



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Thomas Harvie, Chair
Ron Stolle, Vice Chair
Gregory Anglewicz
Michael Chuparkoff
David Lehman
David Nystrom
James Vitale

Greg Hannan, Community Development Director
Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
Matthew Vazzana, City Solicitor

Monday, October 12, 2020

7:30 PM

Via Video-Conference & Live-Stream

I. Call To Order

Chair Harvie 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 - Mr. Anglewicz, Mr. Chuparkoff, Mr. Harvie, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle and Mr. Vitale

III. Swearing In

Chair Harvie decided to do the swearing in with the cases.

IV. Correspondence

Chair Harvie noted correspondence from Ms. Cassie Craven and Ms. Jen Masiella, both of Hudson Drive that are included in the staff report.

V. Public Discussion

There were no items for Public Discussion.

VI. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 9-14-2020](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: September 14, 2020

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes 9-14-20](#)

Mr. Lehman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nystrom that the minutes be approved with the addition of the time of adjournment. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Anglewicz, Mr. Chuparkoff, Mr. Harvie, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Nystrom
and Mr. Stolle

Abstain: 1 - Mr. Vitale

VII. Old Business

There was no old business.

VIII. Public Hearings

- A. [PC 2020-817](#) A Site Plan request for construction of a new commercial building, approximately 4,800 square feet, at 25 Milford Drive, Parcel #3204164 located in Zoning District 5 (Village Core District).

Attachments: [SR 2020-817 25 Milford Drive Commercial Building](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing photos of the property, site plan, renderings of the proposed building on 1.61 acres in District 5 and described the neighboring properties. Mr. Sugar also reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Chair Harvie swore in Ms. Xin Wan, Mr. John Kohr, Mr. Sugar and Mr. Hannan.

Ms. Wan and staff discussed the landscaping, ramp, recommended sidewalk, five-foot setback that will require the removal of two parking spaces and required lighting. Ms. Wan also noted the sidewalk is an existing sidewalk that will require cutting for utilities and replacing in kind. Ms. Wan and Mr. Hannan discussed changes to the existing sidewalk and possible financial assistance from the City.

The Commissioners and applicant discussed: 1) The possible tenant(s). 2) That the parking requirements are met. 3) The setbacks are similar to other buildings in the area. 4) The proposed parking area will have sufficient drainage. 5) The reduction of impervious surface due to new landscaping. 6) The possibility of removing landscaping on the eastern side and using that area for the sidewalk. 7) The required bump-out in the parking lot being in the setback. 8) The agreement by the applicant to abide by the six staff recommendations. 9) Curbing if the bump out is removed. 10) The downspouts being tied into the drainage system.

The Commissioners discussed the removal of the landscaping on the eastern portion of the building and the addition of a sidewalk for pedestrians.

Based on the evidence and representations to the Commission by Xin Wan and City staff at a public meeting of the Planning Commission held at the regular meeting on October 12, 2020 of the Planning Commission. Mr. Chuparkoff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lehman, to approve the site plan in Case 20-817 for 25 Milford Drive according to plans received September 9, 2020 with the following conditions:

1. **Revise the sidewalk design along Milford Drive to be located closer to the proposed building and provide separation from the street.**
2. **Revise the site and landscape plan to remove the proposed parking turn around and provide a five-foot setback along the north property line with incorporation of perimeter landscaping. Perimeter landscaping shall reach a height of at least three feet within two years of installation.**
3. **Submit an exterior lighting plan with photometrics and cut sheets within compliance of the applicable standards of Section 1207.14.**
4. **Curbing shall be installed around all parking areas.**
5. **Revise the site plan to provide a sidewalk along the eastern building line in lieu of proposed landscaping.**
6. **The comments of Fire Marshal Shawn Kasson shall be addressed per the September 24, 2020 correspondence.**
7. **The comments of the Engineering Department review must be addressed per the October 2, 2020 correspondence.**

This matter was approved with conditions

Aye: 7 - Mr. Anglewicz, Mr. Chuparkoff, Mr. Harvie, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle and Mr. Vitale

- B.** [PC 2020-822](#) A Text Amendment request to Section 1205.11(f)(1)A *Hike Bike (HB) Senior Housing Overlay Zoning District 8* of the Land Development Code and to consider a zoning map amendment request to change the zoning of permanent parcels 3001315 and 3001316 from District 8: Industrial/Business Park to District 8: Hike Bike (HB) Senior Housing Overlay Zoning.

Attachments: [SR 2020-822 Hudson Dr Zoning Map and Text Amendment file 1 of 2](#)
[SR 2020-822 Hudson Dr Zoning Map and Text Amendment file 2 of 2](#)
[Letters From Neighbors](#)

Mr. Hannan introduced the proposed map and text amendment and reviewed the staff comments regarding the process.

Chair Harvie sworn in all who plan to speak.

Mr. Burns, zoning attorney, introduced the application by noting the property has been for sale for 40 years with no purchase offers. Mr. Burns believes this is because the land is zoned for office/industrial use and stated there is interest in purchasing the land for residential use, which requires a text amendment.

Mr. Bill Heller, property owner, noted his inability to sell the property over the last 40 years with it being zoned office/industrial.

Mr. Mark S Majewski, AICP, of Northstar Planning and Design, LLC, described the benefits to the seller and City of Hudson achieved by rezoning the property for residential use. Mr. Majeskie then summarized the report submitted to Planning Commission including: 1) This area is now, essentially a residential area. 2) The City Land Use Plan is impractical for this property. 3) Hudson Drive is not an active office/industrial area. 4) The area has many non-conforming structures. 5) The area is two miles from the nearest freeway. 6) The City Master Plan does not support office/industrial use in this area. 8) The developer is willing to build connectors to the existing hike and bike trails.

Mr. Majewski addressed the staff comments and stated the current map does not reflect the circumstances of this property, which is the reason the LDC allows amending zoning. Mr. Majewski summarized his statement by saying the requested text and map amendments are justified by the changing circumstances of this property and surrounds, the proposal will be attractive to seniors, fit well with the surrounding area and meets the objectives of the City Plan.

Mr. Greg Modic, Petros Homes, discussed the reasons Petros Homes is considering this property and his appreciation of the quality of Petros as a company in working with the community and customers. Mr. Modic addressed the staff and public comments, the economic impact of a residential neighborhood as opposed to office/industrial and the traffic study.

The Commission discussed the following items with the applicant and staff: 1) What is impeding the sale or use of the property? The applicant noted there is no market for new office or industrial buildings in this area and discussed the reasons for this change. 2) Existing electric wiring will remain as is, new wiring will be underground. 3) The length of time the owner has owned the property and the zoning laws at the time of purchase. 4) The applicants desired rezoning of the property. 5) The distance from and the connections to the Hike and Bike Trail. 6) Easements described by the applicant of neighboring property owners for access across their property. 7) The number of units in the proposed development. 8) The existing residences as a basis for granting the requested text and map amendments. 9) The reasons light industries have not expressed interest in this property. 10) The LDC allowance for density on the 31 acres of this property. 11) The text of the requested changes. 12) The City Connectivity Plan including existing trails and sidewalks. 13) Other developments by Petros and how they are similar to the proposed Hudson development. 14) Consideration of single-family housing instead of the proposed housing. 15) The cost of houses and continuing fees. 16) The separation between buildings. 17) Visitor parking. 18) Lot sizes of single-family homes. 19) Comparisons with the River Oaks development. 18) The styles of homes and how they fit in the Hudson landscape. 19) Mr. Vazzana's opinion of including a private company as part of the text changes. 20) The use of existing sidewalks and bike lanes as connectivity. 21) That the applicant's

objectives cannot be met through variances.

Chair Harvie opened the meeting for Public Comment and recognized communication from Ms. Cassie Craven.

Ms. Jennifer Masiella, 5422 Hudson Drive, asked questions regarding the application; staff and the applicant responded. Ms. Masselinno noted that many of the area residents moved to this neighborhood because they did not want to be part of a development or downtown.

Mr. Jeff Boylin, 5456 Hudson Drive, noted he has lived on Hudson Drive for 66 years and owns the properties on both sides of 5456 Hudson Drive. Mr. Boylin also stated that the entrance and exit to the new development are directly in front of his driveway. He also expressed concern over the traffic on Hudson Drive and the additional traffic caused by this development. Mr. Boyles also questioned the utilities to be used by the development.

Mr. Jacob Fisher, 5411 Hudson Drive, was sworn in by Mr. Harvie. Mr. Fisher noted he purchased his property because of the wooded lot adjacent to his property and stated he inquired about purchasing part of the proposed property. He also noted a large pond will be located within 100 feet of his home and he has concerns about his family and pets.

Mr. Modic described the location of homes and ponds in relation to Mr. Fisher's home.

Chair Harvie closed the Public Comments portion of the meeting.

The Commission made comments that included: 1) Concern over the tie in to the hike and bike trail and appreciation for the connection to the health and wellness facility. 2) The property can be used for light industry. 3) The applicant is attempting to rezone the property to a zoning code that does not exist. 4) The hike and bike trail will not go away, the health and wellness center might. 5) The applicant does not meet many conditions of the zoning classification. 6) Discussion with Mr. Vazzana about other ways the applicant might approach a solution. 7) Mr. Vazzana stated the Commission's responsibility is to determine if the applicant has met his burden of establishing a reason for the Commission to change the zoning map and text. 8) Why the zoning map made this an office/light industrial area. 9) Can the applicant bring the application back to PC if they change the reasons? 10) Mr. Vazzana stated regardless of the Planning Commission's decision, this application will go to City Council. 11) In reading LDC 1204.01, there does not seem to be any reason to grant the applicants request. 12) The Overlay district was developed for Redwood Development and a few other parcels. 13) Amending the language to include a direct connection to the hike and bike trail as well as a connection to a health and wellness center.

The applicants made final comments, including: 1) When the property was purchased the zoning was more flexible, the change was the marketplace. 2) This property has not sold for 40 years. 3) The quality and integrity of Petros Homes. 4) The desire to know what changes Planning Commission would like made in the application.

Chair Harvie recommended that the applicant and City Staff meet to determine the next steps for the applicant. Mr. Vazzana noted the applicant has the right to have the case heard and determined by Planning Commission and the applicant may request a continuance to the next meeting.

The applicant requested a continuance until the November PC meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Lehman, seconded by Mr. Anglewicz, that this application be continued. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Anglewicz, Mr. Chuparkoff, Mr. Harvie, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle and Mr. Vitale

IX. Other Business

No other business.

X. Staff Update

No staff updates.

Mr. Lehman noted that Mr. Harvie and Mr. Vitale is finishing his term, meaning at least one vacancy will exist on Planning Commission.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Anglewicz, seconded by Mr. Vitale, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Anglewicz, Mr. Chuparkoff, Mr. Harvie, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle and Mr. Vitale

C. Thomas Harvie, 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.

* * *