



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT • 1140 Terex Road • Hudson, Ohio 44236 • (330) 342-1790

PLANNING COMMISSION

CASE NO. 24-355

CONDITIONAL USE

THE PRESERVE OF HUDSON TOWNHOMES

DARROW ROAD - PARCEL #3003001

FINAL DECISION

Based on the evidence and representations to the Commission by Hanna Cohan, Knez Homes, Gerald Wise, Donald Bohning & Associates, and City staff at a public meeting of the Planning Commission held at the regular meeting on May 13, 2024, the Planning Commission approves the Conditional Use Request for the Preserve of Hudson Townhomes in Case 24-355 for Darrow Road Parcel #3003001 according to plans received April 15, 2024 as the Planning Commission finds the application is in compliance with the Conditional Use standards of Section 1206.02.

The Planning Commission makes the following Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal is compliant with Section 1206.02(b)-Conditional Uses: General Criteria and Standards:
 1. The proposal will be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Land Use Plan within the Comprehensive Plan identified this site as a specific location suitable for townhomes.
 2. The use will be physically and operationally compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
 3. The use can be accommodated on the site consistent with any architectural and design standards set forth in the applicable district regulations of this Code, and in conformance with all dimensional, site development, grading, drainage, performance, and other standards for the district in which it will be located. The townhomes are designed to face a central, main drive. Garage doors are oriented towards more narrow alleys.
 4. The proposed access drive has adequate separation from Stoney Hill Drive. The proposed access drive would be shared with future development at the front of the parcel.
 5. On-site and off-site traffic circulation patterns would not adversely impact adjacent uses.
 6. The use will be adequately served by public facilities and services; including City of Hudson water, City of Hudson electric, and Summit County Sanitary sewer.
 7. The use provides adequate off-street parking on the same property as the use.
 8. The use will be screened with adequate landscaping.
 9. The residential use is proposed at a density consistent with that of the existing neighborhood density or is compatible by its use of architecture, orientation of structures and parking, and landscape buffer. Where sufficient natural screening does not exist, or will be disturbed, development adjacent to existing residential shall blend with neighboring properties and increased density shall be directed away from neighboring properties.

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

1. Revise the plans to relocate unit #23 to a more visible location along the street.
2. The submitted trip generation analysis shall be updated to clarify the anticipated number of AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips.
3. The site plan shall be submitted to the Parks Board for determination on the public open space requirements prior to the final site plan review.
4. Revise the plans to set back the limits of disturbance along the areas highlighted in Figure 4 of this staff report to protect trees on adjacent parcels.
5. Revise the lighting plan to depict additional light poles per Figure 5 in this staff report to provide consistent lighting along the main drive.
6. Revise the submittal to address the review letter from the Assistant City Engineer dated May 7, 2024.
7. Revise the submittal to address the review letter from the Fire Marshal dated May 2, 2024.

Dated: May 20, 2024

CITY OF HUDSON
PLANNING COMMISSION



David Nystrom, Chair





City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

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

Greg Hannan, Community Development Director
Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
Marshal Pitchford, Acting City Solicitor & Special Counsel

Monday, May 13, 2024

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Industrial Design Subcommittee (6:45 PM)

Ms. Jones called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

Present:

Planning Commission: Ms. Jones.

Architectural Historical Board of Review: Ms. Marzulla and Mr. Workley

A. PC 2024 111 IDB The Industrial Design Subcommittee will review case 24-111 prior to the MAY regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

Attachments: [Industrial Design Subcommittee Memo - \(FINAL\)](#)
[Revised Elevations for May 13 2024 Meeting](#)
[Previous Elevations from March 11 2024 Meeting](#)
[PC 24-111 Decision - March 11, 2024](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting the site plan and design were approved at the March 11 , 2024, meeting and the status of the four design conditions.

Mr. Matt Edwards, Gemco, described: The proposed use, staffing, and the need for a separate business address . Mr. Edwards also described the design decisions, the reason for building a 10,000 square foot business, and how facing a densely forested area impacted the design of the north and west elevations .

Mr. Rene Jimenez, Geis Company, the Board, and staff discussed how the March 11 , 2024, conditions influenced the updated design including why the windows were not brought lower, how landscaping will be used, and the additional masonry on the building. Mr. Jimenez also noted: The previous design of the corners gave a better impression of the two buildings being one company, that the colonnade does bring the buildings together, the possibility of the door being moved to twelve feet from the corner to bring balance with the other building, how stucco will be used, the possibility of using the sill band around the building, that the archway door is made to match the 1999 building, the high cost of purchasing curved glass, that the roof of the building will interfere with installing a glass window, that the buildings are of different heights because of their function, and that it would be difficult because of wetlands to build to the north and west of the proposed building,

Mr. David Lewis, Gemco, and Mr. Edwards, discussed the need for brick at the bottom of the building and the north side stone door, that the additional costs to comply with the conditions is difficult, that the materials change will not be noticeable, and that the reason for not enlarging the windows is the landscaping will prevent the windows from being seen.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Marzulla that the Industrial Design Subcommittee recommend Planning Commission approval of the application with the following elevation revisions:

- 1. East Elevation: The man door shall be replaced with a window of compatible size.**
- 2. North Elevation: The split face wall material shall be wrapped around the corner approximately 16 feet proportionate to the other corners. The man door shall be relocated along the split face corner to comply with the building code. Brick banding shall be removed.**
- 3. A stucco sill shall be extended along the north, northwest, and west elevations.**

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: Ms. Jones, Mr. Workley, Ms. Marzulla

The Industrial Design Subcommittee was adjourned following the vote.

II. Call To Order

Chair Nystrom 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.

III. Roll Call

Present: 6 - Ms. Jones, Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Romano and Mr. Nystrom

Absent: 1 - Mr. Furbee

IV. Swearing In

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

V. Correspondence

Correspondence: Chair Nystrom notified the Commissioners that Mr. Furbee has resigned from the Commission, Chair Nystrom and others thanked Mr. Furbee for his service to Hudson and the Commission.

Ms. Norman noted that at the March 12, 2024 City Council meeting she represented Planning Commission with her comments and answering questions. Ms. Norman also noted:

1. The possibility of speaking to Council regarding the growth of senior living housing units in Hudson.
2. An email from Mr. Daniel Wright regarding documents that were not executed regarding Hudson Community Living and her subsequent follow up of the matter.
3. A communication from a citizen regarding the normal turnaround time for a permit.
4. The PC and City Council meeting on April 25, 2024.
5. While attending the Ohio Landbank Association annual conference, Ms. Norman met the Cuyahoga County Planning Manager, who understands trends in zoning and discussed the possibility of him meeting with Hudson staff and the Commissioners.

Mr. Vaughan stated he is concerned that someone is trying to cause difficulty for the Hudson Community Living

project, which has been vetted and approved. Ms. Norman noted that the deed restriction document has been filed.

This matter was discussed

VI. Public Discussion

There was no Public Discussion.

VII. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 3-11-24](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: March 11, 2024

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes 3.11.24 \(DRAFT\)](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Stolle, seconded by Ms. Jones, that the March 11, 2024, Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

A. [PC 2024-111 DESIGN](#) Review of Industrial Design Subcommittee recommendation for Case 2024-111, 5640 Hudson Industrial Design Subcommittee.

Attachments: [Industrial Design Subcommittee Memo - \(FINAL\)](#)
[Revised Elevations for May 13 2024 Meeting](#)
[Elevations from March 11 2024 Meeting](#)
[PC 24-111 Decision - March 11, 2024](#)

Chair Nystrom changed the Agenda order to move PC 2024-111 Design earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application which was approved by PC on March 11, 2024. Following the approval the applicant contacted staff regarding changes to the design which were enumerated. Mr. Sugar described the Industrial Design Subcommittee's recommendation to the PC and Ms. Jones described the considerations regarding the recommendation.

Mr. Rene Jimenez, Geis Company, and Mr. David Lewis, Gemco, detailed the reasons the changes were made.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed the reason the door was not included on the design.

Ms. Jones made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stolle, that the Planning Commission find the application is in compliance with the Zoning District Standards of 1205.11 and that the Planning Commission approve the Industrial Design Subcommittee recommendation as follows:

- 1. East Elevation: The man door shall be replaced with a window of compatible size.**
- 2. North Elevation: The split face wall material shall be wrapped around the corner approximately 16 feet proportionate to the other corners. The man door shall be relocated along the split face corner to comply with the building code. Brick banding shall be removed.**
- 3. A stucco sill shall be extended along the north, northwest, and west elevations.**

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

VIII. Old Business

IX. Public Hearings

A. [PC 2024-348](#) Final Subdivision Plat request for Pine Ridge, a Single-Family Open Space Conservation Subdivision.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Improvement Plans](#)
[Subdivision Plat](#)
[Lighting Plan](#)
[Landscaping Plan and Tree Survey](#)
[Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan \(SWPPP\)](#)
[Wetland Information](#)
[Geotechnical Report](#)
[Draft Covenants and Restrictions](#)
[Conditional Use Responses](#)
[Engineering Review](#)
[Engineer's Estimate](#)
[Traffic Analysis](#)
[Stormwater Calculations](#)
[Final Subdivision Improvement Agreement \(DRAFT\)](#)
[Signed Decision - Preliminary Subdivision](#)
[Affidavits](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by: Noting this is the final subdivision plat request, reviewing the meetings and approvals to date, describing the subdivision, reviewing the preliminary plat conditions, noting communications regarding the project, noting other building methods may protect the mature pine trees, describing the wetlands and sewer line issues, and the City Engineer's recommendations regarding the storm water.

Mr. Chris Brown, representing Prestige Homes, GVI, the parcel Developer, and Prestige Builder Group, noted efforts to save the pine trees, the existing condition of the trees and the potential damage to the trees when work is done around them. Mr. Brown also discussed: Shifting the roadway to the west - however, the wetlands to the west will make that difficult, the City Engineer's comments, the open space comments with a walking trail around the pond which will be built near Hudson West Condos for aesthetic reasons and storm water control, and the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Brown also discussed the BZBA and Planning Commission meeting schedule which may complicate the project.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: That in the big picture the trees look to be in good health and that creative solutions may save the trees, if the restrictions on the deed will prevent home businesses and how the terms may be clarified, the number, cost, and types of proposed homes, that as many trees will be preserved

as possible, that white pines do not do well as buffers, that of the eleven staff recommendations - the first two need further discussion, that the driveways will have adequate setbacks, and the distance from Pinewood Trail to Hudson Condos West is approximately 60 feet.

Mr. Sugar noted a condition regarding the storm water and the protection of significant trees. The Board and applicant discussed: Replacing pine trees if some are removed, the significant plantings which will be installed, that Hudson Public Power has requested no new plantings be placed below power lines, that the walking trail will be available to the neighbors, that the .18 acre wetlands will be turned into an aesthetically pleasing pond, the criteria BZBA will use for granting a variance, that staff has not expressed significant concern regarding the wetlands plans, how problems will be adjudicated if the pond does not do all it should do, and that the pond is a common space which is the responsibility of the community as a whole.

Mr. Gerald Wise, Don Bohning and Associates, stated the storm water will not infiltrate the sewer system, that the pond will allow a controlled release, and the city will enter into a maintenance agreement with the homeowners.

The Board, applicant and staff discussed: The staff recommendation for a continuance in light of the required date of decision by PC, moving the driveway towards the wetlands as opposed to saving the pine trees, that the area near the wetlands drops off significantly, that this is the one opportunity to improving the landscaping, how litter control will be handled at the overlook, the snow removal plan, the funds-in-lieu of park space would be approximately \$20,000, the clearing limits marking, the start date of construction, and that the retention pond is the lowest point of the parcel. Mr. Hannan stated the application being complete is a staff interpretation, and that the LDC allows for a one-time finding to give a time extension.

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

The Commissioners discussed: The optimal entrance location and the Hudson Arborist opinion that the trees are healthy and should be preserved.

The applicant stated he believes this will be a good project that also helps the Hudson West Community.

The Commissioners discussion included: The wetlands need to be carefully considered with the possibly of moving them to another area, this is the type of development Hudson needs, a request that the applicant work closely with the City Arborist to save as many trees as possible, an appreciation of the balance the applicant has found in saving as many trees as possible and the water issues, and that using heavy machinery and changing water flow patterns around the trees increases the possibility of damage to the trees.

Ms. Norman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stolle, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission on May 13, 2024, that the Planning Commission approve the Final Subdivision Request for the Cottages at Pine Ridge in Case 24-348 according to plans received April 15, 2024, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Revise the limits of disturbance at the front of the property along the proposed street entrance to protect the significant, mature pine trees as possible by employing such methods as moving the sidewalk to the western side of the street and directional boring utility lines.**
- 2. Revise Lot #10 to depict a consistent 25 ft rear yard setback.**
- 3. The comments of Assistant City Engineer David Rapp shall be addressed per the May 8, 2024 correspondence, specifically the concern over the lack of an emergency overflow path for pond #2.**
- 4. Remove all references in the submittal documents that prohibit on-street parking.**
- 5. Revise the draft declaration of covenants per the following:**
 - a. Add text stating "Any open space restrictions shall be permanent, not just for a period of years" to page 12, Section 40.**
 - b. Add text stating "The association shall be responsible for liability insurance, local taxes, and the maintenance of recreational and other facilities" to page 4, Section 1.**

- c. **Revise Article V, Section 3 to clarify that home occupations, small home based businesses, are permitted as referenced in Section 1206.03(e) of the Land Development Code.**
6. **Submit public open space funds in lieu of dedication prior to the recording of the plat. The amount must be based on a per acre value determined by a recent appraisal of the subject property.**
7. **The applicant shall seek a variance from the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals for disturbance to the .18-acre parcel as identified as “Wetland A”.**
8. **The applicant shall seek a variance from the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals for disturbance to the wetland setbacks of wetlands identified as “Wetland B” and “Wetland C” for the installation of a sanitary sewer line.**
9. **No clearing or grading of any kind shall commence prior to the issuance of the zoning certificate.**
10. **Construction fencing shall be placed along the limits of disturbance.**
11. **The Final Subdivision Improvement Agreement shall be executed and signed by all parties prior to the recording of the subdivision plat.**
12. **The City Arborist shall review the submittals for each individual house lot and make recommendations for protecting significant trees.**

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Romano and Mr. Nystrom

Nay: 1 - Ms. Jones

B. [PC 2024-355](#) A Conditional Use Request for the Preserve of Hudson, a 29-unit townhome development.

Attachments:

[Staff Report](#)

[Conditional Use Responses](#)

[Site Plans](#)

[Landscaping Plan](#)

[Traffic Analysis and Sight Distance Evaluation](#)

[Elevations](#)

[Wetlands Verification](#)

[Fire Department Review](#)

[Previous PC Decision and Site Plan](#)

[Affidavit](#)

[Engineering Department Review](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by: Describing the District 3 overlay parcel on which 29 townhomes are proposed, that PC approved a Conditional Use request of this property on June 15, 2022 - which has expired, that the LDC has been modified since 2022 to reduce the density of the district, displaying and explaining an overview of the property, noting the proposal came before the AHBR in May 2024 - where discussion took place regarding relocating two of the units, that this discussion is for Conditional Use only - with a site plan to come before PC at a later date, and reviewing various attachments in the report and the staff comments.

Ms. Hannah Cohan, Triban Homes, and Mr. Gerald Wise, Donald Bohning and Associates: Discussed the previous configuration and the new LDC regulations which led to the revised design, reviewed the number and type of proposed buildings, displayed photos of the type of units, described the proposal as consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and surrounding neighborhood, responded to staff's questions regarding mail delivery,

litter, and trash pickup, noted AHBR gave generally positive comments regarding the project which will require no variances, and stated that it will be difficult to rotate buildings because of the 1.2 acres of wetlands but should be able to move the two recommended units. The applicants also: Stated a storm water pond is planned, that the entry location was determined by the City Engineer, that the site distance study shows the ODOT requirements are exceeded, that the trip generation report shows a maximum of 15, that the utilities will come in from Darrow Road, that off-street parking will have 21 guest spots and every unit can park 4 cars, the buffer yard and distances were explained, the density of 3.88 units per acre, the 2500 square feet and larger lots exceed the required size and setbacks, that the development is 130 feet from Darrow Road with sidewalks and a gravel path, the impervious surface requirements and limits-of-disturbance requirements will be met, that a 50-feet setback will be maintained, and that a cash-in-leu program will probably be used.

The Commissioners, staff and applicant discussed: The history of the proposals and designs for this property, future development to the north, that the wetlands prevent a connection to Holland Drive, that Triban owns the property to the road which is zoned for offices which Triban has no plans to develop, the units will be build on slabs, the price point is unknown, that work on the project could begin in early 2025 with completion in 2026, the limits-of-disturbance can be adjusted as requested, that a strong market for empty-nesters is anticipated, that primary suites on the first floor will be difficult to design, that the front lot will probably be sold at some point, that an easement will be in place for a shared drive/entry, the two zoning districts have different requirements for building, that the frontage requirement prohibited placing the access road in the middle of the front property, the blending requirement is difficult because there are no residences / developments near the proposed project, the design seems forced with units that face the rear of the property which is because of the LDC requirement of garages not facing a street, the building which is 800 feet from Darrow Road met approval from AHBR, that screening to the front parcel is the obligation of the higher density property with a 25 foot buffer included in this project, empty nester trends in housing, that LEEDs certification is not anticipated, and that the HOA agreement document may exclude rentals.

Chair Nystrom opened the floor for Public Comments.

Mr. Grant Thornlow, 50 Great Oak Drive, stated he is an empty nester who would like to downsize but cannot find a suitable residence in Hudson. He encouraged Hudson to build more diverse housing such as this project.

Chair Nystrom closed Public Comment.

The Commissioners discussed the project meeting the Conditional Use requirements, that for the Site Plan review the door requirements will be difficult, the blending issue may not be a deterrent, that testimony has shown it is unlikely for other developments to be built around this development - making it an island of townhomes, that the density is too great, that the commercial lot has not been incorporated into the plan, that questions remain if this is empty nester housing, that options for elevators might be shown in future plans, that the 2015 Comprehensive Plan mentions this as a transition area, that this does not serve as a transition area since there are no other homes nearby, that the transition must start somewhere and this is a difficult parcel, and that PC should not see this as only for 55 and over - younger people may want these units.

Mr. Vaughan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stolle, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission according to plans received April 15, 2024 that the Planning Commission find the application in compliance with the Conditional Use standards of Section 1206.02, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Revise the plans to relocate unit #23 to a more visible location along the street.**
- 2. The submitted trip generation analysis shall be updated to clarify the anticipated number of AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips.**
- 3. The site plan shall be submitted to the Parks Board for determination on the public open space requirements prior to the final site plan review.**
- 4. Revise the plans to set back the limits of disturbance along the areas highlighted in Figure 4 of this staff report to protect trees on adjacent parcels.**
- 5. Revise the lighting plan to depict additional light poles per Figure 5 in this staff report to provide consistent lighting along the main drive.**
- 6. Revise the submittal to address the review letter from the Assistant City Engineer dated**

May 7, 2024.

7. Revise the submittal to address the review letter from the Fire Marshal dated May 2, 2024.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

X. Other Business

XI. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan and noted comments from the joint Council/Planning Commission session would be integrated into the next draft.

XII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Stolle, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the meeting be adjourned at 10:20 p.m.. The motion carried by the following vote:

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



David Nystrom, 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.

* * *