



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

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

Greg Hannan, Community Development Director
Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
R. Todd Hunt, Special Counsel
Marshal Pitchford, City Solicitor

Monday, November 28, 2022

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. Chair Stolle also apologized to those who were at previous PC meeting when this application was not heard.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Correspondence

Chair Stolle asked the Commission members and staff if they have received any communications that were not included in the staff report or have not been forwarded to the other Commissioners. Chair Stolle noted he has received 24 communications related to a previous agenda item and forwarded all to the other Commissioners.

V. Public Discussion

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Comments on any topic which is not on the agenda and requested all comments to be limited to five minutes or less. There were no Public Comments.

VI. Approval of Minutes

This being a Special Meeting, there were no minutes to approve.

VII. Old Business

- A. [PC 2022-823](#) A Conditional Use request for Laurel Lake, a continuing care retirement community, to construct seven (7) additional duplex buildings, for a total of fourteen (14) units. The request was continued from the September 12th [Cont. from](#) Planning Commission meeting [9.12.22](#)

Attachments: [Staff Report 2022-823 Laurel Lake](#)
[Site Plan](#)
[Applicant Response Letter](#)
[Engineering Dept. Comments](#)
[Fire Dept. Comments](#)
[Trip Generation Study](#)
[Wetland Delineation Report](#)
[Public Comments](#)
[Site Photos](#)

Mr. Stolle reported that on Monday, October 24, 2022, he met with eight members of the Laurel Lake Board regarding their pending application. At the fifteen-minute meeting Chair Stolle informed the Board why their application was continued and encouraged the Board members to meet with Hudson CD staff who will assist them with the application. Chair Stolle then reviewed changes made to the application.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application and reviewed the items which the applicant was asked to study and report back to the Commission. Mr. Sugar noted the following: The proposal has been reduced to seven buildings from the previous nine, the reduced size of the cluster of buildings on the Southwest side of the property, the relocation of the buildings on the Northwest side of the property to comply with the Orientation Standards, a 30-foot setback from the edge of the pond for to the proposed buildings and that two of the building have been relocated to the inner-ring of the property. Mr. Sugar also noted when the final site plan is submitted Hudson Engineering will complete a storm water study and the comments from the fire department will be included.

Ms. Lene Hill, CT Consultants; Ms. Eileen Nacht, Architect; Ms. Donna Anderson, Marketing Director - Laurel Lake Retirement Community, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Anderson reviewed the background and history of Laurel Lake along with the importance of strategic planning to keep the operation viable in the future. The Laurel Lake Strategic Planning Team was formed in 2019 and discovered in today's environment the optimal ratio of living units is 80 percent independent living units to 20 percent healthcare living units. The current Laurel Lake ratio is 70 percent independent living to 30 percent healthcare living units which is the reason this application is being brought to the Planning Commission with the understanding that over 50 percent of the property will remain greenspace.

Ms. Nacht noted her 30-year career has focused on senior design facilities and the need for communities to be agile and able to adapt to the changing needs of seniors.

Ms. Hill described the wetlands delineations submitted by her firm and included in the application for this project which are not required by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Ms. Nacht stated no variances will be requested with this revision to the application and acknowledged resident concerns still exist which will be addressed as the City directs if the project moves forward. Mr. Nacht also noted she has reviewed the communications submitted to PC and commented on items one through eleven in the staff report while noting at this

early stage of development not all questions can be answered, she then pledged to work with the residents, city and all other authorities.

The Commissioners, staff and applicant discussed: The floodplain - which will receive further study if the project moves forward, the operations of the meal plan at Laurel Lake, the average age of move-in being 79 years old for independent living with an average stay of 11 years at Laurel Lake, the number of vacancies per year, the buy-in structure, the number of combined units and the proposed villas being the largest offered by Laurel Lake with some having the ability to buildout.

Mr. Sugar noted the following: A buildout of a unit is considered a minor alteration and does not come before a board, the definition of assisted living as compared to residential institutional, the reason parts of the Use Analysis were not included in the staff report, the expected privacy interests of the residents, the residential parking requirements, the LDC not having a parking requirement for these villas, the density of the current population in the villas and what the density will be if all the villas are built and that all required certificates are not on file with the City.

Ms. Anderson addressed the parking situation of the current villas and the contract residents sign on entry to Laurel Lake.

The Commission and staff noted the site plan information was given as background information, the impervious surface requirements are met, the density increase and wetlands meet the LDC requirements and the traffic report was not updated when the number of villas were reduced.

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for public comments:

Ms. Ann Brickley, 48 Laurel Lake Drive, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak and Laurel Lake for changes in the application. Ms. Brickley also noted the November 7 and the November 11, 2022, plans regarding Villa 5 and the large trees in that area.

Dr. Mimi Larson Becker, 47 Laurel Lake Drive, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to comment on Villa 5 and discussed her visits done to the site in light of discussions with residents of the main building. Ms. Becker suggested that if Villa 5 is to be built, the original site will be better because the pavilion near the lake is often used by the community. Ms. Becker also noted that there are 30 mature trees in the riparian zone that may be damaged or removed with the current plans.

Mr. Phillip Kramer, 54 Laurel Lake Drive, noted the hammerhead turnarounds are too small for their intended purpose and questioned how these villas will help accomplish the desired 80 / 20 ratio of independent living units to assisted living units.

Mr. Larry King, 52 Laurel Lake Drive, discussed the Laurel Lake community meeting but noted no information has been distributed regarding changes to the site plan, the difficulty created by backing onto the loop road and the changes to the environment caused by the proposed buildings.

Seeing no one coming forward to speak, Chair Stolle closed Public Comments.

Chair Stolle commented on the continuing issue between the owners of Laurel Lake and some members of the Laurel Lake Community, which is not in the purview of the Planning Commission and suggested if there are issues between the residents and management, they must be resolved by those two parties. He also noted the Commission's role is to interpret the LDC based on the application.

The Commission and staff discussed questions raised during Public Comments including: Turnaround requirements, backing onto the loop road which is not regulated under the LDC and that the proposed relocation of the pavilion is not in violation of the LDC and may be discussed further when the site plan returns to PC. Staff noted the Commission could ask Laurel Lake for a more definitive plan for the pavilion.

The Commission, staff and applicants discussed the location of the pavilion and possible needed variances, why none of the duplexes are being placed on the small loop roads, the timeline of adjusting the ratio of independent living and assisted living units as well as the studies used for this purpose, financial rate increases for residents, that the wetlands studies are completed, what other studies may be needed and whether or not there are future plans for development on the Laurel Lake property,

The Commission noted that ensuring the parking is adequate, the relocation of the pavilion and plans for trees will be part of the site plan review.

The Commission also noted support for the forward-looking nature of the Laurel Lake development, their financial planning and the hearing of residents' concerns.

Ms. Jones made a motion, seconded by Mr. Vaughn, to approve the conditional use permit with the four conditions in the staff report. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Nay: 1 - Ms. Norman

VIII. Public Hearings

No other Public Hearing were scheduled.

IX. Other Business

A. [PC 2023 SCHED](#) 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Attachments: [PC Schedule 2023 \(DRAFT\)](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Vaughan, seconded by Ms. Norman, to approve the 2023 PC meeting schedule as presented. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

X. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar noted two applications for the December meeting.

The Commissioners discussed several functions of the Planning Commission including overall roles and timelines.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Vaughan, seconded by Ms. Norman, that the meeting be adjourned at 9:43 p.m.. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

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.

* * *