



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Board of Zoning & Building Appeals

Jane Davis, Chair
Lou Wagner, Vice Chair
Lydia Bronstein
Robert Kahrl
Cory Scott

Nick Sugar, City Planner
Lauren Coffman, Associate Planner

Thursday, February 20, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call to Order

Chair Davis called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals 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 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein, Ms. Davis and Mr. Scott

III. Identification, by Chairwoman, of City Staff.

Chair Davis introduced: Nick Sugar - City Planner; Lauren Coffman - Associate Planner; and Marshal Pitchford - City Solicitor.

IV. Swearing in of Staff and Audience Addressing the Board.

Ms. Davis swore-in staff and all the persons wishing to speak under oath.

V. Approval of Minutes

[BZBA 1-16-25](#) Minutes of Previous Board of Zoning & Building Appeals Meeting: January 16, 2025

Attachments: [January 16, 2025 BZBA Minutes - Draft](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Ms. Bronstein, that the January 16, 2025, Minutes be approved as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein, Ms. Davis and Mr. Scott

VI. Public Hearings - New Business

[BZBA 24-1341](#) The subject of this hearing is a variance request of twelve (12) feet from the required rear yard accessory structure setback of fifteen (15) feet,

resulting in a rear yard setback of three (3) feet pursuant to section 1205.06(d)(5)(E)(3), “Property Development/Design Standards - Setbacks” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to build an accessory structure.

The applicant is James Hopkins, 5800 Bridgewater Blvd, Hudson, Ohio 44236. The property owners are Brian and Lauren Nash, 300 Simon Rd, Hudson, Ohio 44236 for the property at 300 Simon Rd in District 3 [Outer Village Residential Neighborhood] within the City of Hudson.

Attachments: [BZBA Staff Report - 300 Simon Rd](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by describing and displaying the property and project, noting the applicable LDC issues, the requested variance, the atypical property, and the staff comments and considerations .

Mr. James Hopkins, applicant, described the 12 x 20-foot shed, the requested variance, noted if the LDC requirement is met the shed would almost touch the house, and there is a very limited view of the shed from the road or neighboring houses.

Ms. Lauren Nash, homeowner, stated the shed is needed to allow the family cars and large mower to be inside the garage, and noted the neighbor's limited view of the shed.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: The size of the backyard, that an accessory building is not allowed in the side yard, that a variance will be needed for any shed built on the property, text messages on Ms. Nash’s phone from the neighbors supporting allowing the variance, the reasons the proposed location in the yard was chosen, the Board’s acknowledgment that corner lots present problems for accessory buildings, that Ms. Nash is agreeable to changing to a lesser variance, that the need for lawn equipment was not anticipated when the house was purchased, the staff suggested placement of the proposed project and the resulting difficulties for the homeowners, the possibility of a lower shed - however, the proposed was chosen to complement the type of structures in the neighborhood, the possibility of making the structure two-feet smaller which will reduce the height of the shed, the architectural standard which requires the shape of the roof to match the shape of the house, and discussion regarding the use of the side lot. Ms. Nash stated she believes the structure will beautify her property.

Ms. Lia Bish, 310 Simon Drive, spoke in support of the variance because of the homeowner’s needs and future homeowners potentially moving to the area.

The Board discussed: The Board’s opinion that as long as the main mass of the shed is in the rear yard - part of the shed may be in the side yard, the distance to move the shed to grant a variance, that the sightline of the rear yard house is affected by the proposed location of the shed, the large size of the proposed shed, the large amount of equipment to go in the shed, that a shed helps eliminate having a car always sitting in the driveway, that the neighbors will have a view of the proposed shed roof, that some Board members would feel better about the shed in the side yard, and that the rear neighbor will not see the shed from their pool.

Mr. Kahrl made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wagner, based on the evidence presented to the Board on Thursday, February 20, 2025, that the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals hereby grant the following:

A variance request of twelve (12) feet from the required rear yard accessory structure setback of fifteen (15) feet, resulting in a rear yard setback of three (3) feet pursuant to section 1205.06(d)(5)(E)(3), “Property Development/Design Standards – Setbacks” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to build an accessory structure.

The Board finds and concludes;

- 1. The Board acknowledges that there would be beneficial use of the property without the variance, as the existing home currently has a 2 car garage.**
- 2. The requested variance is deemed substantial but given the depth of the existing rear yard, a variance must be granted in order to construct a shed on the property in question.**
- 3. The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered, and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance. The Board acknowledges the public comments that were received in favor of the proposed shed.**
- 4. The variance would not affect the delivery of governmental services.**
- 5. The existing regulations were in effect when the applicant purchased the property in 2023.**
- 6. The applicant's predicament cannot be resolved feasibly through some method other than granting the variance. The Board notes that a review was done to reduce the proposed disturbance wherever possible.**
- 7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice would be done by granting the variance.**

Aye: 4 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein and Mr. Scott

Nay: 1 - Ms. Davis

[BZBA 24-1347](#)The subject of this hearing is a variance request of one-hundred and sixty-seven (167) feet from the required minimum lot width of two-hundred and fifty (250) feet, resulting in a lot width of eighty-three (83) feet pursuant to section 1205.10(e)(3), “Property Development/Design Standards - Lot Width” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to complete a lot split.

The applicant is Hanna Cohan, Triban Investment, LLC, 7555 Fredle Dr., Suite 210, Concord, Ohio 44077. The property owners are Triban Investment, LLC, 7555 Fredle Dr., Suite 210, Concord, Ohio 44077 for the property located at permanent parcel #3003001 in District 7 [Outer Village Commercial Corridor and Office Overlay Zone] within the City of Hudson.

Attachments: [BZBA Staff Report](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by describing and displaying: The 12-acre - split zoning property, the proposed lot split, the applicable Land Development Codes, and the size of the proposed lots. According to the applicant, the proposed lot split is intended to make the property more attractive.

Ms. Gillian Hall, Triban Investments, distributed additional information to the Board members regarding the submission, reviewed the project and noted the rear of the property is in District 3 with the roadside of the property in District 7. Ms. Hall then described the 29 units in six buildings off a private drive, the needed variances, that 29 of the 33 lots in the District 7 Overlay have less than the required frontage, examples of the 29 lots, and the site plans of the proposed lot-splits.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: That the flag-shaped split is unusual but others do exist, that PC reviewed this with a private drive, if the Board can infer that PC gave implicate approval of this driveway, that there may be no other options for building out this lot, Hudson's desire to have limited curb cuts, that a traffic study determined a traffic light was not necessary for this location, that Triban intends to sell the front 3-acre commercial lot, that the LDC requires every parcel have street frontage, and that staff proposed the stub street for potential future development.

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

Mr. Kahrl made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wagner, based on the evidence presented to the Board on Thursday, February 20, 2025, that the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals grant the following:

A variance request of one-hundred and sixty-seven (167) feet from the required minimum lot width of two-hundred and fifty (250) feet, resulting in a lot width of eighty-three (83) feet pursuant to section 1205.10(e)(3), "Property Development/Design Standards – Lot Width" of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to complete a lot split.

The Board finds and concludes;

- 1. The Board acknowledges that there would be no beneficial use of the property without the variance. The Board notes that a reasonable return would be to utilize the vacant property and acknowledges the Planning Commissions approval of the proposed development.**
- 2. The requested variance for the commercial segment of the property in question is deemed insubstantial.**
- 3. The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered, and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance. The Board acknowledges the prior approval of the proposed project by the Planning Commission.**
- 4. The variances would not affect the delivery of governmental services.**
- 5. The existing regulations were in effect when the applicant purchased the property in 2022.**
- 6. The applicant's predicament cannot be resolved feasibly through some method other than granting the variance.**
- 7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice would be done by granting the variance.**

Aye: 5 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein, Ms. Davis and Mr. Scott

VII. Other Business

[BZBA 2025](#) Discussion of City Council Ordinance No. 25-21 Codifying the Order and Rules
[Public Hearings](#) of a Public Hearing

- Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)
[Ordinance No. 25-21](#)
[BZBA Admin Rules \(Current\)](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the discussion by briefly describing the proposed ordinance and noting that City Council requested each Board and Commission to comment on the proposed ordinance . Mr. Sugar detailed some of the proposed rule changes for a Public Hearing. The Board and staff discussed Council’s desire to make the processes more uniform between the nineteen Boards and Commissions, and the meaning of ‘standing’ in the proposed ordinance .

VIII. Council Check-in Update

Ms. Bronstein described the City Council check in meeting and discussion .

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Ms. Bronstein, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

Jane Davis, Chair

Louis Wagner, Vice Chair

Joe Campbell, Executive Assistant

Upon approval by the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals, 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 .

* * *