



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

David Nystrom, Chair
Sarah Norman, Vice Chair
Fred Innamorato
Matt Romano
Angela Smith
Ronald Stolle
Erik Vaughan

Monday, October 14, 2024

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call To Order

Acting 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. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

III. Swearing In

Mr. Romano welcomed and swore in Ms. Angela Smith to the Planning Commission.

VI. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 9-9-24](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: September 9, 2024

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes 9.9.24](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Vaughan, that the September 9, 2024, minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain: 2 - Mr. Stolle and Ms. Smith

V. Public Discussion

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Discussion on any item not on the agenda. There was no Public Discussion.

IV. Correspondence

Mr. Sugar noted two letters which have been included in the staff report attachments.

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

- A. [PC 2024-221](#) [CONTINUED](#) A Conditional Use and Site Plan request for Laurel Lake, a continuing care retirement community, to construct seven (7) additional duplex buildings, for a total of thirteen (13) units.

Attachments: [Staff Report for 10.14.24 Meeting](#)
[Updated Site Plans for 10.14.24 PC Meeting](#)
[Engineering Department Review for 10.14.24 Meeting](#)
[Fire Dept Review for 10.14.24 Meeting](#)
[Public Comments for 10.14.24](#)
[Staff Report from 7.8.24 Meeting](#)
[Previous Conditional Use Letter](#)
[Previous Site Plans](#)
[Previous Landscaping and Lighting Plans](#)
[Previous Wetland Delineation](#)
[Previous Elevations](#)
[Previous Stormwater Management Report](#)
[Previous Traffic Report](#)
[Previous NOI Letter](#)
[Previous Public Comments](#)
[Previous PC Decision from 11.28.22](#)
[Previous Fire Dept. Review](#)
[Previous Engineering Dept. Review](#)
[Previous State License](#)
[Previous Owner Affidavit](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting: The application was last presented at the July 8, 2024, meeting and that revised plans have been submitted. Mr. Sugar also noted: The wetlands setback revisions, conflicts with the index of ecological integrity, site staking, and that buildings 1, 2, and 5 have been relocated. Mr. Sugar also stated the staff report focuses on building 1, 2, and 5 as these were the primary areas of concern.

Mr. Jeff Jardine, Riverstone Company, described the changes to buildings 1, 2, 3, and 5, the shift of the driveway, and requested additional time to address the staff comments via a continuance to the November PC meeting. The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed the request for continuance.

Mr. Stolle made a motion, seconded by Mr. Vaughan, to continue the application to the November 18, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

Aye: 3 - Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Romano

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

As the motion failed, the Planning Commission continued with review of the request. Mr. Jardine described: The

number and method of trees to be removed, that a traffic study would clarify if increased traffic will cause problems or not, the required 50-foot wetland setback, proposed utility work and potential impacts, placement of Building 5 relative to the pavilion, the detention pond easement, and that Laurel Lake desires to work with the City of Hudson to build these 13 units.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: Safety concerns regarding buildings 2 and 5, the utility relocation and costs, the pond easement and maintenance, the slope of the pond, alternatives to the building location in order to improve safety, the potential removal of building units 1, 2, and 5, if consideration of moving the pavilion to another location has taken place, that buildings 1, 2, and 5 are next to a high priority ecological area which the applicant plans to disrupt, that the character of the existing buildings are not reflected in the new buildings, that PC has a responsibility to preserve high priority areas, the efforts Laurel Lake is making to preserve the character of the property wherever possible, that the water flow to the lake is not being changed, that other wetlands on the property are not being effected, that Hudson staff believes buildings 1 and 2 conflict with the LDC, the size of the driveways, wetlands and their protection, if the residents have been surveyed regarding the new buildings and the results of the surveys, the changes to the testimony provided in the July PC meeting as compared to this PC meeting, overall demand for the villas, that testimony of a Laurel Lake financial hardship has not been presented, and that a large number of senior living units exist at Laurel Lake.

Staff displayed LDC 1207.3 to show the Commissioners how buildings 1, and 2 are not in compliance regarding the limits of disturbance for the wetlands. Mr. Jardine noted a lack of detail in the drawings.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comments.

Dr. Mimi Larson Becker, 47 Laurel Lake Drive, stated the residents of Laurel Lake have not been engaged in the planning process, her agreement with staff's recommendations, the importance of the space around the pavilion for resident gatherings, the residents concern regarding the use of the land for these buildings, the high cost of the villas without knowing the negative aspects of the villas, and that the \$60,000 for trees is not intended as replacement for taken down trees.

Ms. Madeline Carino, 200 Laurel Lake Drive, noted she agreed with the staff commendations, her concerns over villas 1, 2, and 5, and requested the resident's comments be seriously considered in the review of the application. Ms. Carino also noted Laurel Lake is undergoing an administrative leadership change and requested PC continue this application until the new administration is in place.

Seeing no one else coming forward to speak, Chair Norman closed Public Comment.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed: The proximity of the villas to the road, tree preservation, why the other four villas will not be financially viable without building 1, 2, and 3, why the residents feel they have not been part of the planning process, the land by the pavilion the residents use for overflow, the anticipated change in Laurel Lake's Leadership, and any required variances.

The Commissioners discussed: The importance of this property for any development and the code conflicts with buildings 1, 2, and 5, that PC should not approve a project that is in violation of the LDC, that the remaining buildings are compliant, and that Laurel Lake is a source of pride for the citizens of Hudson and the Commissioners desire to support their services.

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use and Major Site Plan Request for the Laurel Lake villa expansion in Case 24-221 for Laurel Lake, 200 Laurel Lake Drive, according to plans received September 27, 2024, with the removal of buildings #1, #2, and #5, subject to the additional conditions stipulated in the July 8, 2024 staff report.

Aye: 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

- A. [PC 2024-693](#) **A Minor Subdivision request to consolidate 31 parcels into four house lots.**
MINOR
SUBDIVISION

- Attachments:**
- [Staff Report](#)
 - [Map of Vacation Consolidation with Legal Descriptions \(1\)](#)
 - [Reference Maps-Parcel Maps](#)
 - [Original Boston Park Subdivision Plat](#)
 - [Engineering Review Letter \(4\)](#)
 - [Wetland Verification Letter](#)
 - [Other Supporting Docs - Right to sell Agreements Easement Verification](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting the location and nature of the project, reviewing the current parcels and streets, the requested changes, the concerns expressed at the last PC meeting, the staff analysis and recommendations.

Chair Norman noted Mr. Carse submitted a letter stating he will rely on the testimony at the September 9, 2024, meeting.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comment, seeing none, Public Comment was closed.

The Commissioners discussed the remainder of the lots which are not included in the request, staff noted that the number of owners and environmental concerns make developing these parcels difficult.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Vaughan, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

- B. [PC 2024-1084](#) **A proposed Text Amendment request to Sections 1205.09 and 1205.11 of the Land Development Code. The amendment would require uses within District 6 and District 8 that are adjacent to residentially used properties to match the setbacks required when such uses are adjacent to residentially zoned properties.**

- Attachments:**
- [Staff Report](#)
 - [ORD 24-104 LDC Amendment Section 1205 Setbacks](#)
 - [ORD 24-105 LDC Amendent Section 1206 Non-Conforming Uses](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the proposed Text Amendments which deal with non-conforming residential properties and strengthen the rights of the homeowners, he then explained the purposes and details of the proposed test amendments.

The Commissioners and staff noted: Agreement with attempting to protect property owner’s rights, that the proposals came about at Council’s request after hearing various residents’ concerns, that City Council has no legal issues with the proposals, that the number of residential property owners affected, setbacks from residential properties, alignment with the Comprehensive Plan, that the current LDC anticipated the affected properties would become commercial uses, though after 25 years that has not happened and the residents will now be given greater protections, staff’s opinion that unlawful exclusionary zoning is not being created by the amendments,

District 8 residential use is non-conforming and questioned if consideration was given to making a residence a conditional use.

Mr. Vaughan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stolle, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission by City staff at a public hearing of the Planning Commission held at the regular meeting of October 14, 2024, that the Planning Commission finds the proposed text amendment to be in substantial compliance with the appropriate review standards of Section 1204.01, and recommends approval of the amendment as presented.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

- C. [PC 2024-1085](#) **A proposed Text Amendment request to Section 1206.05 of the Land Development Code. The amendment would provide greater ability of existing non-conforming residential properties to rebuild or expand an existing dwelling on an existing parcel.**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[ORD 24-104 LDC Amendment Section 1205 Setbacks](#)

[ORD 24-105 LDC Amendent Section 1206 Non-Conforming Uses](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the proposed Text Amendment.

The Commissioners discussed: That mortgages and insurance drove the higher financial limit for rebuilding being included in the current text, that any non-conforming residence in the City is affected by the proposed text amendment, how conforming verses non-conforming residences are treated, that this text amendment will not affect conforming residences, that the houses are limited as to the rebuild size because this is a commercial district, and that the current Comprehensive Plan has not changed the zoning for this area.

The Commissioners and staff discussed if a non-conforming residence in other districts could rebuild at any size and reviewed the other considerations. The Commissioners expressed concern that the 150 percent rebuild for any cause may incentivize the demolition and rebuilding at a larger size. The Commissioners discussed standard regulations for all homes, and if the City limits what may be done on a property - if it may be considered a taking,

Mr. Hannan noted the District 8 setback standards apply to all properties in the District, the Commissioners and staff discussed the differences in setback and standards in various districts, the City attorney noted that localities have the authority to limit non-conforming existing structures, and the text amendment may need further study and could be brought back to the November meeting.

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stolle, to table the vote on this proposed Text Amendment for further refinement by staff regarding incongruities and the details related to the implementation of the Text Amendment. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

IX. Other Business

- A. [LDC UPDATED 2024-2025 DISCUSS](#) Discussion of potential updates to the Land Development Code

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hannan introduced the list of code amendments to consider and prioritize which are detailed in the staff report and noted that after the meeting he would like to report back to City Council with PCs prioritization recommendations.

The Commissioners provided input for each item and discussed the potential for a LDC rewrite and to what scale that effort may look like.

X. Staff Update

Mr. Hannan noted Commissioners may speak to their individual Council person or the Council representative to Planning Commission regarding a rewrite of the LDC.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Vaughan, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:07 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Sarah Norman, Acting 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.

* * *