



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Ronald Stolle, Chair
David Lehman, Vice Chair
Gregory Anglewicz
Michael Chuparkoff
Melissa Jones
David Nystrom
Erik Vaughan

Greg Hannan, Community Development Director
Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
Matthew Vazzana, City Solicitor

Monday, July 12, 2021

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.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Mr. Anglewicz, Mr. Chuparkoff, Ms. Jones, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle and Mr. Vaughan

III. Swearing In

Chair Stolle swore in all wishing to speak at this meeting.

IV. Correspondence

Chair Stolle noted the Commission received thirteen emails. Other emails were submitted after the final Commissioner's update. All will be entered into the record.

V. Public Discussion

There was no public discussion regarding items not on the agenda.

VI. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 6-14-21](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: June 14, 2021

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes June 14, 2021](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Lehman, seconded by Ms. Jones, that the June 14, 2021 Minutes be approved as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain: 2 - Mr. Anglewicz and Mr. Chuparkoff

VII. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

VIII. Public Hearings

A. [PC 2021-539](#) A conditional use request of a 16-unit townhome development at parcel 3010258 near the intersection of Argyle Drive and Barlow Road.

Attachments: [Staff Report 21-539](#)
[Site Plan](#)
[Department Reviews and Studies](#)
[Correspondence Received](#)
[Elevations](#)

Chair Stolle noted that the applicant's request is for a Conditional Use. Should the conditional use be granted the applicant will then submit a detailed site plan for review by staff and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by showing the site plan, explaining the initial approval processes and noted the town homes are permitted so long as they comply with the conditions in the staff report. The next step will look at storm water, utilities and detailed grading. This is a sixteen-unit townhome development in Zoning District D-3 on 3.2 acres served by a private drive with public utilities.

Mr. Dave Grunenwald, Green Forest Real Estate Development, discussed the changes to Barlow Road through the years including more residential housing. Mr. Grunenwald noted the proposed townhomes are designed for people who desire first floor bedrooms and limited yard work.

Mr. Grunenwald discussed the garage doors facing the back of the home as opposed to the front while noting that rear facing garage doors will increase the impervious surface and decrease safety. The issue of impervious surface will be helped by using public utilities that take rainwater to Route 91. Mr. Grunenwald noted two units will face Barlow Road and additional trees will be added to the project.

Mr. Sugar described the history of the parcel as being tied to the western commercial properties, its rezoning through the years and the current residential zoning. Mr. Sugar also noted that townhomes are permitted in this District as a conditional use and the Comprehensive Plan states townhomes should be located downtown, near major corridors, in commercial areas and can be sited in residential subdivisions. Mr. Sugar also discussed the allowed density which must be mitigated with architectural design standards, proper orientation, parking and buffers. The landscaping plan was displayed and explained including a fifteen-foot buffer which is greater than required in the code, however staff believes even more screening could be provided. Mr. Sugar also discussed the orientation standards which requires some units face Barlow Road. The proposal provides two parking spaces per unit and more may be developed. A trip generation report was submitted by the applicant and was reviewed by the City Engineering Department. The wetlands show .03 acres of wetlands being developed which must be mitigated and a full wetlands delineation will be required. Sidewalks will be required on Barlow Road which connect to all the units. The impervious surface will allow up to sixty percent and will be reviewed by the Engineering Department.

Mr. Grunenwald noted that in the Barlow Road neighborhoods, garage doors do face the street and in 2018 a staff report

stated that front facing garage doors should be permitted in areas with front facing garage doors. Mr. Grunenwald also stated that, with one exception, the proposed townhomes are no closer to the neighboring houses than the existing houses are to each other.

The Commissioners, staff and applicant discussed, that this area has been zoned residential since before the 1990s, that no technical aspects of the site plan will be reviewed at this meeting and that engineering has done a preliminary study regarding storm water being directed towards Route 91. Mr. Grunenwald stated the area is at grade or below Barlow Road and required storm water planning. For that purpose, an easement from the adjoining property owner was obtained and a will serve letter was obtained from the appropriate utility. These along with the retention pond will handle the storm water. Mr. Hannan explained the City water standards and the heightened storm water standard for this development. Staff stated there are no concerns regarding utilities for this property.

The Commissioners discussed the privacy concerns of adjoining property owners; staff noted this was the impetus for requiring additional landscaping and the types of planting which might be required. 1207.04 also requires the safety of the community including noise and light pollution and questioned if the proposed landscaping be adequate to address this. Section 9, Residential Use as consistent with the neighborhood was discussed and will continue to be studied. The Commissioners discussed 'use by right' compared to 'conditional use' and the implications for decisions of the Planning Commission and to inform the applicant how to come into compliance. Mr. Sugar explained the LDC codes regarding garage door orientation, the role of AHBR and that per LDC standards, units within 130 feet of the street must be orientated towards the street, in this case Barlow Road. The applicant noted that they have agreed to orient the two end units to Barlow Road.

The Commissioners discussed the impervious surface. Mr. Matthew Neff, applicant team, stated the impervious surface area is near sixty percent and when all Commission conditions are included, will remain within the sixty-percent requirement, however if the garages are oriented towards the back, it is doubtful if the impervious surface requirement can be met. Mr. Grunenwald stated he attended a community meeting and later was discouraged from having subsequent meeting with the neighbors.

The Commissioners also discussed the diagram from page 2 of the staff report which displayed the possibility siting the units with an orientation to Barlow Road and garages on the sides of the other units. The Commission discussed fitting 'a lot' onto this area and questioned if a plan with fewer units could be brought back for review that better meets the requirements. Staff noted open space requirements have not been addressed and stated if townhouses were not permitted then single-family homes would be allowed as well as assisted living facilities and duplexes.

Mr. Grunenwald noted the last revision of the plan displays the distance from existing homes and individual town homes will be approximately 2700 square feet, priced between \$400,000 and \$450,000 and built by Pulte Homes with utility work done by Triban. Staff noted that sidewalks are being extended on Rt. 91 and will not immediately connect to the proposed new sidewalk on Barlow Road. The Commission questioned the angled driveway which will direct headlights into neighboring homes. Mr. Neff stated changing the angle of the drive will be studied. The Commission suggested reviewing the trip generation report and noted that the impervious surface on the existing property might be relieved by this project. Mr. Hannan noted the current paved areas do not incorporate any storm water management while the new project will be required to have storm water management. Mr. Grunenwald noted the easement will solve the adjoining property owner's storm water issues.

Public Discussion

Chair Stolle swore in additional speakers.

Ms. Kristen Schell, 1510 Barlow Road. Delivered 400 signatures regarding the proposed development to Chair Stolle. Ms. Schell also described the response to Mr. Grunenwald regarding meeting with the neighbors about the project. Ms. Schell described the enjoyment of her backyard and opposes the high-density housing, additional noise, light and lack of privacy brought by this development. Ms. Schell is most concerned about the density of housing, the front facing garage doors,

the lack of buffering and additional traffic.

Mr. Chuck Raufman, 5734 Bradford Way, stated his concern is business placements on the south side of Hudson which have changed the nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Joe Czerwien, 1560 Barlow Road, stated that because the conditions of Conditional Use are met, does not mean it is the right use. Mr. Czerwien noted his house was built in 1830 and a prime reason for his moving to Hudson was owning a historic house in a single home community. The proposed 3 acre, long and narrow property, is going to have too great a density and will destroy mature trees along with the buffering they bring. Mr. Czerwien also expressed concern over additional traffic on Barlow Road.

Mr. Neil Thackaberry, 1535 Barlow Road, questioned the previous industrial use of the property and if there will be studies of possible pollution in the soil.

Mr. Kevin McGarvey, 1674 Carriage Hill Drive, discussed the quiet history of Barlow Road, questioned the need for townhomes in this area and the architecture of these home compared to the existing homes. Mr. McGarvey also expressed concern about traffic, front loading garages, the 2700 square foot size of the homes and their high rooflines.

Mr. Joe Coffey, 5652 Gibson Court, noted the area has very mature trees with abundant wildlife. Mr. Coffey questioned how the mature trees can be replaced with bushes and be considered a buffer and noted the stated distance on the applicant's chart is from his kitchen, not his property line.

Mr. Robert Schwieterman, 5732 Argyle Drive, thanked the Commission for questioning the angle of the proposed street which would shine headlight into his yard. Mr. Schwieterman also feels the proposed density is too high, the traffic level on Barlow Road is too great as is and the proposed landscaping is inadequate. The loss of the woods will cause a loss of habitat as well as possibly harming endangered species. Mr. Schwieterman also expressed concern regarding water runoff.

Mr. Mike Eizenberg, 1431 Winchell Drive, expressed concern regarding the retention pond placed next to his back yard and the danger to his and other children in the neighborhood. Mr. Eizenberg also noted that light pollution from cars will affect his property.

Mr. Beau Miller, 248 N. Main Street, speaking on behalf of his mother, Ms. Miller, 1629 Beckwith Drive, noted that renderings are often inadequate and misrepresent the small amount of land that the 16 units will occupy. Mr. Miller would like the Commission to require less units which are smaller.

Mr. Gary Maher, 1470 Winchell Drive, would like to remind the Commission that this does not meet the conditional use because of the impervious surface requirements and that he believes this is not an industrial/retail area, this is a single-family residential area.

Mr. Sugar noted the key topics of the letters sent to the Planning Commission primarily mention: Greenspace, increased traffic, utility connections, lowering home values and water run-off.

The Commission requested information regarding environmental testing. Mr. Hannan stated the City does not require environmental testing, though a Phase 1 study may have been performed. Mr. Gruenwald stated the land in question did not have buildings, storage tank or seepage and currently has mature trees. Phase one studies were done and will be shared with the Commission. Mr. Gruenwald in response to questions from citizens stated: 1) The sixteen new units will not show up on a traffic study because of the large quantity of vehicles on the road today from the current 500 neighboring houses, Little Tikes and soccer field traffic. 2) The lights shining into the house on Argyle Drive will be address. 3) The danger of the retention ponds will be addressed so it will be safe for children. 4) The overall design is not complete and comments from the neighbors will be considered. 5) Since the trees are on private property, some will be removed in the development. 6) As the project has developed there have been many discussions regarding the design and other issues raised by citizens, the LDC and staff.

Commission members, staff and the applicant discussed: 1) Detached homes which the applicant said will not be as profitable and the forward-facing garage doors. 2) The landowners right to develop the land and his seeming desire to make it an acceptable project for the community. 3) The Commissions desire to see more compliance with the conditional uses including: Privacy concerns, grading and drainage, noise, light and visual pollution and if the proposal will be compatible with the architecture of the area. 4) The front facing garage doors make sense. 5) The Commission's role to upholding the LDC. 6) The balance of applying the LDC, the new property owner's rights and the existing property owner's rights. In this instance the property owner has the right to cut down the trees and this D3 property allows for more intensive uses than this sixteen-unit development. 7) The application is well taken subject to review of the site plan and more detailed plans to be submitted. 8) The need in Hudson for more housing with the question of where it should be built? 9) The need to strictly adhere to the requirements of the LDC including the setbacks, side loading garages and changing the orientation of the private drive intersection with Barlow Drive.

The Commission discussed the seven recommendations from staff on page 6 of the report for further study.

Mr. Gruenwald stated his is willing to table the application to the August meeting in order to supply more information to staff and the Commission. Mr. Hannan reviewed items that the applicant may wish to include in the further information and requested the information be submitted within two-weeks.

The Commission requested submission of the Phase One Environmental Report, a landscaping report, the wetlands and retention ponds safety information.

The Board and staff discussed private drive as compared to public streets.

Mr. Angelwicz made a motion to table the application to the August meeting. He further recommended the seven items identified by staff be addressed including:

- 1. Building siting: Revise the street front units to incorporate the front entrance oriented towards Barlow Road and be sited closer to the public street.**
- 2. Orientation: Revise the garage orientation to incorporate side or rear loaded entrances.**
- 3. Parking: Provide additional off-street parking for visitors.**
- 4. Landscaping: Incorporate Bufferyard C along the east and south property lines with Bufferyard D along western property line.**
- 5. Sidewalks: Incorporate sidewalks along the private drive and along the Barlow Road frontage.**
- 6. Wetlands: Submit a delineation to verify the location and category of on-site wetlands**
- 7. Open Space: Demonstrate compliance with the applicable open space standards.**

In addition, Mr. Angelwicz recommended the following:

- 1. The Phase One Environmental Study be submitted. Report on the feasibility of relocating the entrance to the private drive.**
- 2. Identify the mature trees that will remain.**
- 3. A revised traffic memo from the City Engineer regarding the need for a more comprehensive traffic study be submitted.**
- 4. Provide plans regarding the safety of the proposed retention plan.**
- 5. Changes to the orientation of the units within 130 of Barlow Road.**

Ms. Jones seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Anglewicz, Mr. Chuparkoff, Ms. Jones, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle and Mr. Vaughan

- B** [PC 2021-726](#) **A Text Amendment to the Land Development Code Chapters 1201, “General Provisions,” 1202, “Administrative and Review Roles,” 1203, “Development Review and Administrative Procedures,” 1205, “Zoning Districts-City of Hudson Zoning Map”, 1206, “Use Regulations,” and Appendix D, “Architectural Design Standards” to implement certain updates to the City of Hudson Land Development Code.**

Attachments: [2021 LDC Update - PC Memo 7.20.21](#)
[Staff Report 21-726](#)
[Text Amendment](#)

Mr. Hannan did a point-by-point review and received comments regarding the attached 2021 Text Amendments. These items were developed following feedback from the three review boards, the Charter Commission, the draft of the Agricultural Use Standards, the Hudson Law Department and City Council comments.

This matter was discussed

IX. Other Business

X. Staff Update

Mr. Hannan stated he will report at the next meeting regarding the Route 91 project.
Mr. Sugar reported that the condominium project on Route 91 was denied by Council.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Lehman, seconded by Mr. Anglewicz, that the meeting be adjourned. 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.

* * *