

O H I O

HUDSON

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT • 115 Executive Parkway, Suite 400 • Hudson, Ohio 44236 • (330) 342-1790

DATE: September 24, 2015

TO: City of Hudson Planning Commission for September 28, 2015 Meeting

FROM: Greg Hannan, City Planner
Mark Richardson, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Update
Ordinance No. 15-124

PC Case No: 2015-24

Project Introduction

Planning Commission conducted its public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan (Plan) at its meeting of September 14, 2015. The commission continued the public hearing to the September 28, 2015 meeting to further discuss the proposed plan and to request some additional information from staff. Project Manager Dan Gardner from Houseal Lavigne Associates (HLA) and staff will be present at the September 28, 2015 meeting. In response to the discussion at the meeting and subsequent comments received from commission members, staff offers the following brief comments.

Topics discussed at the September 14, 2015 meeting:

South Hayden Parkway - Ogilby Drive Connector: Staff requested insight from the Engineering Department on the key steps needed to complete a major street project. City Traffic Engineer Chris Papp has noted a typical project of this scale would require 5-8 years to complete the design and construction process and would involve multiple public meetings. The Engineering Department has indicated the proposed connector is neither on the five year capital project list nor the unfunded project list. City Engineer Thom Sheridan confirmed the roadway would not be feasible to complete within the next ten years.

Based on the ten year horizon of the Plan, the fact that the connector is not on any project lists of the City Engineering Department, and the resident concerns expressed at the September 14, 2015 meeting, staff recommends removing the connector from the plan.

Downtown Traffic: Planning Commission and resident comments referenced downtown traffic and potential impacts from the Downtown Phase II project. The City of Hudson has already commenced collecting existing traffic counts to document the current conditions. A significant traffic impact analysis will be conducted to determine how the proposed development would impact the street network. Staff notes the existing bus garage, Hudson Public Power, and

Windstream facilities generate significant truck/bus traffic which would be removed from the downtown area with the proposed plan.

Housing Diversity: Each of the public engagement steps (online survey, key person interviews, visioning sessions, resident/business workshops) included significant feedback regarding desired diversity of housing. The plan recommendations include creating trail oriented development, adding design flexibility to allow expanded mixed use or mixed housing types within a development, and expanded low impact development. The Downtown Phase II Plan (Chapter 6) meetings included significant discussion by the Downtown Committee noting the district as a good location to incorporate townhome and multifamily housing to address the community desire for housing diversity and to support the downtown retail district. The proposed housing diversity will provide more choices to residents such as empty nesters and young professionals than the current single family detached housing units which comprise 87% of the city housing units.

Additional Comments Received From Planning Commission Members:

Economically Competitive (page 1): Commission member noted text on this page references the need to make Hudson economically competitive. Rather than referring to a specific weakness or problem the text is documenting a directive or mindset for the city to strive for.

Business recruitment tools (Page 4): Commission member noted the reference to a key person interview comment(s) related to a lack of available tools for economic development. Staff has noted this as a goal for the city to expand retention and recruitment tools rather than the lack of a specific tool or resource.

Grade Separation (page 21): Within the vision of Hudson in 2030 the third column references the at grade railroad crossings at Stow Road and Hines Hill Road have been eliminated with over/underpasses to eliminate traffic delays.

Flex Space (page 27): Commission member asked about the use of the term flex space within Chapter 5 Land Use and Chapter Six Downtown Phase II. The classification in Chapter 5 is a separate description from Chapter 6; however, both describe the ability for multiple uses to be considered. The YDC and Koberna properties noted in Chapter 5 require study beyond the scope of the comprehensive plan and are thus noted under the Flex category.

Population Trends (page 30): Commission members commented on the declining population and the ability of the community to support more development. The plan documents the flat to declining population of the city. The flat population is part of a national trend due largely to shrinking average household size; however, is also impacted by the city's growth management controls. The proposed housing diversity would respond to the shrinking household size and the desire for young professional and empty nester housing.

Street Edge (page 37): Commission member asked for clarification regarding the term street edge. The term is used in reference to the surface parking lots on Clinton Street and the lack of buildings or activity along the edge of the street. The Downtown Committee discussed the need to strengthen connections between First and Main and Phase II. The current street edge of

Clinton Street is developed with large surface lots which could be enlivened with limited infill development, unified streetscape, banners, etc.

Office and Flex Space (page 43): Commission member commented on the capacity for expanded office space downtown and for clarification on the term flex space. The Downtown Phase II plan targets high quality office space based on the general feedback received from numerous companies looking to locate or expand in the downtown. Staff is proceeding with market based analysis to confirm this finding. The flex space category describes areas appropriate for redevelopment if desired by the property owners.

Route 8 to Interstate 380 (page 51): Commission member asked for background related to the desired classification change of State Route 8 to I-380. The change in classification is desired as part of a regional effort already underway by AMATS and other agencies. The classification change would provide additional federal funding opportunities and assist with business recruitment being adjacent to the interstate highway system.

Required PC Action, Chapter 1203.03(c)(1)(B)

Any recommendation for modification or amendment of the Comprehensive Plan shall receive a Public Hearing by the Planning Commission and within six months following the public hearing, recommendation shall be made by the Planning Commission to Council. Council shall hold a public hearing and take action to adopt, reject or modify the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan within six months of receipt of a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Recommendation

After due consideration of input gathered from the citizens of Hudson through numerous public engagement methods, the Planning Commission recommends City Council accepts the recommendation of the Downtown Re-Development and Improvement Phase II Ad Hoc Committee and the Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee to adopt the Hudson Comprehensive Plan as presented to the Planning Commission at the September 14, 2015 Public Hearing with the following amendment:

1. Remove the proposed South Hayden-Ogilby Connector, as listed within Chapters 7 *Transportation and Mobility Plan* and Chapter 10 *Implementation Plan*.