



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Ronald Stolle, Chair
David Nystrom, Vice Chair
Andrew Furbee
Melissa Jones
Sarah Norman
Matt Romano
Erik Vaughan

Greg Hannan, Community Development Director
Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
John Kolesar, City Solicitor

Monday, October 9, 2023

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call To Order

Chair Stolle 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: 6 - Ms. Jones, Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Furbee and Mr. Romano
Absent: 1 - Mr. Vaughan

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Correspondence

There was no correspondence noted by the Commissioners or staff.

V. Public Discussion

Ms. Jones stated that PC 2023-676 was noticed as a public meeting, not a public hearing and inquired when public comment would be made. Chair Stolle verified public comments would be taken during review of the application.

Ms. Norman reminded staff and the Commissioners that speaking directly into a microphone is critically important

VI. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 9-11-23](#) Minutes of previous Planning Commission meeting: September 11, 2023

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes September 11, 2023](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Jones, that the September 11, 2023, Minutes be approved as edited. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Jones, Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle and Mr. Furbee

Abstain: 1 - Mr. Romano

VII. Old Business

VIII. Public Hearings

A. [PC 2023-789](#) A conditional use and site plan request for a 7,539 sq. ft. addition to Ellsworth Hall, located at Western Reserve Academy.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Applicant's Presentation](#)
[Applicant Response to Conditional Use Criteria](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Building Elevations and Floor Plan](#)
[Lighting Specifications](#)
[Trip Generation Report](#)
[Owner Affidavit](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plan and describing the scope of the project, noting it will be a net increase of 4800 square feet after part of the current building is demolished, he also described the proposed exterior changes, and noted the staff comments.

Mr. Mark Olson, Bialosky Cleveland, and Mr. Seth Duke, project manager, described the purpose of the project as allowing the totality of the staff and student body, approximately 500 people, to gather for lunch together while the existing dining hall holds only 350 people. Mr. Olson: Noted the proposed addition will match the historic look of the existing building, reviewed the constraints placed on the project, stated the building will be fully sprinkled, and reviewed elements of the storm water management system. The expanded curb cut, the split boulevard, the natural gas entry, and fire department truck turnaround were all detailed. Mr. Olson also discussed and displayed the proposed landscaping and the green roof system.

Mr. Duke described the functional benefits and gathering areas of the proposed addition, the attempt to respect the architecture of Ellsworth Hall, and views of the four side of and top of the building.

Mr. Olson displayed drawings of the lighting details, reviewed the landscape survey, explained the effort to save the legacy trees as well as a red oak which is adjacent to the proposed detention basin, the traffic study, and the photometric study which will have reduced pedestrian lighting as compared to the original submittal.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: An overview of the lighting report, the white oak tree referenced in the report near the sidewalk, the loading dock with staff's recommendations to lower the screening, that the lighting will have the normal campus lighting hours, that each building has an individual address but is one parcel with frontage on Prospect Street, the expanded curb cut which may impact how trucks enter and leave the parking lot, the difficulty of making a turning circle in the parking lot, the slope of the loading dock, creating short term pickup and drop off parking spaces, that the step and patio areas are ADA compliant, that students will

not be on the green roof, the alternate lighting plan, the sidewalk which provides exterior access to service areas .

Mr. Jeff Jacot, WRA, addressed questions regarding the parking lot wall of the previous WRA project.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: That water service is sufficient to support a sprinkler system, an approximate cost of nineteen million dollars with the project timeline of January 2024 to completion in June 2025. It was also noted that a full basement will include service areas, classrooms, bathrooms, and new laundry area. Mr. Jacot noted that the sheds adjacent to the practice fields would be demolished and not replaced .

Mr. Olson noted the recommendations from the City Arborist, that electrical upgrades will be made throughout Ellsworth Hall, and that the retaining wall be tiered and blend in with the building behind.

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Comments. There were no Public Comments.

The Commissioners discussed the five staff recommendations and the applicant's alternate plan .

Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Mr. Romano, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission, according to plans received June 21, 2023, the Planning Commission finds the application is in compliance with the general conditional use standards of Section 1206.02(b) and the Special Conditions and Standards 1206.02(c)(1),(2),(11),(12) & (14) applicable to private secondary schools.

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

- 1. Revise the height of the loading dock wall to have a maximum height of eight (8) feet to be compliant with Section 1206.03(b)(5)(B). Alternative screening methods may be explored, to be verified by City Staff, or a variance request could be submitted to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals.**
- 2. Revise the proposed landscaping plan to address the comments of the City Arborist, including:**
 - 1. Document how the mature White Oak located at the rear of the building would be protected through construction subject to approval by the city arborist.**
 - 2. Revise the pond layout to preserve the adjacent, mature Red Oak.**
 - 3. Revise the grading plan to relocate grading outside of the existing Locust tree along College Street, near the location of the existing driveway.**
 - 4. Submit a landscape bond in an amount equal to 110 percent of the cost of the installations.**
 - 3. Reduce lighting levels in the areas along the proposed outdoor seating area to be compliant with 1207.14-Exterior Lighting of the Land Development Code.**
 - 4. This approval is in conjunction with the proposed alternative plan the applicant presented to the Planning Commission during the October 9th, 2023 meeting. The alternative plan removed the tiered seating of the prior plan. The applicant shall revise all final documents to refer to the alternative plan.**
 - 5. The comments of Assistant City Engineer David Rapp shall be addressed per the September 29, 2023 correspondence.**

Aye: 6 - Ms. Jones, Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Furbee and Mr. Romano

IX. Other Business

- A. [PC 2023-676](#) A compatibility review/concept plan request for Canterbury Crossing, a 34-lot, single-family subdivision.**

Attachments: [Staff Report 2023-676 Canterbury Crossing Compatibility Review](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Assistant City Engineer Review Letter](#)
[Wetland Delineation](#)
[Public Comments Final 8.14.23](#)
[Density and Open Space Calculation Exhibit](#)
[Renderings](#)
[Signed Affidavit - Property Owner A](#)
[Signed Affidavit - Property owner B](#)

Mr. Stolle noted this application is not a public hearing, however, Public Comments will be received.

Ms. Jones recused herself from this application as a Commission member in accordance with the Ohio Ethics Commission's opinion but stated she would be participating in the discussion as a public citizen as permitted by the Ohio Ethics Commission.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by giving an overview of the project.

Mr. Stolle noted that 14 correspondences from 9 different persons have been received by the Commission.

Mr. Chris Brown, Kutchar LLC, and Prestige Builder Group, discussed the exceptional quality of the 1300 homes built by Prestige Homes in Hudson, the history of this project, and reviewed the staff report. Mr. Brown also noted that in the previous PC meeting a plan was referred to, however that plan was submitted by a different builder.

Mr. John Russell, President, Prestige Builder Group, described the history of Prestige Homes, his work with the boards in Hudson, and his decision to form Prestige Builder Group in 2020 and build 12 to 15 high quality homes per year.

Mr. John Slagter, Tucker Ellis Law Firm, discussed the three stages of the proposed project, and the excellent reputation and vision of Prestige Homes and Prestige Builder Group. Mr. Slagter then reviewed the LDC Subdivision codes which he stated are applicable to this Compatibility Review. Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Discussion.

Mr. Richard C. Fedorovich, 6575 Chestwick Lane, believes Prestige has done an excellent job in building houses including the one he lives in and anticipates purchasing another house from Prestige Builder Group.

Mr. Chris Cosma, 2242 Ravenna Street, described: Lots 29, 30 and 31 as the headwater for Brandywine Creek, that rain causes flooding in various areas, that the area by the train tracks are not usable because of wetness, that this rural area will have lighting and noise pollution, that vehicles will have headlights aiming into the riding arena, and the number of vehicles will cause traffic jams.

Mr. Robert Vizmeg, 6395 Ridgeline Drive, stated his appreciation of the new homes in his neighborhood, that he moved back to Hudson with a desire for a new home which he and many others find in short supply. Mr. Vizmig also believes the proposed development represent progress in Hudson.

Ms. Melissa Jones, 2233 Ravenna Street, reviewed 1) Portions of the Comprehensive Plan, and stated this application does not meet the requirements for the goals and area descriptions within. 2) The Land Development Code and the density requirements, the purpose statement regarding District 2, and that new residences are only permitted that incorporate the Rural Residential Character. 3) The LDC requirement that the Comprehensive Plan

guidelines are followed including contiguous land. 4) The Ohio Revised Code description of contiguous land which would define this area as two subdivisions. 5) That she has received threat of legal action from the applicant's attorney.

Mr. Skyler Sutton, 2243 Ravenna Street, disputed the idea of the developer wanting to work with the neighbors, stated the primary issue is following the LDC not people's wishes, that trusting the developer's judgment cannot supersede the LDC requirements, that the applicants statements show these are areas with incompatible densities, and that a new development cannot supersede the requirements of the LDC.

Mr. Slagter noted the purpose of serving legal notice to the city, the Ohio Ethics Commission and Preservation Letters to individuals was to protect his client in future actions.

Mr. Dan Walker, 7610 Warren Point Lane, stated he has lived in three Prestige Homes in Hudson and believes each home was great and are the homes that many people desire.

Seeing no one else coming forward, Chair Stolle closed Public Discussion.

The Individual Commissioners further discussed the proposal as it relates to the requirements of the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan and the spirit of the requirements.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed:

1. That the upcoming submission would be a Preliminary Subdivision Application for Open Space Conservation.
2. A Planning Commission member asked for a set of soil borings and water table analysis to be submitted with the Preliminary Subdivision application.
2. That staff is unaware of another application for a development of noncontiguous land. However, Mr. Slagter stated that the land is contiguous and that multiple parcels may be used for a subdivision.
3. That previous wetlands reports are not part of the applicants review. Mr. Brown noted he would not use someone else's report. Mr. Slagter stated if the Commission desires, he will find previous wetlands reports.
4. The Open Space Conservation development requirements.

A formal motion was not made by the Board as this request was for Compatibility review.

B. [PC ADMIN](#) Updates to the Planning Commission's Administrative Rules - Conflict of [REVIEW FALL](#) Interest Text [2023](#)

Attachments: [Staff Memorandum](#)
 [Admin Rules Draft](#)

Chair Stolle performed a first reading of the Proposed Conflicts of Interest change. There were no comments from the Commissioners.

X. Staff Update

1. Mr. Hannan stated:
 - a. That there is not a path to revoke the Turnpike parking as permitted by the City.
 - b. That Council is reviewing: Vape shops, tattoo parlors and North Main Street permitted uses.
2. Ms. Norman recused herself from any discussion of the Hudson Country Club and requested she be deleted from any emails regarding the cart barn project.
3. Mr. Stolle updated the Commissioners regarding the Comprehensive Plan Review and discussed the

possibility of a full rewrite of the Land Development Code.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Norman, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was approved unanimously.

Chair Stolle adjourned the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

Ronald H. Stolle, 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.

* * *