



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 27, 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. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith and Ms. Obert

Absent: 1 - Ms. McCoy

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes to review.

V. Public Discussion

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Discussion.

VI. Correspondence

Chair Norman requested that the Commissioners and staff reveal contacts with citizens that concern the Planning Commission.

It was reported that the Clinton Crossing subcommittee has nothing to report.

Mr. Pitchford reported on the appeal of PC's decision: Judge O'Brian's opinion stated the LDC is difficult to interpret, and there was sufficient evidence to support PC's determination, he did not overturn PC's decision.

Chair Norman noted that all residents may attend PC meetings.

This matter was discussed

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

A. [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 reminded the Commissioners that the applicant presented his case at the previous PC meeting .

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed: Why this specific location within the development was proposed, that the entire building will be constructed at once, that drainage is indicated on the topographic maps, that the City engineer has reviewed the proposed location, that the applicant believes sufficient parking is being proposed, that it is expected the sales time period will be no later than two years, that the model home was not required to be approved prior to this time, that the applicant is under a confidentiality agreement regarding his company working with the previous applicant, that each building will need a certificate of occupancy prior to anyone moving in, the sequence of the build, that the building numbering on the sheets is not consistent, how many units are part of each building, that sheet ID 01 has no directional marking, that landscaping will be installed as soon as possible after the winter, that the model home will be open without landscaping, staff's comment that there is no specific LDC requirement for the number of parking spaces for a model home, the LDC's requirement that the number of parking spaces is to be determined by the City Manager or his/her representative, that the model home will be ADA accessible, how ADA regulations fit PC's role in this approval, that a conflict exists regarding where deliveries will take place and the applicant's willingness to restrict deliveries, that no signage is expected for the model home, that the applicant is not required to use the city broadband service, that model homes for townhouse exist in other Pulte developments, that no units have been sold to date.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for citizens with standing to comment . There were no comments.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comments . There were no comments.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff, discussed: That any other temporary structure on the property will be reviewed by staff, that the applicant is not at liberty to discuss any information regarding the seller of the property, that heaters may be used during the sales season, that it is not anticipated to use propane heaters in the units being constructed, that the commissioners recognize the proposed development type is not desired in the current Comprehensive Plan; however, model homes are a Conditional Use, and that, theoretically, a potential buyer could visit any of the applicant's offices to purchase a unit.

The applicant noted this is a temporary request that will not change the outside of the unit, that two application processes are needed to apply for the project as a whole and the model home, that the sales effort will be better if a model home is allowed at the requested location, that the model home will help limit the time of day when units are shown, and that previous model home requests in Hudson have been unanimously approved .

The Commissioners discussed: That having a model home at the location is a reasonable request, that loading and unloading does not seem to be an issue, that the model home will result in the project being completed sooner, ADA requirements, that the errors in the submitted drawings require correction, that giving more time for a more complete application will harm the Hudson community by delaying the development, and the possibility of adding conditions to any approval.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, to approve the application according to the plans received September 15, 2025, subject to the following conditions: 1) The approval will be temporary, and conditional use approval will lapse and be null after two years from the date of PC approval. 2) All loading and deliveries will be confined to the temporary parking lot. 3) No business other than the new home sales of these townhomes will be conducted. 4) No more than three employees will be on site at the model home. 5) Hours for viewing or sales activity shall not occur outside of 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. 6) Any features not originally approved by PC in the original submission are expressly excluded from approval with this action, and the action is limited only to questions related to the model home. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ms. McCoy

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

A. [PC 2025-1238](#) A Compatibility Plan review request for Canterbury Meadows, a 32-lot, single-family open space conservation subdivision.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Wetland Jurisdictional Determination](#)
[Trip Generation Letter](#)
[Geotech Report](#)
[Tree Survey](#)
[Department Reviews](#)
[Supplemental Documents](#)
[Public Comments](#)

Mr. Sugar opened the discussion by introducing the application as a Compatibility Review for a 32-lot single-family open space conservation subdivision located in District 2. He outlined the subdivision review process, emphasizing that this Compatibility Review serves as an initial, high-level step to guide the applicant. He also presented the staff report, along with comments and recommendations.

Chair Norman then requested Solicitor Pitchford to explain the process and validity of this application. Mr. Pitchford explained the legal framework surrounding second applications, noting the key issue would be whether the new submission introduced material changes or was substantially similar to the original. The Commissioners deliberated on how to assess the differences between the two applications. Mr. Pitchford offered examples from past court decisions to illustrate how such determinations have been made, clarifying that these were not exhaustive but illustrative.

Due to a business conflict, Ms. Obert requested to be excused from the hearing, and Chair Norman granted the request.

Mr. John Slagter, Tucker Ellis LLP, expressed concern that he had prepared for a public meeting rather than a hearing, expecting a more conversational format. He urged the Commission to focus on compatibility and requested the redaction of a draft document mistakenly sent to Mr. Sugar, which he claimed violated attorney-client privilege.

Mr. Chris Brown of Prestige Builders Group introduced Garrett Walker, an advisory team member. Mr. Walker spoke about the concept of compatibility within the Hudson community, referencing the Comprehensive Plan and posing questions about the future demographics, housing needs, and community identity of Hudson. The Commissioners acknowledged their familiarity with the Comprehensive Plan and asked Mr. Walker to speak directly to the application.

Mr. Brown then detailed revisions made to the plan, including a redesigned drainage system that would reduce runoff to the southwest, modifications to wetlands and streams, He also spoke to staff comments on clustering, impervious surface coverage (noting it was at 37 percent), smaller parcel sizes, proposed lot dimensions, increased setbacks, reduced subplot sizes, expanded open space, and the addition of a walking trail. He asserted that the project complies with applicable standards.

Landscape designer James Arch added the number of lots had been reduced by two, average lot size decreased by 21 percent, open space increased by 9 percent, land disturbance reduced by 10 percent, and the western setback expanded by 30 percent.

Mr. Slagter and the Commissioners then discussed procedural concerns and due process. Chair Norman directed the applicants to present any new information, prompting a formal objection from Mr. Slagter, who emphasized the applicant's efforts to address staff feedback.

Mr. Gerald Wise, representing the design firm, reiterated the project's improvements, including lot reductions, expanded open space, trail additions, and stormwater enhancements. He noted that all interceptable stormwater had been addressed, and that the city's downstream retention facility and culvert would serve both the city and the development. He also stated that pond sizes had been maximized and all preservable wetlands had been retained.

Following a brief recess, the Commissioners returned to express concerns that the project's density did not align with the Comprehensive Plan, which prioritizes open space preservation and limits new housing. They also questioned the role of Mr. Walker as an advisor to the property owner.

Mr. Brown reviewed the previous application from a year earlier and outlined the changes made since then. However, a Commissioner remarked that the new plan did not appear materially different. The discussion covered ingress and egress points, appreciation for increased open space, unchanged street orientation, and modifications to lot sizes, trails, setbacks, and stormwater access. They also discussed the reconfiguration of a natural pond, rerouting of a stream caused by a broken tile, the 5.07 acres of wetlands, and the disturbance of wetlands, which is typically plowed for crops. The Commissioners emphasized that the LDC prohibits wetland and stream disturbance.

Mr. Brown described the wetlands as low-lying areas and noted that a new traffic study would be conducted due to the reduced number of lots. He confirmed that soil borings and a tree study had been completed, but a wildlife

study had not. He stated that the proposed density of 2.96 units per acre matched the surrounding neighborhood, though the Commissioners questioned whether the development could be considered innovative.

Further discussion explored the possibility of submitting two separate applications for the north and south parcels. Mr. Brown stated that the average home would be about 3,600 square feet and priced around \$1 million, with land improvement costs estimated at \$80,000 to \$95,000 per lot. Commissioners voiced concern over the lack of substantial changes from the previous application. Mr. Wise acknowledged that no cut-and-fill estimates were available but said they would be provided.

The Commissioners questioned the absence of clustered housing. Mr. Brown responded that 62 percent of the land was now designated as open space and that he considered those areas to represent agricultural preservation. He explained that the emergency overflow plan would only be needed if all ponds failed, in which case water would flow as it currently does. The Commissioners emphasized that the goal of open space conservation is to maximize preservation, not merely meet minimum requirements. Mr. Brown maintained the plan met the LDC's intent. The Board referenced a letter from Mr. Vizmeg noting the lack of smaller homes, to which Mr. Brown replied that market data supports demand for the larger homes his company builds.

The board questioned who currently owns the property. Staff stated that the property is owned by Canterbury Farms, LLC, with Mr. Vizmeg as an authorized agent. The property was transferred on October 17, 2025, after the application was submitted. Mr. Brown noted his prior experience with Open Space Conservation applications. The Commissioners compared the current proposal to a previous one, expressing concern that this version did not reflect the same conservation principles.

Chair Norman reminded the applicant that the Planning Commission's role is to evaluate the plan's compatibility with adjacent development and that all comments must be addressed in the preliminary plan. Mr. Brown stated that it is his belief most of the Commission's concerns had been addressed, except for the ongoing question of whether the plan truly qualifies as an Open Space Conservation development. The Commission reiterated that the spirit of open space preservation is more important than simply meeting numerical thresholds.

The discussion turned to how the development could be made more compatible with nearby residents. Mr. Brown stated there are increased perimeter setbacks, road layouts designed to minimize land disturbance, and efforts to preserve existing trees. The Commissioners clarified that clustering involves more than simply placing homes close together. Mr. Slagter argued that the plan includes smaller lots, attempts to balance development across the site, and that making the lots even smaller would reduce compatibility with neighboring properties. The Commission countered that the applicant appeared to be circumventing Open Space requirements and explained what a true conservation plan entails. Mr. Slagter concluded by asserting that the plan does preserve the site's natural features, which is a core goal of Open Space Conservation.

The Commissioners and the applicant engaged in a detailed discussion regarding the amount of open space that would remain in the proposed development and the effort to ensure compatibility with neighboring properties. It was acknowledged that the preliminary plan would need to feature very small lots with a rural village aesthetic, though this character may be obscured by visual screenings. The applicant confirmed that a wetland study had been submitted. The Commissioners clarified that the applicant does not have permission to remove wetlands, or intercept stream water.

The applicant also affirmed their readiness to comply with the Open Space lien requirement outlined in the Land Development Code (LDC), as well as the recommended side and rear setbacks for individual lots. They noted that the permitting process would identify any wildlife present on the site and explained that only nesting bald

eagles receive special protection. The applicant demonstrated awareness of the LDC's stormwater regulations, including the prohibition of swales, and stated that a cul-de-sac layout is the most appropriate street configuration for the development.

Chair Norman, the City Solicitor, and the applicant discussed the procedure for receiving public comments. Chair Norman then opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Skyler Sutton of 2243 Ravenna Street, read his previously submitted comments into the record. He voiced objections to the reconsideration of the application and cited deficiencies in the submission. Mr. Sutton referenced an email from Mr. Vizmeg to city staff, which he viewed as an attempt to influence the Planning Commission, and argued that the proposed density was double that of surrounding homes. He urged the Commissioners to find the application incompatible.

Ms. Christine Thaxton, 2710 Ravenna Street, spoke from her background in environmental issues, stated the development was unsuitable for a rural residential area where homes typically sit on multiple acres. She expressed the belief that increased density would not benefit the community.

Ms. Renee Buchanan, 6312 Stow Road, raised concerns about traffic and the potential for a neighboring lot to become an access point, which she felt would diminish the rural charm of the area.

Ms. Melissa Jones, 2233 Ravenna Street, addressed stormwater concerns, stating that the land could not accommodate additional runoff.

Ms. Andrea Hall, 2545 Ravenna Street, reported sightings of a bald eagle and a barn owl on the property and advocated for a wildlife study.

Mr. Dave Zahuranec, 2161 Ravenna Street, noted that the proposed homes did not resemble existing homes to the east, south, or west of the site. He warned that the development would increase traffic and cited an engineer's report indicating that some areas would require significant remediation to support construction.

With no further public comments, Chair Norman closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

The applicant responded by stating that it is their belief compatibility and clustering concerns had been addressed and asked if additional areas required attention. Mr. Slagter emphasized the team's efforts to make the project viable and responsive to previous Planning Commission feedback, noting that every lot had been modified in some way to align with the Open Space Conservation District.

Commissioners responded with a series of concerns and recommendations. They suggested the application be deemed incompatible, proposed separating the north and south parcels into distinct applications, and called for reduced lot sizes and a revised layout emphasizing clustering. They requested a wildlife study, the elimination of wetland disturbances, and a clear commitment to preserving all wetlands. Commissioners asserted that the application did not meet the LDC's definition of an Open Space Conservation project, which is intended to be environmentally sensitive and innovative. They emphasized the difficulty of building on the constrained land and reiterated their role in protecting both the land and the community.

The Commission noted that the project resembled a Canterbury 3 development and did not reflect the character of homes along Ravenna Street. They acknowledged the challenge of reaching consensus given the diverse opinions on the property's future and expressed concern about stormwater issues. Balancing development across

the north and south parcels was seen as problematic, and while reducing the number of homes was desirable, they recognized it might not be economically feasible. Commissioners also stated that the application appeared materially similar to a previously denied proposal.

They emphasized that District 2 is a rural/suburban area and that the proposed development did not align with its surroundings. The Commission's mandate to limit new housing and preserve open space was reiterated, along with the fact that Hudson's density codes are being updated, potentially further restricting development. They argued that the proposal contradicted community preferences and that each parcel should be evaluated independently under the LDC. The Comprehensive Plan, viewed as the citizens' directive, was cited as requiring innovative designs with lots under 20,000 square feet and setbacks close to the minimum recommended in an Open Space Conservation district. Commissioners called for clustering on one portion of the property and criticized the application as an attempt to exploit Open Space Conservation privileges.

For the preliminary site plan, they insisted that stormwater retention ponds undergo a full checklist review and demonstrate non-structural justification. If no alternative system is viable, the applicant must return to the Commission to explain the need for ponds. To minimize flooding, the development should be confined to one side of the property. Filling of ponds and encroachment into wetlands would not be permitted, and any such encroachment would require a mitigation plan. A maintenance lien to the city is required for Open Space dedication. Commissioners also stated that the subdivision should be discreetly located behind existing screening, that mounding would be viewed unfavorably, and that both a wildlife study and an innovative design would be necessary.

Chair Norman concluded by stating that the formal submission of a preliminary site plan must address the Planning Commission's comments.

No formal motion was given as the request was for a Compatibility Review

B. [PC 2025-1248](#) A Text and Zoning Map amendment request to establish a new zoning district, District 11.

Attachments:

[Staff Memo](#)

[District 11 Draft Regulations](#)

[Hudson Draft Zoning Map - District 11](#)

[Hudson 2024 Comprehensive Plan - S Main](#)

[South Darrow Road Zoning Timeline](#)

[South Darrow Subcommittee Use Matrix](#)

[Ordinance No. 25-146](#)

Ms. Obert rejoined the meeting as Mr. Hannan began the presentation by introducing Mr. Brian Griffith, Assistant City Manager, and Ms. Katie Behnke, Economic Development Manager. Mr. Griffith explained that the matter at hand included the JoAnn property and the proposed study area for District 11. He informed the board that income tax revenue had declined by approximately 3.7 percent compared to the previous year, a decrease attributed to JoAnn's departure.

Ms. Behnke then presented a PowerPoint outlining the rationale for establishing the new district, emphasizing the absence of key amenities such as restaurants, lodging options, and reliable cell phone coverage. Mr. Hannan continued the presentation, highlighting the opportunities and vision developed by a subcommittee of Council members and staff. Following this, Mr. Sugar elaborated on the proposed text amendment, detailing potential uses for the property and outlining restrictions on certain types of business activity.

During the discussion that followed, Commissioners and staff explored various aspects of the proposal . They considered the proximity of the site to residential neighborhoods and emphasized that drive-thru restaurants were not currently intended for inclusion. It was noted that the property owner preferred to utilize the existing building and that the goal was to attract a high-revenue-generating tenant. The conversation also touched on the building's size, current marketing trends, and the potential for creative design solutions to enhance the frontage area . The importance of precise language in the text amendment was underscored, particularly the consistency of terminology with other sections of the Land Development Code. There was also discussion about allowing smaller lodging facilities as a Use by Right and the need to clarify density requirements. Throughout the conversation, participants stressed the importance of prioritizing income-generating businesses in the development strategy and acknowledged that large businesses often hold a negative perception of operating in Hudson.

This matter was discussed

IX. Other Business

X. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar stated there are applications and other business for the November meeting.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:42 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 .

* * *