



# 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, October 13, 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 9-8-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: September 8, 2025

**Attachments:** [PC Meeting Minutes September 8, 2025](#)

**A motion was made by Ms. McCoy, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the September 8, 2025, Minutes be approved with edits. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

### V. Public Discussion

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comment on any topic not on the agenda. There were no Public Comments.

### VI. Correspondence

Ms. McCoy announced she attended the golf clubhouse opening in her capacity as a Planning Commission member.

Chair Norman noted the following, she: September 9: Participated in a City Council workshop to answer questions about the moratorium request. September 16: Attended the City Council meeting regarding the

moratorium, which was subsequently passed. September 18: Met with staff to discuss: The senior housing overlay, and Planning Commission work plans during the moratorium period. September 28: Responded to a misinformed public post about the inclusive playground, and answered a resident's question regarding lighting hours at a WRA facility. Staff confirmed discussions with WRA occurred.

## **VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)**

### **A. [PC 2025-904](#) A Text Amendment request relevant to regulations applicable to Assisted Living, Continuing Care Retirement Communities, and Institutional Care (nursing)**

**Attachments:**    [PC Memo for 10.13.25 Meeting](#)  
[EMS Incident Report](#)  
[Map of Existing Facilities](#)  
[PC Memo from 9.8.25 Meeting](#)  
[Staff Report - August 11 PC Meeting](#)  
[Council Memo](#)  
[Hudson Comprehensive Plan](#)

Ms. Norman informed all attendees that agenda items are reviewed in the order in which they are received.

Mr. Hannan stated that, during the September Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners requested that staff revise the proposed amendment to limit the discussed uses to Districts 2 and 3, and to ensure that such uses are located within one mile of the Hudson Safety Center, with the Ohio Turnpike serving as the northern boundary. In response, staff presented a map of the designated area as requested. Mr. Hannan also noted that an additional use restriction was included to reflect the one-mile limitation, which will help simplify the amendment text and allow the Commissioners to consider future amendments related to density or housing.

**Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith, to recommend to City Council that the LDC text amendment, as outlined in the recommendations of the October 2025 staff report, be approved. The motion passed by the following vote:**

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

## **VIII. New Business (including public hearings)**

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

**Attachments:**    [Staff Report](#)  
[Site Plans](#)  
[Elevations](#)  
[Trip Generation Analysis](#)  
[Engineering Review](#)  
[Fire Marshal Review](#)  
[Supplemental Documents](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the proposed addition by: Outlining its location, purpose, and components. He also noted the Architectural and Historic Board of Review (AHBR) conducted an informal review and found the design generally compliant with Design Standards. Additionally, the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals (BZBA)

granted a variance reducing the southern side yard setback from 15 feet to 10 feet. Mr. Sugar also reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Chair Norman and staff discussed several items centering on the possible incompleteness of the application. The Commissioners agreed to proceed with the application.

Mr. Joe Matava, Peninsula Architects, and Mr. Joseph Gutoskey, Civil Engineer, explained that the curb cut to the east of the project would be relocated further east. They noted the neighbor declined a shared access point, the purpose of the planting box up to the sidewalk, explained their desired conversation with the City arborist, and that trash cans will be stored in the new garage.

Mr. Gutoskey, stated that the project will utilize existing water and sewer lines and will add a new stormwater connection, while power will be provided through the existing connection. Mr. Matava stated the property is unique, which has a shared connection with the residential building to the south, that the landscape plan reflects shared access by two property owners, that both owners prefer a more open landscape with lower plantings, and the staff comments on screening were taken into account.

Further discussion among the Commissioners, applicant, and staff addressed the possibility of eliminating the retaining wall around the bioretention area in favor of alternative water retention in the driveway. Mr. Gutoskey explained that the city limits the size for stormwater outflow, and that pre- and post-impervious surface plans are included in the SWPPP and staff report. They also reviewed the: Construction staging logistics, downspouts, bio-retention pads, and explained that the addition will be used for storage and office space to support the growing business.

Mr. Azam Qadri, owner, expressed his desire for an aesthetically pleasing addition, noting that his current office is too small and located on a stairway. He explained that the garage is used for trash storage making it not suitable for business storage or vehicle parking, and the proposed plan will facilitate moving heavy equipment into the building. Mr. Qadri addressed concerns about client parking on Division Street by explaining where staff and patients currently park.

The Commissioners and staff discussed: The AHBR's preliminary review, which discouraged removing large portions of the historic building and supported the use of a connector, the meeting with the neighboring owner regarding easements, staff opinions on screening options, and the arborist's views on the existing trees' future. Staff reiterated that improvements are typically not allowed in the right-of-way and that grass may be planted instead. Mr. Qadri confirmed that patients will not use the new offices, which are primarily for storage, and that consideration was given to removing part of the back wall to add the offices. Mr. Matava stated the current plan best follows the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines, which discourages attempting to mimic the look of a historic building, and that there are no plans to add restrooms in the addition. The possibility of reducing the addition's size to protect trees was discussed, but Mr. Matava maintained that the addition is small and appropriately scaled. Mr. Qadri emphasized that a disconnected building would not meet his business needs.

The Commissioners and staff discussed: Whether a stormwater structure is permitted in a setback, and that the structure has two frontages. Discussion took place regarding the Land Development Code (LDC) requirement that trees damaged as a result of construction be replaced, and whether this includes the tree to be removed. Staff noted the buffer yard requirement between the two properties is based on their residential and commercial uses and that the applicant's landscaping plan is satisfactory.

The Commissioners and staff discussed: If landscape credits may be granted for preserving existing trees, even

though the tree in question is located off the property. They reviewed ADA requirements, which is satisfied by the existing ramp, and that since the neighbor refused to grant an easement for shared driveway access, it left no reasonable alternative. The Commissioners questioned whether the LDC permits staging construction equipment on public streets. Staff clarified that a loading space is not required for a building of this size and that utilities may not be required for detached office space. The applicant agreed to the development's obligation to protect the historic structure. Dr. Qadri explained the difficulty of moving dental equipment in and out of the building and noted that the storage space will be used for business-related items such as gloves and masks. Mr. Matava expressed interest in further discussions with the City arborist to explore alternative construction methods and surfaces that might reduce the impact on the tree. Staff clarified that payment in lieu is not permitted if the damage results from planned construction. It was also noted that the business does not generate noise or other nuisances and that the residential neighbor to the east owns the driveway.

Chair Norman opened the floor for public comment from individuals with standing.

Mr. Jay Bixby, 35 E. Main Street, expressed concern that landscaping might obstruct his view when backing out of his driveway.

Ms. Robyn Meeker, 33 E. Main Street, raised questions about potential future expansion of the practice, whether any living space would be included, and how parking would be affected. She also shared her experience with additional requirements, voiced disagreement with the size of the proposed addition, and stated that the architectural style does not match the existing building.

With no further public comments, Chair Norman closed the public comment period.

The Commissioners then questioned the size of the door connecting the addition to the existing building, which the applicant confirmed would be large enough to accommodate equipment. Mr. Qadri reiterated that no living space would be rented in the building. Mr. Sugar declined to speak on behalf of the City Arborist, as he was not in attendance. Mr. Matava added that his client would be willing to pay for the tree's removal at a later date if it is damaged during construction. Staff noted that the exterior water spigot is likely for plant watering, that there is no prohibition regarding parking on public streets, but that storing or staging materials on public streets is not allowed.

Chair Norman invited any final comments from the applicant, but there were none.

The Commissioners then discussed the unique nature of the property, which is flanked by residences, and expressed concern that the business may already be too large for the structure. They noted the shift in character from residential to commercial and acknowledged the efforts of the architect and owner to balance the rights of the applicant with those of the neighbors. The AHBR will review the project, but the Commissioners agreed that the meeting should be continued to allow the applicant to meet with the arborist and explore ways to reduce the project's impact on the neighborhood and tree canopy. They also discussed whether less intrusive designs could better preserve the residential character of the street, and several Commissioners expressed the view that the current design disrupts the existing streetscape. The challenge of balancing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards with the building's design and historic nature was also acknowledged.

**A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom and seconded by Ms. Obert to continue the matter to the next meeting, allowing the applicant time to review options that would reduce the project's impact on the neighborhood and tree canopy, and to meet with the City arborist. The motion passed by the following vote:**

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

**B. [PC 2025-1237](#) A Major Site Plan request for the City of Hudson's proposed inclusive playground at Oak Grove Park.**

**Attachments:**    [Staff Report](#)  
[Site Plans](#)  
[Wetland Delineation](#)  
[Stormwater Report](#)  
[Trip Generation/Parking Letter](#)  
[Renderings](#)  
[Equipment Specs 1 of 2](#)  
[Equipment Specs 2 of 2](#)  
[Building Specs](#)  
[Engineering Review](#)  
[Public Comments](#)  
[Supplemental Documents](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing the site, the elements of the project, and the drainage system, noting that it is a Use-By-Right, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Ivan Valentic, Project Manager, walked the Commissioners through the purpose of the Inclusive Playground (IP), emphasizing that it is designed to provide a welcoming and accessible space where any child with a disability can find a place to play. He highlighted the extensive work already completed to make the property suitable for the IP and stated that the facility is intended to serve as a national model, constructed in accordance with Consumer Safety Standards and ASTM guidelines. Mr. Valentic then described the various components of the playground, as outlined in the information packet provided to the Commission.

He explained that black ornamental fencing will be installed around the playground for safety and aesthetics, and noted existing tee-ball fields are located on the property. A potential connection from the IP to the adjacent trail system was also identified and illustrated. He clarified that the proposed lighting is intended solely for security purposes when the park is closed, and that staff's comment regarding the use of 16-foot-tall light poles is acceptable and will be incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Valentic further explained that the existing vault restroom on the site will be replaced with a prefabricated restroom facility, which will utilize water from a well and a septic system; however, the exact location and specifications of these utilities are still to be determined. The park will include a total of 205 parking spaces, 15 of which will be ADA-compliant. He described how the number, location, and design of the parking spaces were determined, noting that budget constraints limit the amount of asphalt that can be used. He assured the Commission that no wetlands will be impacted by the project and that no additional buffer areas are expected to be affected.

Finally, Mr. Valentic stated that he is in agreement with the comments provided by the Assistant City Engineer and will work to address them as the project progresses.

A video presentation of the project was then shown.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed that the existing playground would remain unless the septic system impacts it, that the photometric plan shows light will remain on-site, and that parking is being changed to

parallel parking. They confirmed that electric service will be extended to the park, that Envirofill artificial turf with underlying padding will be installed, and reviewed the safety zone sizes around each piece of equipment. It was noted that the playground equipment will not have "S" hooks and will be installed by certified personnel, that bolt caps are desired, that there are no sharp edges, and that elevated surfaces will have guardrails.

Ms. Linda O'Neil, of Saint Ives Blvd and Chair of the Hudson Park Board, discussed future inspections of the playground and stated that signage will be posted requiring adult supervision of children. She also responded to a Commissioner's question regarding the type of fencing around the playground.

Mr. Trent Wash, from the City of Hudson, stated that the Assistant Supervisor for Parks is a certified playground inspector.

The Commissioners and Mr. Valentic discussed the Geotech report, which raised no concern for Mr. Valentic. He described the three-layer safety surface system. They reconciled differences between the number of parking spaces presented by staff and Mr. Valentic, noting that 45% of the existing parking spaces are being lost, though Mr. Valentic expressed low concern. The Commissioners agreed the estimate was well done.

The Commissioners and staff discussed the definitions of a park and a playground, and how Use-By-Right is determined by square footage. Mr. Wash noted that no decision has been made regarding allowing pets in the fenced area. The applicant stated that no bike racks are currently planned, but the Commissioners recommended including one. Staff explained that the comment regarding paving the trail was based on surrounding paved areas, and discussed why the aisle is recommended for paving. The ADA parking location was reviewed, and it was determined that saving any trees in the proposed playground area is not practical. Staff believes the disturbance caused by the French drains will not require a variance due to their existing location. The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant, discussed or determined the following: Landscaping regulations in the LDC regarding maximum contiguous areas may become a condition of approval. The project will comply with 100-year flood requirements. Plat notes may be added by the City. Decibel readings and noise-making components of the IP. Because the lot predates January 2000, a septic system may be used without a variance. The relationship between the Jaycees and Kiwanis, with the Jaycees stating they use only the first three lanes of parking. That the industry standard for fencing is 36 to 48 inches with self-closing gates, as approved by the City. The anticipated maximum load capacity is 500 people. and Gametime equipment warranties vary by component.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for comments from those with standing. There were no comments.

Chair Norman then opened the meeting for public comments.

Ms. Christine Callahan, 57 Ambrose Drive, noted that the artificial turf makes the IP inclusive for many children who cannot walk on other safety surfaces. She emphasized the importance of a paved connection to the IP and restrooms and requested that parking spaces be large enough to accommodate special needs children.

Ms. Megan Higgans, 6387 Forest Edge Drive, and representing the Hudson Inclusive Project, expressed appreciation for the designers and their expertise, acknowledged the extensive planning by experts, and requested that the project be approved as submitted and as quickly as possible.

Ms. O'Neil stated that the Park Board will discuss allowing animals in the fenced area and explained the reasons for installing lighting. She also noted that electric power may be needed for charging equipment.

With no further public comments, Chair Norman closed the public comment period.

Chair Norman and staff discussed the Planning Commission's role in deciding on the site plan and recommending approval or disapproval to City Council.

The Commissioners discussed their approval of the design, noting from personal experience that parking is not a problem. They viewed the connector path as a positive feature and agreed that grading the parking lot will help with wet conditions. They expressed appreciation for the thoroughness of the application and noted that

additional plantings may not be necessary due to the location. They also discussed: Whether extra paving or wetland protection should be required, and noted the parking spots will be paved, but there may not be a need for the aisle leading to the parking spaces to be paved.

**Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the major site plan application for the proposed Inclusive Playground at Oak Grove Park, per Case 25-1237, according to the plans received on September 15, 2025, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Provide an additional pedestrian/bicycle path linkage as depicted in Figure 2 of the staff report.**
- 2. Revise the design of the fence to comply with the requirements of the City's Architectural Design Standards in Appendix D.**
- 3. Update the Trip Generation and Parking Analysis report to document the following:**
  - a) How the playground parking needs interact with the needs of the ballfields and the Jaycees haunted house.**
  - b) Any potential impacts to the Barlow Road traffic pattern.**
- 4. Revise the lighting pole heights to a maximum height of 16 ft.**
- 5. The comments of Assistant City Engineer David Rapp shall be addressed per the October 1, 2025 correspondence.**

**The motion passed by the following vote:**

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

**C. [PC 2025-1240](#) A Conditional Use request for a model homes sales office at the Preserve of Hudson.**

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Submittal Documents](#)  
[Exhibits A - D](#)  
[Property Survey](#)  
[Landscape Plan](#)  
[Engineering Review](#)

Chair Norman and staff discussed the staking of the property. The applicant confirmed that the parking area had been staked.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing and displaying the site, the proposed project, and the purpose of the model home. He noted that this is a conditional use and reviewed the applicable regulations, including the staff comment that this is a temporary use permit.

Mr. Keith Filipkowski, representing Pulte Homes, described his company and noted that this request is consistent with previous applications submitted for other developments, which were approved. He reviewed the conditional use requirements and explained how his company will comply with them.

The Commissioners discussed continuing this application to the next meeting since it was approximately 11:20 p.m., and there will not be sufficient time to give to hearing the application before Old Town Hall must be closed for the evening.

**Ms. Smith made a motion, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, to continue the application to the October 27, 2025, Planning Commission meeting. The motion passed by the following vote:**

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

## IX. Other Business

### A. [Moratorium Discussion](#) on the upcoming plan review [Moratorium](#)

Attachments:     [Staff Memo](#)  
                              [City Council Resolution Establishing the Moratorium](#)

Mr. Hannan: Noted the moratorium will begin on November 6, and continues to February 4, 2026, reviewed the key priorities, and stated staff is available to assist the Commissioners as needed.

The Commissioners discussed the moratorium and how their work will proceed.

Chair Norman discussed the following topics and requested the Commissioners choose which area to concentrate on: Attention to definitions, parking requirements and tables, density, revision of the growth management allocation, District 11, and clerical issues - items across the LDC.

The Commissioners also discussed adding traffic, noise, and recreation in general to the topics of study. Chair Norman then went through a more extensive list of possible study topics, including making the Comprehensive Plan at the forefront of all studies.

The Commissioners discussed: How to proceed with the work; as one body or as subcommittees, Chair Norman's expectation of the process and final work, the potential difficulty of this project, that PC has been tasked by City Council to make these revisions, staff's role in the process, that density be the first topic discussed, how the Comprehensive Plan will be used in developing each of the topic revisions, that if the LDC is based on the Comprehensive Plan - it must be realized the Comprehensive Plan changes every ten years, that staff be requested to draft a Comprehensive Plan first strategy, and that Density be the second topic after the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff and the Commissioners discussed how staff can best assist the Commissioners through the process.

**This matter was discussed**

## X. Staff Update

Staff reviewed the cases for the next meeting, noted that Appendix A will be reviewed by Council at the November meeting, and that PC is responsible to make recommendations regarding the Comprehensive Plan and Growth Management, to Council on a yearly basis

**This matter was discussed**

## XI. Adjournment

**A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:47 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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



---

**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 .*

\* \* \*