



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

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

Monday, February 9, 2026

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: 7 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

III. Swearing In

Chair Norman introduced Mr. Nick Sugar, City Planner, and Mr. Marshall Pitchford, City Solicitor.

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

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 1-12-26](#) **Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: January 12, 2026**

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes: January 12, 2026](#)

approved. by the following vote:

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

Abstain: 2 - Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Obert

V. Public Discussion

Mr. Tom King, 12 Hudson Common Drive, addressed the Commission regarding the November 10, 2025 Public Hearing on the Village Dental Site Plan review.

Mr. King expressed that he was appalled of the conduct of the Planning Commission during the hearing, notably of the Planning Commission Chair.

Mr. King noted his experience participating in over 130 Planning Commission meetings with both the City of Hudson and the City of Akron, he emphasized that he had never witnessed an applicant being treated with such

disrespect. He acknowledged that Commissioners have the right to interpret the Land Development Code (LDC) strictly; however, he stressed that disrespect toward applicants is unacceptable for officials representing the City and may harm an individual's reputation.

Additionally, Mr. King cited a misapplication of LDC criteria by the Planning Commission during the Site Plan review, specifically criticizing the Commission's comments on the proposed building architecture as incompatible with surrounding neighborhood homes. He clarified that, under the City Charter, the Architectural and Historic Board of Review (AHBR) holds authority over architectural style, façade design, and material composition-not the Planning Commission.

Mr. King urged Planning Commission members to be mindful of their words and maintain professionalism in all proceedings.

VI. Correspondence

Chair Norman requested the PC members reveal correspondence with the public outside of the PC meeting. Ms. Obert stated that she and Ms. Norman were removed from the Clinton Crossing subcommittee for reasons unknown. Mr. Sugar noted only members of Council are on the subcommittee.

Councilwoman Weinstein stated that Council decided not to place residents on the subcommittee, that having a larger committee might make planning more difficult, that there was not a need to have PC input, that having PC members be part of creating a plan and then approving the same plan might create difficulties. Councilwoman Weinstein stated she does not know of any other subcommittees with residents. Solicitor Pitchford stated his opinion was that a new subcommittee was formed, which is in the President of Council's prevue, and that no one was technically removed from the old subcommittee. Chair Norman stated she believes that having subcommittee members well versed in the applicable development laws would be a benefit. The Commissioners and Councilwoman Weinstein discussed the wisdom of having or not having members of PC, with expertise in the LDC, on the Subcommittee.

Mr. Romano stated he believes that for the sake of transparency this discussion is beneficial.

Chair Norman noted she received an invitation to the Cities Capital Projects on March 3, 2026, that she will be attending.

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

A. [PC 2025-1022](#) **Planning Commission Decision for Case 2025-1022 - Major Site Plan approval DECISION for Village Dental.**

Attachments: [PC 25-1022 DRAFT Decision - Village Dental](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by presenting the preliminary Findings of Fact, summarizing prior Planning Commission comments, and outlining the current draft of the Findings of Fact document.

The Commissioners reviewed and discussed the draft Findings of Fact. Comments included that the document accurately captured the Planning Commission's discussion and that a draft should be forwarded to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals (BZBA) for feedback on whether it meets their review needs.

The Commissioners and Solicitor Pitchford also considered whether the development of Findings of Fact should be required only in cases where an application is appealed, given the significant amount of work involved in preparing such documents. Additional discussion focused on how Findings of Fact are determined and their role in supporting decisions made by boards or commissions.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, that this application and the submitted Findings of Fact, be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

IX. Other Business

Chair Norman noted PC will deal with three topics and a possible recommendation to City Council. She then reviewed the history of:

1. The recommendation to limit senior housing which originated from City Council, was discussed by PC who made geographic recommendations to City Council, who then tabled the recommendation the overlay district. This may or may not be discussed by City Council at a future meeting.
2. The District 11 proposal from Council to PC, which was discussed at three PC meetings, and returned to City Council, because of time limitations, with a request to return with a recommendation to return the topic to PC for further discussion.
3. Residential density discussions, especially new standards for high density residential with PCs request for a 90 day moratorium on new applications.

A. [LDC 2026 - DENSITY FEB](#) Planning Commission Discussion Topic: Density

Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)
[Consultant Memo](#)
[Potential Future Housing Sites](#)
[Growth Management Report](#)
[Comprehensive Plan Research - Housing Information](#)

Mr. Sugar reviewed the staff report and summarized the three prior Planning Commission meetings. He then introduced Arthur Schmidt, Principal with OHM Advisors, who will assist the Commissioners with their discussion.

Mr. Schmidt referenced the memo included in the staff report and explained that he was asked to complete two tasks: an analysis of national housing trends, which appears on page two, and a peer city analysis review, which appears on page three. He stated that Medina, Ohio, is the most comparable city to Hudson and also discussed other surrounding communities and their zoning districts before reviewing the remainder of the report.

The Commissioners and Mr. Schmidt engaged in an extensive discussion that covered a wide range of topics. They examined Twinsburg's 2024 zoning rewrite, which encourages increased density in targeted areas while protecting the central corridor, and noted that Hudson's zoning code is largely in alignment with many peer cities. The conversation emphasized the importance of decisions related to District 11 and clarified OHM's definition of "corridor" as mixed-use areas with major traffic flow. They discussed how cities such as Medina plan for future residential development through designated areas, as well as broader trends toward smaller

families and condominium living. Other points included project-based development in small, concentrated areas, planning for higher-density housing for small families and young couples, and how communities are defining their identity and using housing policy to shape this desired identity. The discussion also touched on comparisons to historic Northeast Ohio cities and ways Hudson differs from them, the role of transportation availability in driving housing development, Hudson’s comparison to Chagrin Falls in terms of density, and the appreciation for the peer city analysis and its insights. Commissioners considered how cities adjust density to attract commercial development by enabling developers to sell homes, the need for amenities that require a certain population threshold, and the considerations from staff comments and Comprehensive Plan recommendations regarding future housing. There was disagreement among the Commissioners regarding the choice of comparison cities and discussion of the possibility of reducing density levels in District 5.

The Commissioners then discussed moving forward with recommendations one through four as noted in the staff report. These included removing housing type allowances in District 2, Reducing density allowances in District 5, rezoning a portion of District 8 Overlay to District 8, and removing allowances for mixed use housing in District 9. The Commissions requested additional changes be added to include reducing density allowances for single-family attached and multi-family in District 4 and District 8 Overlay. The conversation concluded with agreement that multi-family housing is most appropriate in the downtown area and further discussion of density levels across various districts.

Ms. Obert moved, and Ms. Smith seconded, to request that staff prepare the considerations and proposed reduced density levels for discussion at a future Planning Commission meeting. The motion included Considerations One through four of the staff memo with the following modifications: District 4 at four units per acre for single-family attached and 5 units per acre for multi-family, District 5 at 15 units per acre for townhomes and multi-family homes, and the District 8 Overlay density allowances to be adjusted to align with the current density of the Redwood Development.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

B. [DISTRICT 11](#) District 11 Zoning District: Planning Commission recommendation to City Council [RECOMMENDATION](#)

- Attachments:**
- [Staff Memo](#)
 - [District 11 Regulations draft 2.2.26](#)
 - [Cross Section](#)
 - [Planned Development Models](#)
 - [Hudson Zoning Map - Proposed](#)
 - [Hudson 2024 Comprehensive Plan - S Main pages](#)

Ms. Smith made a motion, seconded by Ms. Obert, to remove the District 11 application from the table for discussion. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: Ms. Norman, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, and Ms. Obert

Nay: Mr. Romano and Mr. Nystrom

Following the vote, the Commissioners and Councilwoman Weinstein discussed City Council’s decision to table the decision on senior living developments. Ms. Weinstein explained that Council is waiting for additional

information regarding financial and staffing concerns related to emergency services and senior living facilities. Chair Norman offered to provide testimony before Council and shared relevant information.

Mr. Sugar then reviewed the history of District 11 discussions and outlined revisions to the Text Amendment as requested by the Planning Commission. The conversation addressed several key points, including the fact that in the last 20 years, only First & Main has been approved as a Planned Development, and staff's opinion that senior living facilities will not be permitted in District 11 regardless of Council's decision on limitations. Chair Norman identified numerous sections of the Land Development Code and the Text Amendment that, in her opinion, would require updates if the proposed amendment is adopted by Council.

Further discussion included whether the Commission could justify allowing 15 town homes per acre in District 11 while only 5 per acre are permitted in District 3, whether residential units should be located only along the property edges as noted on page 3, and how bonuses allowed under Section 1204.2(c) might impact District 11 designs and the process for implementing bonuses. Commissioners also discussed Council's final approval authority, the Comprehensive Plan's recommendation for a citywide traffic study, what qualifies a development for bonuses and what constitutes a public amenity, the purpose of the final review process, and the option for applicants to request a Concept Review. Additional topics included the 75% impervious surface requirement, which was carried over from District 8, compatibility requirements under Section 1204.05 for subdivisions within 1,000 feet, and exceptions allowed under subsection (b)(7), noting that qualifiers for these exceptions are not clearly defined.

Staff confirmed that a review process will be outlined and presented at a future PC meeting.

The Commissioners then debated the timing of a vote on District 11, weighing the impact on property development against the need to ensure the planned development is thoroughly vetted before approval.

Ms. Katie Bankie, representing the City of Hudson, stated that there are no immediate plans for development and noted that Council has requested Planning Commission recommendations and comments for its next meeting. Solicitor Pitchford advised that public comments will be accepted at the upcoming Council meeting, that the vote will be actionable, and that Council may act at that meeting.

Ms. Smith made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, to recommend to City Council the following: That multi-family units and townhomes be limited to 15 units per acre, that the minimum Planned Development acreage requirement be increased from 10 acres to 50 acres, and that bonuses not apply in District 11. The rationale for excluding bonuses is that the Planned Development chapter in the Land Development Code is difficult to interpret, and the 25% bonus allowance is so significant that it may render a development incompatible with nearby subdivisions. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

C. [PC ADMIN RULES - SUBPOENA](#) Planning Commission Discussion: Subpoena Power

Attachments: [PC Admin Rules \(Current\)](#)
[Draft Admin Rules Edits](#)

Solicitor Pitchford noted that the Hudson Legal Code grants the Planning Commission the authority to issue subpoenas to compel testimony from any individual within the Hudson city limits. The Commissioners discussed

how and under what circumstances a subpoena might be issued. Chair Norman stated that this discussion would serve as the first reading on the topic of subpoena power.

This matter was discussed.

X. Staff Update (including upcoming agenda items, appeals)

Mr. Sugar noted there are no appeals of PC cases, and reviewed future applications.

This matter was discussed

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Smith, that the meeting be adjourned at 10:28 pm. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

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.

* * *