



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Sarah Norman, Chair
Angela Smith, Vice Chair
Fred Innamorato
Chelsea McCoy
David Nystrom
Jessie Obert
Matt Romano

Monday, May 12, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call To Order

Chair Norman 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: 7 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 3-31-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: March 31, 2025

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes March 31, 2025](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Smith, that the March 31, 2025, Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith and Ms. McCoy

Abstain: 2 - Ms. Norman and Ms. Obert

B. [PC 4-14-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: April 14, 2025

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes April 14, 2025](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Innamorato, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the April 14, 2025, Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith and Ms. McCoy

Abstain: 2 - Ms. Norman and Ms. Obert

V. Public Discussion

Ms. Norman opened Public Discussion on any topic not on the agenda.

Mr. Chris Foster, 7303 Walters Road, representative of Ward 2 on City Council, and the City Council representative to Planning Commission. Mr. Foster noted PC responsibility is to act on commercial and industrial site plans, conditional uses, and subdivisions, as well as making recommendations to City Council on a variety of issues. Mr. Foster also noted the members of the Planning Commission are volunteers with no financial remuneration for their duties, and encouraged speakers to use their time judiciously during the meeting.

VI. Correspondence

Chair Norman requested staff and the Commissioners reveal any outside correspondence received.

Mr. Romano noted correspondence from the Ashbrooke subdivision pertaining to the dog kennel.

Ms. Norman reported two items:

1. A meeting with City staff and Fairmont Properties regarding developing town homes in the Clinton Street and Morse Road area.
2. Numerous email and text messages regarding the kennel development.

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

There was no Old Business.

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

A. [PC 2025-373](#) A Conditional Use request for driveway modifications to the Hudson Middle School entrance at N. Oviatt Street

Attachments:

[Staff Report](#)

[Use Compliance Letter](#)

[Site Plans](#)

[2018 Traffic Flow Map](#)

[2024 Post Construction Traffic Study](#)

[Signed PC Decision Middle School Phase II](#)

[Stormwater Report](#)

[Engineering Department Review](#)

[Supplemental Documents](#)

[Public Comment](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing the middle school property, and the PC imposed condition that an updated traffic analysis be conducted - which has revealed an ongoing issue of stacking of cars on the driveway that intersects with North Oviatt Street. Mr. Sugar then reviewed the recommendation from page 4 of the staff report and two updates that arrived after the staff report was distributed.

Mr. John Peterson, GPD Group, stated the issue is primarily at school dismissal when cars begin to overflow onto North Oviatt and the adjacent street. Mr. Peterson stated the proposed work is an attempt to get the cars on

the school property and relieve the neighborhood of the stacking cars .

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed why the stacking was not addressed during the original construction and the desire to keep the Saywell House which is in a state of disrepair with safety issues .

Mr. Tom Barone, Hudson City Schools, noted: 1) That the School Board has met the legal requirements for the preservation of the house. 2) That only basic maintenance has been done during the past ten years. 3) That no offers were received on the purchase of the Saywell House .

The Commissioners noted that the Saywell House is now an eyesore with debris piled on the outside . The applicant stated the debris are from the lead abatement process which was required to take place, that the new driveway will be approximately 34-feet wide as opposed to Oviatt being 24-feet wide, and the curb cut will be approximately 85-feet wide. Mr. Peterson described the proposed decorative lighting and landscaping along the driveway, the crosswalk markings, the alternatives proposed by staff to save the Saywell House, and the reasons the staff suggested options were not adopted including: Strain of school staff, the unsafe conditions created by using the staff parking lot, the misuse of school property if the lawn was used for another driveway, and that 550-feet is needed for 25 cars.

Mr. Barone noted he is the director of operations for the district and that Hudson City Schools does an excellent job with maintenance, that staffing issues exist, that some of the playgrounds could be improved, that little maintenance has been done on the Saywell House, that during the progression of the master school plan - the school district determined there was no school use for the Saywell House, that there was no plan for the Saywell House when the 1927 building was demolished, that a traffic study was done prior to construction of the new middle school and this application is in response to an updated traffic study, that the traffic flow changed after the new middle school was constructed, and that the Oviatt Street issues were not anticipated in the original traffic study.

Mr. Barone noted: The Saywell House was required to be offered through public auction and after receiving no offers, the district was willing to give the house to anyone who was willing to move it. Mr. Barone also stated he believes the school board hoped someone would want the building, he cannot recall contacting a realtor, and that he believes the demolition of the house is the best option at this time .

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff, discussed: That the drive needs to be widened, that the greenspace should not have a drive around it, that there has been no school board vote Mr. Barone is aware of to remove the Saywell House, that Mr. Barone has made the decision to remove the Saywell House as the best option to remove cars from Oviatt Street, that - to date, no plan has been worked out to make use of the open space where the 1927 building was located, that the Hudson Heritage Association would like to see the Saywell House moved to another location and restored - but no offers were made to move the house, that the necessary legal standards were followed prior to auctioning the house, the function of the power poles around the house, the recent uses of the Saywell House, and that the district determined there was no further use of the house for Hudson Public Schools.

Also discussed were: Other options would be less expensive than the proposed, that the applicant believes the proposed plan is better than the proposed alternatives, that Hudson Middle School was built in 2020 and the driveway existed at that time, that the school board has owned the Saywell House for many years, the proposal cost of about \$350,000, that at the peak - about 25 cars are backed up onto Oviatt Street, that cones will be set up on the bypass lane to force the merger into one lane, the possibility of using the Oviatt Street driveway enter only during pickup and wrapping the drive around the stadium would incur little cost to the schools .

The Commissioners and staff discussed the date the schools acquired the Saywell House - no date could be established but was most likely a gift from WRA, that the AHBR could give advice regarding a property to PC, that the house is not in the Historic District, that the property was staked on the day the application was submitted, that a sidewalk already exists and a pathway is part of the proposal, that a public road is being used for stacking which violates the LDC, that the City Engineer required a post build traffic study and previously approved the traffic plan, that seven curb cuts exist on the property while the limit is two, that the LDC defines parking as a stopped vehicle - which exists on Oviatt Street, that the LDC is not clear on stacking cars, that the Conditional Use Standards require Safe Routes to Schools - which the proposed drive does not reference, that a City wide traffic plan has not been developed, the comments of the Comprehensive Plan regarding schools, how the proposed project is integrated into the surrounding community - which is accomplished by alleviating the stacking on Oviatt Street, that the Saywell House does have historic characteristics, that the drive around Malson Field was closed in conjunction with the first phase of the demolition of the 1927 building, that the Saywell House was in good condition and that it would be part of the Historic District if it were not part of the school district, that a Conditional Use requires a 50-foot setback from residences - while the proposed project has only 30-feet - if the stacking area is determined to be parking, that public parking should be minimized from the public view which could be accomplished by additional plantings, where loading spaces will exist, that the light poles are similar to the approved city light poles, that the proposed light poles match the existing poles on the driveway, that lower impact lighting may be a conditional use, that a permit was not required for the interior abatement work on the Saywell House, that the annual budget of the school district is \$70,000,000, that no known events regarding calling the police or security have taken place on the driveway, that the character of the community is served by reducing the stacking on Oviatt Street, that the proposal does not save significant money, that a buffer yard is required when abutting a historic landmark, that a neighbor uses the drive to access a private garage, the definition of a Historic Monument, how the project encourages foot traffic over vehicular traffic, that the project creates harmony with the existing development by completing the original goal of smooth traffic flow, that the number of stacked cars varies with the day, that the proposal will make the stacking better but may not alleviate the stacking completely, that it is unknown what the teacher's responsibility is when students are being released, that the abatement process began approximately on the 15th to 20th of April following a professional assessment, that the house doors were removed to aid in the removal of interior parts, and the Safe Route plans concerning schools were reviewed regarding crosswalks and bus traffic.

Public Testimony

Cynthina Higgins, 80 N. Oviatt, expressed concern over additional hardscape causing water problems, the possibility of no left turns onto, or off of N. Oviatt Street, that school buses should not be using N. Oviatt Street because of children walking to school, and regulating which parents are allowed to drop off children on which day.

The Commissioners and Ms. Higgins discussed the flooding of Oviatt Street and front yards during heavy rains.

Ms. Susan Newman 2694 Stonebridge Ct., on behalf of the Hudson Heritage Association (HHA), noted that the traffic study discussed the four options, two of which have not been put in use and would meet the LDC without additional cost. Ms. Newman also stated that HHA does not favor the demolition of the Saywell House, that three other historic buildings have been demolished by the school district, that the three-lane driveway will detract from the neighborhood, and that the school district should put great effort into respecting the historic neighborhood in which it is located. Ms. Newman is also concerned that the school board has not been involved in the decision to demolish the historic house.

Mr. Mark Madar, noted that he has restored about seven houses in the historic district, and he is personally

interested in acquiring the Saywell House, but did not know of the desire to sell the house .

Seeing no one else wishing to make Public Comment, Chair Norman closed Public Comments .

The Commissioners, applicants, and staff discussed: The possibility of selling the house as is where it is, that safety can be accomplished in a variety of ways, that the school district agenda has an agenda item to vote on the project this night, that the Oviatt Street residents were not contacted regarding the plan, the possibility of withdrawing the motion to consider other options, that the school board agenda is not complete, that there is not a signed contract for the demolition of the house, that plans exist to begin the process of removing the ‘stuff’ on the front of the house, and that Mr. Barone does not have the authority to decide to demolish the house .

The Commissioners discussed: The impact of an industrial driveway in a residential area, that other options exist instead of the proposed driveway, that the demolition of a 130-year old building that has seemingly been intentionally neglected is wrong, that the proposed plan does not meet the LDC in numerous ways, that less impactful options were not pursued before proposing a very impactful solution, that the presentation lacked sincerity and transparency, that Ms. Obert, who is a licensed real estate agent, did not know the house was for sale, that the school board agenda seems to show a decision will be made regarding demolition and paving, that the school district will have demolished three historic buildings in 15-years, that the proposed solution may not solve the problem, that the school has additional land to use to find a solution, that the LDC states a building shall not be altered - which includes interior spaces, that the Commission has not taken action in order to allow the school board to find a buyer or solution, that the driveway be 50-feet away from residential use, that the parking be off street, and that the plan and cost be shown .

The Commissioners discussed the possibility of the schools demolishing the building if PC continues the application.

Discussion took place regarding the demolition review process .

Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Ms. Angela Smith, to deny the Conditional Use request for the driveway modifications to the Hudson Middle School entrance at N Oviatt Street.

Aye: 7 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

B. [PC 2025-360](#) A Conditional Use request for a boarding kennel

Attachments:[Staff Report](#)[Use Compliance Letter](#)[Site Plans](#)[Landscaping Plan](#)[Elevations and Floor Plan](#)[Trip Generation Analysis](#)[Wetland Delineation](#)[Fire Department Review](#)[Engineering Department Review](#)[Public Comments](#)[Supplemental Documents](#)

Chair Norman called the meeting back to order and stated that the meeting must conclude at 11:45 p.m. because of building security, therefore, the meeting may not conclude on this date.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing the property and proposed project, noting it is a Conditional Use request, and that the project must also be reviewed by AHBR.

Mr. Dan Bestic, applicant, and Mr. Jason Beutel, Manager of Dogs with Style, noted the large public response to the application. Mr. Bestic then gave his reasons the property was chosen for this use: 1) It was a blighted property. 2) That it was previously a boarding and grooming facility. 3) That his boarding facility will be run professionally. 4) That in the 15 years his business has been open, he has received no complaints for odor or noise. 5) That his business will keep his customers happy with the facility, as does his current business. 6) The differences between indoor kennels and indoor boarding.

Mr. Bestic then explained that he is bringing his businesses under one roof in the proposed property. Mr. Bestic also noted the property is located by train tracks and a freeway, which will have noise.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed: 1) The difference between the business being on Darrow Road and located in a neighborhood. Mr. Bestic stated he believes the noise from the trains and the turnpike will be similar to the noise from Darrow Road. 2) Why the plans are labeled Hudson Veterinary if it is a boarding kennel, and why are the client and owner's name missing from the plans. 3) If the city has previously approved boarding kennels with a capacity of 130? 4) That no other known commercial businesses exist in the proposed area. 5) That Mr. Bestic personally staked the property inaccurately and did not see in the application it had to be professionally staked. 6) That 2.5 acres on the north portion of the property may be split off for a residential or commercial property. 7) The tree preservation plan and the areas of the property which have not had trees removed. 8) The desire to keep additional landscaping costs to a minimum in order to fit in with the neighboring houses and preserve the look of the present building. 9) That while it is a 10,000 square foot building - it will not seem that way from the street. 10) That trees were cleared due to the misunderstanding that under an acre of trees could be removed without a permit. 11) That Mr. Bestic went through the approval process for his current building and should have known the process. 12) That work was stopped when the stop work order was received.

Mr. Sugar noted CD received a tree clearing application on March 8, 2025, which he responded to on March 11, 2025, noting that a tree clearing application cannot be approved prior to the PC application being approved. The applicant commenced clearing despite this notification. Mr. Bestic described his process for beginning the clearing and the stop work order, that three arborists assessed the trees, that the landscape plans and the tree

plans conflict with each other, the plans for the remaining water wells, that the fenced in area will be used for dog walking, that indoor boarding includes 'runs' and 'play-yards' on the inside, that the outside property will be used for dogs relieving themselves - with limited time and barking. That noise is controlled with: Acoustic drop ceilings, thick insulated drywall, and proper care, which includes a proper staff-to-dog ratio.

Mr. Bestic noted his present location presents difficulty with pulling onto Darrow Road, the chalet that pre-existed was during the township era and evolved from a veterinarian center into boarding, that if the business was purchased while still in use Dr. Bestic would have been allowed to continue the business, that because of the break in time for the business this is a new conditional use, that both live trees and dead trees were cut down with Dr. Bestic stating the arborist called the live trees in poor health, that the tree company was Mr. Falls who said tree clearing could be done without a permit, the location of the dog walking areas was pointed out, that easements and powerlines caused the building to be in the proposed location, that the larger fenced in areas are for one dog, that an average boarding facility will vary between 120 and 130 dogs, that Twinsburg Vet Lodge has space for 144 dogs, that the dog daycare business seems to be growing quickly, the profitability of boarding animals, that this is not drop in dog boarding - reservations must be made, and the consolidation taking place with dog boarding companies.

Staff and the Commissioners noted: The applicant has been advised to develop a site restoration plan as part of the application process and that if the project does not go forward a plan will have to be put together, the applicant's lack of technical knowledge in how to address questions from the Commissioners, that approximately \$2,000,000 will be spent on the project, and the Commissioners may not trust the answers from the applicant.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed work related to Section LDC 1203 .02, which states that an applicant is not allowed to begin work on the project unless or until a certificate of zoning compliance is issued.

The Commissioners also discussed: Page 8 of the staff report, information the Commissioners would have liked at the meeting, if the has Commission ever denied an application because of an incomplete application? The Commissioners noted that applications have been continued but possibly not denied.

The text of the motion was discussed with the Commissioners agreeing that a no vote will mean the application will return to the next meeting without supplemental information.

A motion was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. McCoy, that this application be tabled by the Planning Commission and that supplemental information may be provided. The application is due back on 7/14/2025. The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye: 2 - Ms. Smith and Ms. McCoy

Nay: 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Obert

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that this hearing is to be continued to the July PC meeting (without supplemental information). The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Nay: 1 - Ms. Smith

IX. Other Business

- A. [PC Housing Density Disc 5.25](#) Planning Commission discussion on residential density allowances

Attachments: [Housing Chart - LDC](#)
[Hudson Zoning Map](#)

The Commissioners continued this discussion to a future meeting.

X. Updates

Mr. Sugar noted the subcommittee has met twice for submittal requirements review, and that BZBA and AHBR are also making comments on their submittal requirements.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

Sarah Norman, 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.

* * *