

**From:** Jennifer Abdoo <jenabdoo13@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 7:26 AM  
**To:** Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>; Sutton, Skylar <ssutton@hudson.oh.us>  
**Subject:** Townhome Development in Darrow Rd Area

Dear Council Members:

In regard to the requested development with the addition of townhomes in the area of Darrow Road and Plymouth Village - please note our vehement request that this not be permitted.

The current infrastructure cannot support additional traffic. Frequently morning and afternoon traffic backs all the way from First and Main to the Drug Mart Plaza. Stow Road is the same. These are the only two ways we are able to go north from Plymouth Village. We are a neighborhood of working parents, teen drivers and minivan families. There is no way that adding so many homes in this area will not further affect our ability to leave our neighborhood in a timely manner.

We purchased our home, as did our neighbors, with the understanding that the majority of our area had been developed fully. The zoning in place protected us from further high-volume development. Is it fair to ask us and our neighbors to accept a change in zoning which in no way benefits our neighborhood and its residents? Having townhomes near our neighborhood could actually hurt the desirability of our neighborhood simply because of the density it will add and because it will change the feel of our single-family residential area.

Who would this zoning benefit? What will happen if these expensive units are not sold as the developer is promising? Will it then become a rental neighborhood if buyers cannot be found? How will the construction process affect the surrounding neighbors as well? How will the developer be held accountable if their promises are not fulfilled? There are no guarantees and the burden of any shortfall and all disruptions would be on Hudson residents and neighbors. **The risk is on the residents.**

Finally - how would this development benefit your Hudson neighbors? There is no benefit, except perhaps for a very few. The benefits in this case are financial for the land-owner and for the developer, but there are minimal to no benefits for current Hudson residents.

We have something special here in Hudson. This is a great place to raise a family and a large quantity of townhomes in an area of single-family residences just does not make sense.

We ask that you please vote against allowing the zoning change and the development.

Thank you -

The Abdoo Family, Eastham Way, Plymouth Village Hudson  
5991 Eastham Way

From: Sarah Bhatia <sarah.bhatia16@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 4:27 PM  
To: Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>; Sutton, Skylar <ssutton@hudson.oh.us>  
Subject: Oppose Rt. 91 Rezoning and Development Plans

Councilman Sutton:

I recently learned of two new development plans in your ward which would add dozens of townhomes to Hudson. I'm very concerned about this plan for several reasons.

—Traffic on Rt. 91 throughout Hudson is already not ideal. The two specific areas where the development is proposed are particularly congested throughout the day, and I have seen numerous close calls as drivers exit CVS and the veterinary hospital

—Hudson's infrastructure was built over several decades and seems comfortable with a population of about 22,000 people. Our population plateaued at this level almost 30 years ago, and increasing the density in a town of just 25 square miles seems unwise

—I understand that part of the reason for this population plateau is a new housing freeze which was instituted in the mid-1990s. Perhaps that needs to be explored again, or we may risk the safety of our roads and the capacity of our schools.

Thank you so much for your consideration of these comments.

—Sarah Bhatia

91 Steepleview Drive

**From:** Family Hildebrand <29jtjg@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 4:03 PM

**To:** Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>; Sutton, Skylar <ssutton@hudson.oh.us>

**Subject:** Proposed townhomes across from Stony Hill

RE: District 7 overlay zone hearing

Please read, send to members and make part of the public record.

We are OPPOSED to the change of language within the land code to make an amendment to build town homes across from Stoney Hill. Besides the obvious traffic implications that it will have. Changing the land code is opening the door for sweeping changes in our community. The townhomes will look out of place along 91 next to 1 and 2 story homes. What happened to Hudson being a tree city? Why are all the green spaces on our side of town being cleared away? In the course of one month two large areas of trees are in danger of coming down. If the wording is changed there is nothing stopping developers (non Hudson residents) from sweeping changes to our views in a part of Hudson that seems neglected because we are not close to town.

We are dangerously close to Ward 3 becoming overwhelmed. There is no reason to change the code to allow non - residents have a say in the look of 91. The trees are what make this portion of Hudson still part of the quaint downtown area.

Please do not allow District 7 overlay language to be changed. The vote within the planning commission was a close one and I hope that is due to members seeing that this would not be good for 91. Please take residents' views into account and keep the language the same and not allow for townhouses to be built right up on 91.

Terri and Jeff Hildebrand  
1657 Arbutus Drive  
Hudson Ohio

**From:** Chrissanna Krisch <chrissanna@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 3:37 PM

**To:** Sutton, Skylar <ssutton@hudson.oh.us>; Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>

**Subject:** to be included in June 1 council meeting

I hope to attend tonight's meeting. If I am unable to attend, I would like this to be read aloud. Please include this as part of public record.

City Council,

It is my understanding that in order for text or zoning map amendments to be passed, they must meet one of 9 standards set forth in the Land Development Code. This change fails to meet these standards.

Most notably, we would like to discuss standard 2 and standard 4.

Standard 2 addresses whether or not the proposed amendment furthers the long-range planning goals of the City. This amendment does not. While the back portion of the property in question is indeed zoned for townhomes based on the long-range plan of the city, the front portion is not. The amendment would change the code to allow townhomes on the front of the property, thus altering the long-term planning goals. Unfortunately, areas cannot be spot zoned. While the developer is looking at a particular location, the proposed amendment would alter the zoning for the entire section. This sets a dangerous precedent. In essence, this means that a developer COULD buy up the property along 91 and legally relocate the businesses to build townhomes all along this area. This would dramatically alter the long-range planning goals of the city.

Standard 4 focuses on whether or not the amendment corrects an inequitable situation created by the Land Development Code, rather than granting special privileges. We understand that it is a challenge to own property that has two different zoning requirements. However, there is an option where the developer or owner can apply to have his/her particular property zoning changed. This change would affect one individual property as opposed to opening the door for massive changes to the city's long term planning goals.

As you consider the benefits and ramifications of moving forward with additional development of closely spaced housing and eliminating greenspace in favor of traffic, please remember these will be against a large number of Hudson homes. The additional units will impact traffic and decrease the safety of our children riding bikes throughout our established neighborhood.

The change to the District 7 overlay, will change the "flavor" of this area. Increasing this already populated section of Hudson will negatively impact the current residents. It will bring increased noise, decreased greenspace, increased traffic, and permanently change the aesthetic essence of this area. Please do not ignore your long-time constituents in favor of a developer or investor who does not live in the immediate community that it would affect.

Plymouth Village and Old Town Colony neighborhoods are both areas known for young families. They are a community. The addition of these townhomes would alter that small town atmosphere. The very atmosphere that brought these families to the community. Traffic is ALREADY an issue here. Ward 3 is already a very population dense area of Hudson. Please do not make it worse. A decision to allow the amendment change will permanently cause detriment to the community.

We appreciate your time and consideration. Hudson has long been a community known for its greenspace, small-town atmosphere, and support of those within the community. We trust that you will continue to uphold these values and listen to what those who reside in the impacted areas have to say.

Robert and Chrissanna Krisch  
5971 Eastham Way

**From:** Kueitsung (Philips) Shih <ktshih@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 4:21 PM  
**To:** Sutton, Skylar <ssutton@hudson.oh.us>; Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>  
**Subject:** OPPOSITION to Ordinance 21-54

Date: June 1, 2021  
Subject: OPPOSITION to Ordinance 21-54

Please read our letter at tonight's meeting, send it to all members of City Council, and enter it into public record.

City Council,

We are writing in OPPOSITION to Ordinance 21-54. Passing it holds massive consequences for the Plymouth Village and Old Towne Colony neighborhoods. According to currently available information from the developer proposing the text amendment to the zoning code, at least 40 new housing units with potentially 80 additional vehicles will be part of the everyday traffic flow in a closely spaced housing area.

Increasing traffic volume to an already troubled traffic flow means increased concerns for safety due to excess through-traffic as well as increased level of inconvenience affecting quality of life for many young families with young children living in the area.

The proposal of "3 STORY" Townhouses at the street entrance to Rt. 91/Darrow Rd. would look very out of place aesthetically compared to the area surrounding the townhouses. This just doesn't make sense. The homes and businesses in the area are 1-2 story buildings.

It is our understanding that in order for text or zoning map amendments to be changed they must meet one of 9 standards set forth in the Land Development Code. This change fails to meet these standards. We would like to ask the Council's attention to standard 2 and standard 4.

Standard 2 addresses whether or not the proposed amendment furthers the long-range planning goals of the City. This amendment does not. While the back portion of the property in question is indeed zoned for townhomes based on the long-range plan of the city, the front portion is not. The amendment would change the code to allow townhomes on the front of the property, thus altering the long-term planning goals. The text change for District 7 Overlay was approved by the Planning Commission by a 4-3 margin, which indicated that some Planning Commission members had the same hesitations that community members have. The passing of this amendment will set a dangerous precedent. Changing ALL of District 7 Overlay instead of the 1 project proposed, opens the door to many additional Townhouses to be developed by land owners if they choose to build in the future. In essence, this means that a developer COULD buy up the property along 91 and legally relocate the businesses to build townhomes all along this area. This would dramatically alter the long range planning goals of the city.

Standard 4 focuses on whether or not the amendment corrects an inequitable situation created by the Land Development Code, rather than granting special privileges. We understand that it is a challenge to own property that has two different zoning requirements. However, there is an option where the developer or owner can apply to have his/her particular property zoning changed. This change would affect one individual property as opposed to opening the door for massive changes to the city's long term planning goals.

As you consider the benefits and ramifications of moving forward with additional development of closely spaced housing and eliminating greenspace in favor of traffic, please remember these will be against a large number of Hudson homes. Hudson has long been a community known for its support of those within the community, greenspace, and a small-town atmosphere. We trust that you will continue to uphold these values and listen to what those who reside in the impacted areas have to say.

Sincerely,

Kueitsung Shih  
Jing Zhang  
1662 Arbutus Drive

**From:** Lisa OMalley <leeshka48@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 9:15 AM  
**To:** Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>  
**Cc:** Lisa OMalley <leeshka48@yahoo.com>; Timothy O'Malley <tjomalley54@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Building Townhouses etc.. on Rt91/Darrow Rd

\*This email is to be part of public record  
\*Read Out Loud  
\*Sent to Council Members

Our names are Timothy & Lisa O'Malley.  
We reside at 1650 Arbutus Dr/ Ward 3.

We are OPPOSED to Townhouses etc... being built along the street FRONT ( entrance/exit) of Rt. 91/Darrow Rd.

The text change for District 7 Overlay was approved by the Planning Commission by a 4-3 margin. That is hardly a unanimous vote. Some Planning Commission members had the same hesitations that community members have. Changing ALL of District 7 Overlay instead of the 1 project proposed, opens the door to many additional Townhouses to be developed by land owners if they choose to build in the future.

The proposal of "3 STORY" Townhouses at the street entrance to Rt 91/ Darrow Rd would look very out of place aesthetically compared to the area surrounding the townhouses. This just doesn't make sense. The homes and businesses in the area are 1-2 story buildings.

We are not opposed to alternate housing choices for the city overall, but allowing Townhouses etc... that are 3 stories high to line the southern section of Rt 91/ Darrow Rd is an example of rushed/poor planning.

Thank you for your time.  
Tim & Lisa O'Malley  
1650 Arbutus Drive

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**From:** Gina M Trehan <ginamtrehan@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 9:21 AM

**To:** Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>; Sutton, Skylar <ssutton@hudson.oh.us>

**Subject:** Townhouses near Stoneyhill and Barlow: Comment for Public Record

Hi

Please reconsider the building of Townhouses in this area (including Barlow). We live on Bradford and the traffic (even during a pandemic where a lot of people are still working from home, including my husband and I) is horrible. We moved to this neighborhood over 10 years ago thinking it'd be a great place to raise a family, one where our children could ride bikes and play outside with friends.... over the past 10 years to today, the environment and traffic has already increased beyond what I could've ever imagined. I get so nervous allowing my son just to ride over to Colony on his bike because of the speeding cars and traffic. The addition of even more homes is an idea that provides ZERO benefits to this neighborhood, only downfalls. Save some trees and do not add to an already busy neighborhood. Please, please, please, for the safety of our Hudson children and families, do not do this.

Thank you for reconsidering,  
Gina Trehan  
5879 Bradford Way



**From:** Scott Wachsberger <s.wachsberger@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 2:46 PM  
**To:** Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>; Sutton, Skylar <ssutton@hudson.oh.us>  
**Subject:** Ordinance 21-54

To Whom it May Concern:

I request for this to be made public record and sent to members of City Council.

I am writing in regards to Ordinance 21-54. Passing this ordinance holds major consequences for the Plymouth Village and Old Towne Colony neighborhoods.

As you consider moving forward with additional development of closely-spaced housing, please remember the impact this will have on people living in the area. It will bring increased noise and traffic, decreased green space, and will permanently change the aesthetic of the area in a negative way. Please do not ignore your constituents in favor of a developer or investor who does not live in the area that this ordinance would impact.

Plymouth Village and Old Towne Colony neighborhoods are both areas known for young families. They are a community. The addition of these townhomes would alter that small-town atmosphere--the very atmosphere that brought families here in the first place. Traffic is already an issue. As previously mentioned, adding these housing units would only make it worse.

I appreciate your time and consideration. Hudson has long been a community known for its support of its residents. I trust that you will continue to uphold this notion and listen to what those who reside in the impacted areas have to say.

--

Scott Wachsberger  
5818 Ogilby Drive

From: Gary Windt <winslow44236@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 9:42 AM  
To: Slagle, Elizabeth <ESlagle@hudson.oh.us>  
Subject: New developments at Argyle and Darrow rd., and Darrow Rd., 91

My husband and I have lived on Winslow nearly 30 years. It's been a fairly quite development so far. Why do we need to develop every single green space. The proposed units for these 2 areas will not fit into the surrounding homes. Additionally, who in their right mind would spend 4-5 hundred thousand dollars and more for a townhouse or a home in an area where nothing else is worth that much. The increase in traffic at Barlow and 91, and all along 91 past Stoney Hill is already heavy. This issue would not improve with this kind of development. Please consider rejecting this idea.

Gary, Mary Lou Windt  
1590 Winslow Drive

Sent from my iPad