Smith

Recused: 1 - Mr. Innamorato

B. [PC 6-23-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: June 23, 2025

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes June 23, 2025](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Smith, that the June 23, 2025, minutes be approved as edited. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

V. Public Discussion

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Discussion on any item not on the Agenda. There was no Public Discussion.

VI. Correspondence

Chair Norman requested the Commissioners and staff reveal any private correspondence. There were no comments.

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

There was no Old Business.

VIII. New business (including public hearings)**A. [PC 2025-716](#) A Concept Site Plan request for a proposed townhome development**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Concept Site Plan](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Title Commitment](#)
[Current Deeds](#)
[Engineering Department Review](#)
[Fire Department Review](#)
[Site Photos](#)
[Public Comments](#)

The Board and staff discussed the application related to the submittal requirements.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing the site, noting the location, and then described the project, parking, and storm water basin. Mr. Sugar noted the general standards for town homes and that this is a review for Concept Site Plan with a Major Site Plan submittal to follow. Mr. Sugar reviewed the staff comments and considerations.

Mr. Randy Ruttenberg, Fairmount Properties, mentioned Fairmounts history in the community, that 21 units are being proposed, and that feedback from the Planning Commission is desired.

Mr. Ron Lloyd, RDL Architects, discussed: The high quality of life in Hudson, his desire to contribute to the community, and the immediate neighborhood around the proposed town homes.

Ms. Suzanne Meltzer, Senior Design Architect, RDL Architects, walked the Commissioners through the proposal for two and three-story units, some of which have bedrooms on the first floor, with two-car garages, on-street parking, and a 75-foot stream setback.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed: That the density was determined by reviewing the Hudson LDC, the sewer capacity for the 22 units, and discussed the City-owned property to the west.

Mr. Dave Petretone, Riverstone Company, stated that a dry basin is planned with the top of the basin eight inches above the 100-year flood level.

Mr. Dave Rapp, Hudson Assistant City Engineer, informed the Commissioners about the wastewater system and stated the information was reviewed with Summit County. Mr. Rapp also noted that Summit County is in the process of improving the wastewater system in the area.

The applicant and Mr. Hannan discussed the city's role in the on-street parking request.

Mr. Rapp, the Commissioners, applicant, and staff, discussed the required parking spaces per resident, the sewer capacity of the system, the total number of parking spaces in the area - both public and private, that this is a Use-By-Right application, the additional traffic the 21 units will create, the type of parking stall markings on Owen Brown Street, the Hudson Public Power utility pole located near a building that may be required to be moved, the logistics of the various construction activities, that teenagers tend to gather in the area of any project, the current neighborhood density of 13.3 units per acre, if the applicant would reduce the number of units, and that the applicant is convinced the proposed units are desirable to Hudson residents.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff also discussed if innovative features were incorporated into the project and that PC is charged with managing growth in Hudson. Also discussed was that the development must protect historic structures, what the District 4 regulations might teach regarding this development - if it were in District 4 - instead of being in District 5, and the regulations regarding new developments in District 5 being required to protect various items in the District

The Commissioners and staff discussed: How net density was calculated, that unknown factors could reduce the total unit number below 21, the setback requirements in the district for a residence, the impervious surface requirements, the number and location of allowable curb cuts, the flood plain overlay maps, the applicant's statement that no part of a building is within the flood plain, that the water retention basin is allowed to be in the flood plain, that a formal analysis will be provided by the flood plain administrator, the requirement that the development not reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store water, that the basins will be wet basins if located within a stream setback - and the resulting requirements a wet basin brings, how *open space in lieu* affects this development, that City Council will make the decisions regarding *open space in lieu*, and that the LDC states the garage parking space is counted for parking spaces.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comment from residents with standing.

Ms. Jill Flagg, 64 Owen Brown, commented on the impervious surface requirements, noted the property behind her house has been raised by eight feet, which created a water dam in her back yard, resulting in flooding in her yard. Ms. Flagg also expressed concern regarding drainage if the proposed development is built. Ms. Flagg also stated that six town homes facing Owen Brown Street may hurt her property value.

Mr. Keith Moore, 63 Owen Brown, noted that flooding covers the street in front and behind his house, and that he has concerns regarding the overflow that dumps into the Brandywine Creek. Mr. Moore stated his house was built in 1835, and he has owned the property for 6 years.

Mr. Randy Thornlow, 20 Great Oak Drive, thanked the developer for coming to Hudson and stated he is one of the many Hudson residents who would like to remain in Hudson and desires a housing unit like the proposed. Mr. Thornlow also stated he believes Hudson needs more units like the proposed ones so residents can remain in

Hudson. In response to the Commissioner's question, Mr. Thornlow stated he was in sales and that no one asked him to speak regarding the development.

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

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff, discussed: The proposed density, the question during Public Comments regarding if a commenter was asked by someone to speak, that the project will not be viable if less than the proposed number is built, and the challenges with building on the site, including soil conditions.

The Commissioners concluded their questioning.

Mr. Ruttenberg, expressed his appreciation for the meeting, noted his teams desire to work collaboratively with the City, his willingness to take suggestions from PC regarding the development, and committed to speaking transparently in discussions with the City.

The Commissioners discussed: Their respect for the developer, the need for additional work on this plan which is very dense, that Hudson demands quality buildings, that more open space is needed to match the neighborhood, the concern over water in the area, that parking spaces may be an issue, that PC has the mandate to conserve property values, that the project will negatively impact Hudson and the neighborhood, that the right development for the residents who live in Hudson must be built, and that PC must insure the development is best for the city residents - not the developer. Chair Norman provided and articulated a list of concerns regarding the proposed development.

The Commissioners discussed a possible vote on the application and their concerns, including: The developer's statements regarding not being willing to reduce the density of the development, flooding, the possibility of continuing the application, and that the LDC states any decision at this meeting is not a final decision.

The Commissioners stated the following issues for the developer to consider: 1) Less than 21 units. 2) More open space. 3) A better parking plan. 4) How storm water will impact neighboring properties? 5) The ability to articulate the innovative features of the plan. 6) How the proposal implements and supports the Comprehensive Plan. 7) The consolidation of the lots. 8) The on-street parking study. 9) The curb cuts. 10) Expanded information regarding the sanitary system.

Ms. Smith Made a motion to approve with the nine conditions as enumerated.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Innamorato made a motion, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the Planning Commission deny the Concept Site Plan Request for the townhome proposal in Case 25-716.

Aye: 3 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano and Mr. Innamorato

Nay: 1 - Ms. Smith

- B. [PC 2025-717](#) A Conditional Use and Site Plan request for an addition for Christ Community Chapel serving as an office space.**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Statement of Compliance and Project Narrative](#)
[Site Plan, Landscaping, Photometric](#)
[Elevations - Floor Plan](#)
[Trip Generation Letter](#)
[Stormwater Report](#)
[Wetland Delineation](#)
[SWPPP](#)
[Engineering Department Review](#)
[Fire Department Review](#)
[Supplemental Information](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the Conditional Use and Site Plan Request by displaying a map of, and describing the office addition project, reviewing the staff comments and recommendations, including the revised plans in which the applicant has agreed to meet the staff recommendations. Mr. Sugar also noted the applicant's questions regarding the requirement to build a sidewalk, which may be discussed with the Commissioners.

Mr. Jimmy Kozy, Christ Community Chapel (CCC), described the proposed addition and the purposes of the addition, including: 1) A more secure location for children's programming. 2) To have adequate space for the current programming. 3) That all staff be located in one area of the building, instead of being spread throughout the building.

Mr. Eric Dalpiaz, Sol/Harris, Architecture, described the office addition, the location of the addition on the rear of the building, that he believes the impact will be minimal, that it will be in harmony with the existing building, and that the staff conditions regarding lighting and screening have been agreed to.

Mr. Kozy also noted that CCC requests that the staff condition regarding a sidewalk along Terex Road be removed from the conditions.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed the following related to the sidewalk: 1) The cost. 2) That internal walkways exist. 3) The difficulty of placing a sidewalk along Terex Road. 4) That the City's walk and bike plan removed the Terex Road area from the plan.

The Commissioners noted: A sidewalk is not appropriate along Terex at this time, that a significant impediment would exist toward building a sidewalk, the site logistics including delivery trucks coming in from Terex Road, the need for a site logistics plan for PCs review, that a chain link fence will be used to delineate the construction area, the Commissioner's suggestion to enlarge the logistics area, the difficulty of cleaning the building and related safety concerns, that construction trailers will be on site and will need space, that the new HVAC will be independent of the existing building, that the construction manager will be responsible for site safety, that if approvals go well - construction will begin in 2025, that the rooftop units will be similar to the existing building and hidden, that the existing building is not part of this project, and that background checks will be required of the tradespeople - who will park outside of the chain link fence area.

Staff noted the definition of a "substantial expansion", the applicant noted the screening gap has existed for probably 15-years, that 78 people are employed at CCC, that the gap between the proposed addition and the existing building is partially because of equipment in the gap, and that no fire code issues were noted.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comments.

Ms. Holly McDunnan, 5644 Londonairy BLVD, noted her concerns regarding stormwater drainage, and if plans for construction times and noise are in place. Ms. McDunnan also expressed her support of the plan and questioned if this may become a school or preschool.

Seeing no one coming forward, Chair Norman closed Public Comment.

The applicant noted: A preschool request is a possibility in the future, but there are no present plans for a preschool. Staff and the applicant noted: A preschool would come before PC because it would introduce a new use for the building, that the City does have standards regarding construction times and noise levels, that small cranes will be used, that the applicant stated the construction manager will operate within the rules of the city, and discussed how fire protection will be incorporated into the steel structure.

The applicant thanked PC for their time and consideration.

The Commissioners discussed: that requiring this sidewalk does not benefit the public, that a sidewalk along Terex might be unsafe and the details of how a sidewalk might be built.

City Solicitor Marcum stated after reviewing other applications where sidewalks were not required, no clear opinion may be given.

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, to approve the application from Christ Community Chapel, subject to the staff conditions aside from number three, the requirement to install a sidewalk. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano and Mr. Innamorato

Nay: 1 - Ms. Smith

C. [PC 2025-755](#) A Text Amendment request relevant to regulations applicable to Boarding Kennels and Veterinary Facilities.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Ordinance 25-92](#)
[Map - Existing Vet Clinics and Boarding Kennels](#)
[Public Comments](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by: Noting this discussion is at the request of City Council, giving an overview of the boarding facilities and veterinary clinics in Hudson, noting seven facilities currently exist in Hudson, describing how the text amendment will affect surrounding neighbors, and detailing the staff recommended changes to the text amendment as shown in the staff report.

The Commissioners, and staff, discussed, if the text amendment will affect pet sitting in a residential house, the difference between a boarding facility and residents who care for animals as in a home day care, that an existing use would meet the existing non-conforming use condition and might have problems in some situations, LDC regulations regarding noisy animals, the possibility of limiting kennels to Districts 6 and 8, if the proposed Text Amendment looks forward to the future of what Hudson citizens desire, that the 500-foot setback is a common residential setback within the LDC, a precondition that city water and sanitary sewer system be installed, the

possibility of removing veterinary from District 2 and leave in boarding kennels, and possibly limiting boarding kennels to 20 dogs in a residential area.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comments.

Ms. Carol Mastina, 1621 Prospect Road, stated she believes 20 dogs at a facility are too many for a residence, and that 20 dogs should only be allowed in a business facility.

Ms. Alicia Poge, 1230 Hunting Hollow Drive, stated she believes the Text Amendment should not include District 2.

Ms. Teri Gallegos, 1481 Prospect Road, stated she believes 20 dogs at a facility are too many, and will bring too much noise.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the applicable standard for reviewing the proposed Text Amendment and discussed: Limiting animal facilities to the business district with 20 dogs, that the community has strong opinions regarding animal facilities in residential neighborhoods, and the need to be clear in defining a facility from a residence that watches dogs.

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, to approve the text amendment with the following recommendations in addition to the proposed amendments recommended by Council and staff:

1. Remove both Boarding Kennels and Veterinary facilities entirely from District 2.

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

IX. Other Business

The Board discussed: Reviewing the density and types of townhouses allowed, that Council be asked for permission to place a moratorium on building units in the City to allow changes to the LDC, that PC discuss the limits of growth in Hudson and the capacity of our infrastructure, and that PC consider discussing the density levels in the Districts..

Chair Norman asked Mr. Sugar to make the discussion of this as a future PC agenda item.

X. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar noted he would send a follow up to the board once August agenda items were finalized.

This matter was discussed

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:29 p.m.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

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.

Public Hearings by the Commission will be undertaken for each case in the following order:

* * *