



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, November 10, 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: 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 10-13-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: October 13, 2025

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes: October 13, 2025](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the October 13, 2025, Minutes be approved as edited The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

B. [PC 10-27-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: October 27, 2025

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes: October 27, 2025](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the October 27, 2025, Minutes be approved as edited. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

Abstain: 2 - Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

V. Public Discussion

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Discussion. Seeing no one coming forward, Chair Norman closed Public Discussion.

VI. Correspondence

Chair Norman requested the Commissioners and staff reveal PC related contacts with the public outside of a PC public meeting: The Chair noted she: 1) Received a telephone call from a citizen whose mother is a resident of Laurel Lake and appreciates the stakes being removed. 2) Received numerous telephone calls from citizens and members of PC regarding the recent election and how it might impact the work of the Planning Commission. 3) Reviewed recent decision from the court of appeals which appreciated the work of PC.

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

A. [PC 2025-1022](#) A Major Site Plan request to construct an addition for Village Dental [CONTD](#)

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
 [Site Plans](#)
 [City Arborist Review](#)
 [Elevations and Floor Plan](#)
 [Trip Generation Analysis](#)
 [Engineering Review - Updated](#)
 [Fire Marshal Review](#)
 [Public Comment](#)
 [Supplemental Documents](#)
 [Staff Report - October 13 meeting](#)

Mr. Sugar began the meeting by reviewing the updates made to the October 13, 2025 plan and introduced the revised recommendations outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Joe Matava of Peninsula Architects presented the revisions to the application, which included adjustments to the curb cut and efforts to preserve the existing tree. He noted that the arborist's recommendations would be followed, with the exception of the suggestion to mulch the entire rear yard, which he would like to discuss with PC. He also explained that the revised design includes a five-foot setback from the street and accommodates a proposed bioretention area, which will allow plantings to soften the transition zone. Mr. Matava referenced the Secretary of the Interior's architectural standards. He further stated he believes the proposal would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, asserting that the design is consistent in both size and scale. Mr. Matava requested to hand out updates to the PC; however, The Commissioners advised that if the applicant wished to submit additional materials, the meeting would need to be continued to allow time for proper review. The Commissioners ultimately declined to accept the new documents in order to proceed with the review.

Chair Norman questioned the applicant about the size of the new door and whether it would impact the patio area.

A discussion followed among the Commissioners, the applicant, and staff regarding the upstairs living area. Dr. Qadri clarified that the space has always functioned as an apartment and is not suitable for storage. He explained that the proposed design would create a direct path for moving equipment into the building and emphasized the need for both office and storage space. He noted that most of the addition would be used for storage and that the property is located in a mixed-use neighborhood with both commercial and residential elements.

Further discussion addressed concerns that the addition resembled a commercial rather than a residential structure. Commissioners expressed skepticism about the tree's health if the work is done, questioned whether the applicant was requesting more than would typically be granted, and noted that the tree canopy covers the entire yard, which, according to the arborist's report, would require full-yard mulching. The applicant stated that the AHBR had responded positively to the project and that a similar building form exists on Church Street. Commissioners discussed the purpose of the wider door into the storage shed and the intended use of the garage space.

The applicant stated that an existing wall would be converted into an entrance door and that construction materials would be stored on-site, as far from the tree as possible. The City Engineer's report confirmed that materials would be stored on the applicant's property. The definition and function of the bioretention area were also discussed.

Mr. Joe Gutoskey of Gutoskey and Associates explained the purpose and operation of the 11-by-11-foot bioretention area.

Chair Norman reminded the group that the Planning Commission is responsible for ensuring that architectural design aligns with the Land Development Code (LDC). Mr. Sugar noted that the AHBR had conducted an informal review and that Mr. Matava had incorporated some of their feedback into the revised design. He added that the AHBR was generally supportive of the application. Chair Norman questioned why AHBR's comments were not included in the staff report, to which Mr. Sugar responded that a high-level summary had been provided in the previous staff report. The group discussed the importance of the Planning Commission having some familiarity with architectural standards when reviewing such applications.

The Commissioners also discussed how equipment would be brought into the new addition. Dr. Qadri explained the process and confirmed that the second floor would be used for office space. It was noted that the existing curb cut and driveway had not been evaluated for alternative uses, such as connecting to the existing building. The applicant mentioned a shared garden area between their property and the neighbors, and that a rock garden was being developed to enhance the visual appeal for both properties.

Chair Norman opened the floor for public comments from individuals with standing, but no comments were made. She then opened the floor for general public comments.

Dr. Sarra Qadri, daughter of Dr. Qadri, spoke on behalf of the family, emphasizing that Hudson is their home. She explained that three dentists share the office space and that the proposed addition would allow them to order supplies in bulk, improving efficiency. She noted that they had been forced to purchase another business in a different city to accommodate their needs and that equipment deliveries often disrupt the dentists' schedules. The new space, she said, would help the practice operate more smoothly.

With no further public comments, Chair Norman closed the public discussion.

The Commissioners and the applicant discussed the potential to park vehicles in the storage building. It was noted that the current staff includes four full-time and one part-time employee, none of whom have dedicated office space. Dr. Qadri stated the doctors and office manager are in need of offices.

Mr. Hannan clarified that while the Commissioners may consider the application with the proposed doors, the final decision on that element would rest with the AHBR. He also clarified that the correct term for the proposed door is "overhead door," and that the application could be approved with the condition that the mulching recommendation be subject to further review by the arborist.

During their deliberations, Several Commissioners acknowledged that the concern over the building being used for automobile storage or parking had been addressed. They expressed appreciation for the revisions made to the plan and noted that the building serves as a suitable transition to the rest of the street. The overhead door was not seen as objectionable by some, and there was agreement that the decision regarding mulch should be left to the arborist. Commissioners also recognized that the applicant had incorporated Planning Commission (PC) recommendations into the revised plan and expressed appreciation for the collaborative effort with the neighboring property owner to create a visually pleasing garden. The treescape and integration of the project into the neighborhood were also commended.

The Commissioners further discussed; the property's prominent location, the role of AHBR, compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, the arborist's comments, suggestions to reduce the size of the addition.

Additional concerns included the lack of testimony regarding the actual amount of storage space needed, the possibility that the proposed doors could allow for vehicle parking, and the need to follow the arborist's mulching recommendations. Some Commissioners felt that the applicant had provided inconsistent explanations about how the addition would improve equipment access and noted that no interior layout had been submitted. There was also discussion about the potential for the addition to be used as an Airbnb or short-term rental, and disappointment was expressed that a dramatically different, reimagined plan had not been submitted.

Questions were asked about the rationale for placing offices on the second floor, the need for additional office space, and the future use of the property-particularly the second floor. Commissioners also questioned where apartment occupants would park and whether the second floor might eventually be converted into a residence or short-term rental.

Ms. Smith made a motion, seconded by Mr. Romano, to approve the application with the staff comments, stipulating that landscaping be coordinated with the arborist's recommendations and that the final decision on the door be made by AHBR. The vote was as follows

Aye: 3 - Mr. Romano, Ms. Smith and Ms. Obert

Nay: 3 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. McCoy

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

With a 3-3 tie, the motion to approve the application failed.

Following the vote, Solicitor Pitchford explained that under administrative rules, a tie vote results in the application being carried over to the next meeting, and that all voting must occur in person.

Mr. Innamorato then made a motion to reject the application, but it failed for lack of a second.

The Commissioners discussed what changes might be made to the application that could lead to a different outcome. Suggestions included a redesign of the existing building, more creative use of the curb cut, exploring less intrusive ways to meet the building's needs, and providing a report on how the second-floor apartment and office are currently being used. Commissioners also encouraged the applicant to consider alternative design options that would better align with the architectural character of the neighborhood.

Ms. McCoy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Romano, to continue the application to the December meeting, requesting revised drawings, clarification on the building's use, and a reimagined design for the addition. The vote was as follows:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Nay: 1 - Ms. Smith

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

B. [PC 2025-1284](#) A Text and Zoning Map Amendment request to establish a new zoning district, District 11.

Attachments: [Staff Report - November 10 Meeting](#)
[Staff Memo - October 27 Meeting](#)
[District 11 Draft Regulations](#)
[Hudson Draft Zoning Map - District 11](#)
[Hudson 2024 Comprehensive Plan - S Main](#)
[Imagery Photographs of Development Sites](#)
[South Darrow Road Zoning Timeline](#)
[South Darrow Subcommittee Use Matrix](#)
[Ordinance No. 25-146](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application for a Text and Map Amendment, presented the areas to be rezoned, and reviewed the staff comments to allow commercial uses for redevelopment in the area. Mr. Sugar also noted a City Council subcommittee studied the area and made recommendations using the general guidelines from the stricter District 8 combined with the commercial allowances of District 7. It was also noted this is a Public Hearing and staff is interested in hearing from comments from the public.

Discussion between PC and staff included the proposed allowances for townhomes in a planned development with PC and Council's approval.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comment from those with Standing.

Mr. Cory Roberts, Treasurer, Hudson Professional Office Park, expressed the encouragement of the organization for this Text Amendment, frustration with the amount of time for approvals to be given, and a desire for PC to work with businesses. The Commissioners and applicants defined the businesses represented by Mr. Roberts, the properties Mr. Roberts owns, and his frustration with the process to replace an existing sign.

Ms. Joyce Kuryla, KGK Company, Georgetown Road, expressed her encouragement for additional restaurants and retail businesses in the immediate area of her business, questioned why the district does not extend down Georgetown Road, and questioned if the industrial uses of District 8 are still valid, and the possibility of enlarging the potential uses in the proposed new District 11.

Mr. Jack Root, 1531 Carriage Hill Drive, stated using the internet, he could not find the possible uses included in the proposed District 11, staff stated they would follow up with the information.

Seeing no one else wishing to speak, Chair Norman opened Public Comments from the general public.

Mr. Tom King, 12 Hudson Common Drive, stated: His support of including mixed uses in the new District 11, his belief that the proposal will not compete with downtown, and made comments on the specific uses in the new district. Mr. King also noted his agreement to allow a small lodging business by right and encouraged the use of the present LDC for application reviews.

Seeing no further people wishing to comment, Chair Norman closed Public Comments.

The Commissioners and staff discussed: The Use-by-Right of town homes, why the proposed schedule is reasonable, that public comments will be incorporated into the revisions of the Text Amendment, that PC has already determined that town homes should be downtown, that the proposed District 11 is near traffic and already has large areas of impervious surfaces, that the public does not want town homes, that this is a pivotal time for planned development in the City and PCs determinations regarding this area will have great influence on the City's future, that the Comprehensive Plan should guide PCs decisions, that the Comprehensive Plan was developed prior to JoAnn Store leaving, that more people living in the area will be beneficial, that town homes are buildings which share a common wall with another building and have a front and rear entrance, that Valor Acers in Brecksville is selling million dollar town homes with views of an industrial area, and that these same units will also sell in Hudson.

The Commissioners discussed continuing the meeting and allowing staff to revise the Text Amendment by incorporating the comments received and further studying the items identified in the staff report.

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Romano, that this application be continued to the next meeting.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Nay: 1 - Ms. Smith

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

- A. [PC 2025-905 SUB REQ](#) A Text Amendment request to amend Appendix A related to submittal requirements for various zoning applications.**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Previous PC Decision - 9.8.25 Meeting](#)
[Exhibit A - Redline Changes](#)
[City Council Ordinance No. 25-167](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the history of the recommended Test Amendment noting no changes to PCs recommendation were made by Council.

There were no Public Comments.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Obert, to pass ordinance 25-167, as amended, which meets the terms of 1204.01. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

B. [PC 2025-1378](#) A Text Amendment request to establish Section 1206.07 within the Land Development Code. The amendment is regarding the transfer of land for Planning Commission approvals.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Ordinance No. 25-168](#)
[Staff Recommended Redlines](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the City led Text Amendment, reviewed the details of the application, noted the City Solicitor has reviewed the proposal, and reviewed the staff recommendations and comments.

The Commissioners discussed the revisions recommended by the City Solicitor, the repercussions if the regulations are not followed, how a transfer of property is discovered by staff, PCs appreciation for the revisions by staff, and that better planning is made possible with this document.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Smith, to recommend passage of 25-168 to Council as amended by the staff comments, since the amendment meets the terms of 1204.1, related to Text Amendments. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

IX. Other Business

A. [LDC 2026 - Density](#) Planning Commission Discussion Topic: Density

Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)
[Use and Density Chart](#)
[Available Land Map](#)
[Comprehensive Plan Research](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the Density discussion by reviewing the staff prepared overview document with considerations added by District.

The Commissioners requested that District 11 be added to the document, and that information regarding institutional senior housing be included in the staff report.

A motion was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Romano, that this Staff Report be recommended for continued to the December Planning Commission. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

B. [LDC 2026 - Comp Plan](#) Planning Commission Discussion Topic: Comprehensive Plan references within the Land Development Code

Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)
[Comp Plan References](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the agenda item regarding how the Comprehensive Plan can be incorporated to a greater extent, in PC discussions, and reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith, that this Staff Report be revised by staff an return to Planning Commission at a later date. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. [PC 2026 SCHEDULE](#) 2026 Planning Commission Schedule

Attachments: [DRAFT PC Schedule For 2026](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Smith, that the 2026 PC schedule be approved. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

X. Staff Update

Staff described the upcoming December PC meeting agenda.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Obert, that the meeting be adjourned at 10:40 p.m.. 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.

* * *