



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Sarah Norman, Chair
Jessie Obert, Vice Chair
Fred Innamorato
Chelsea McCoy
David Nystrom
Matt Romano
Angela Smith

Monday, January 12, 2026

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: 5 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, Romano and Norman

Absent: 2 - Ms. Obert and Innamorato

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Election of Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Industrial Design Subcommittee and Alternate)

Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Mr. Romano, to elect Ms. Norman as Chair of Planning Commission. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, Romano and Norman

Absent: 2 - Ms. Obert and Innamorato

Election of Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Industrial Design Subcommittee and Alternate)

Ms. McCoy made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith, to elect Ms. Obert as Vice-Chair of Planning Commission. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, Romano and Norman

Absent: 2 - Ms. Obert and Innamorato

Appointments to the Industrial Design Subcommittee and Alternate

Chair Norman appointed Mr. Innamorato to the Industrial Design Subcommittee, Mr. Romano was appointed the

alternate to the Industrial Design Subcommittee.

This members were appointed

V. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 12-8-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025

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

Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Ms. McCoy, to approve the minutes from the December 8, 2025, PC meeting as submitted. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, Romano and Norman

Absent: 2 - Ms. Obert and Innamorato

VI. Public Discussion

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

VII. Correspondence

Ms. Norman reported that City Council has repealed the Planning Commission requested Moratorium. Additionally, she informed the Commission of her recent appearance before City Council to provide clarification on Appendix A and the regulations regarding the Prohibition to Transfer Property following Planning Commission approval.

This matter was discussed

VIII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

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

Attachments: [Staff Report - January Meeting](#)
[Cover Letters](#)
[Updated Plan Set - January Meeting](#)
[Additional Documentation for January Meeting](#)
[Assistant City Engineer Review 12.26.25](#)
[Preservation Brief-Additions](#)
[Staff Report - November Planning Commission Meeting](#)
[Staff Report - October Planning Commission Meeting](#)
[Trip Generation Analysis](#)
[City Arborist Review 11.3.25](#)
[Fire Marshal Review 10.1.25](#)
[Supplemental Documents](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application, which was continued from the November 2025 Planning Commission meeting, and reviewed the applicant's subsequent meetings with City staff, application changes, staff comments, and recommendations. Mr. Sugar also highlighted changes to the format of the staff report, which included the addition of Preliminary Findings of Fact. Mr. Joseph Matava, Peninsula Architects, along with the Qadri family, were present for the hearing.

Mr. Matava presented responses to the previous Planning Commission comments. Mr. Matava summarized the building's architecture and history. Mr. Matava explained that the transition from brick to wood was a deliberate choice to match surrounding houses. He further stated that the Department of the Interior guidelines recognize the need for minor impacts on historical houses to meet modern needs. Additionally, Mr. Matava detailed discussions with the City Arborist and Assistant City Engineer regarding stormwater management and strategies to preserve the front yard tree.

The Qadris explained that the dental practice requires additional space for four dentists, office functions, and storage. They stated their due diligence regarding water issues and their commitment to minimizing the impact on the existing tree. Ms. Qadri confirmed the practice has no plans to leave its Hudson location and stressed the need for a building that is both functional and aesthetically pleasing. She also noted the physical stress placed on her staff, who must manage supplies across multiple levels and presented photos of the currently crowded storage rooms.

The Commission, staff, and applicants discussed business parking and delivery access. The applicants any heavy equipment deliveries would require plywood to protect the grass. City Arborist Tom Kiepora clarified that a semi-permanent fence would be used during construction and stated that pruning would be limited to only a few limbs to allow for the structure's completion.

The Commission and Mr. Qadri discussed the overhead door design. Mr. Matava noted that only one door would be used and that the budget would likely decrease due to reduced site work. While the number of garage doors in the neighborhood was discussed, Mr. Matava noted it was his understanding the Architectural and Historic Board of Review (AHBR) would determine the final style. Chair Norman pointed out inconsistencies in the provided drawings regarding the revised steps; Mr. Matava assured the Commission that the submitted drawings would be corrected.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for persons with standing. Ms. Robin Meeker of 33 E. Main Street stated that no existing buildings in the neighborhood feature two architectural styles joined in the middle and noted that staff would still need to manage supplies across different levels. She questioned the door size and the village's policy regarding attached garages. In response to Ms. Meeker's question, Mr. Sugar clarified that attached garages are permitted in the Historic District so long as they are not directly oriented to the street.

Chair Norman then opened the meeting for persons without standing. Mr. Tom King of 12 Hudson Common Drive spoke in support, noting that dentistry is a permitted use and that other non-residential structures, such as fire bays, exist nearby. He suggested that the proposal fits zoning standards and that dual review of the design might constitute "double jeopardy," arguing that AHBR standards should govern historic appropriateness.

The Commission and applicants discussed the removal of the drive apron and the addition of an interior sink, addressing prior conflicting testimony regarding water access. The applicants responded to Ms. Meeker's testimony by noting the existing building already connects two structures and clarified that the proposed space is intended as a storage room to improve internal traffic flow rather than to house a vehicle.

The Commissioners discussed surrounding garages, removal of the drive apron removal, and garage door compatibility. However, some members raised concerns regarding the lack of LDC standards for attached garages, missing staging information, and the casual nature of the application. Further discussion focused on the need to preserve the Historic District, the long-term impact of the decision, and the projects compliance with the Purpose Statement of District 5.

The Commission concluded by discussing the staff-provided Findings of Fact. Chair Norman expressed that the

findings were too brief and lacked specificity. The Commission requested that Chair Norman's specific comments be preserved in the minutes and that staff enhance the Findings of Fact for future review. The session ended with a discussion on the procedural distinctions between preliminary and final Findings of Fact, and that if the application is approved, the final Finding of Facts will be presented to the Commissioners at the February meeting.

Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the application with the following conditions: That recommendations one through seven, as presented in the staff report be followed, that recommendation number two be amended to state the site plan will be revised to remove the existing driveway apron along Division Street and convert that area to a tree lawn, that the stairs may not built in the public right of way, and a material staging area be approved by staff. Staff will prepare written findings of fact to be reviewed at the February 9, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, Romano and Norman

Absent: 2 - Ms. Obert and Innamorato

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

Attachments: [Staff Report - January Meeting](#)
 [Draft Amendment - January](#)
 [Residential Map Study](#)
 [Mixed Use Development Study](#)
 [Character Images](#)
 [Hudson Comprehensive Plan](#)
 [Staff Report - December 8, 2025 Meeting](#)

Mr. Sugar reviewed the requested revisions to the Zoning Map Amendment as detailed in the staff report. His presentation included mixed-use development studies from Brecksville and Solon, character images illustrating potential building designs under the Hudson Land Development Code (LDC), and a study identifying potential locations for future multi-family developments within the city.

Assistant City Engineer Dave Rapp reported that the JoAnn property currently lacks significant stormwater storage, noting that developing the necessary storage capacity would occupy a portion of the site. He stated that the city is still awaiting data from Summit County regarding peak sanitary sewer usage. Additionally, Mr. Rapp referenced a Traffic Congestion Study, identifying the vicinity of the JoAnn property and the northbound intersection of Route 91 and Route 303 as primary areas of concern. Mr. Hannan and Mr. Rapp further discussed utility capacity, noting that while the property has significant electrical capacity through First Energy and a large existing utility infrastructure, the City of Hudson regulations will require all stormwater to be managed on-site. It was also clarified that sanitary sewer authority rests with Summit County.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for public comment; seeing no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

The Commissioners and staff discussed the proposed mixture of commercial and residential zoning, which staff explained is intended to provide developers with greater flexibility. The Commission suggested implementing larger setbacks or increased greenspace along the roadway to better protect adjacent neighborhoods. It was noted the Comprehensive Plan designates this area for light residential use. The Commission discussed the minimum

size Planned Developments and expressed concern over the number of housing units that could be built. Staff mentioned that housing may utilize no more than 2.5 acres of a 10-acre plot, which would likely reduce the total number of units. Further discussion took place regarding how conditional use versus use-by-right designations would shape the final build-out.

The Commission examined LDC 1204.2(e)(8) requirements and the District 11 Context Map, and estimated the number of housing units that could be constructed. Members questioned if this would serve as an appropriate transition or buffer into Hudson and suggested that increasing buffer yards or greenspace, along with the decreased residential building heights, might improve the transition. Mr. Rapp noted that the City is also planning to redesign the intersections at Terex Road and Route 91.

Concerns were raised regarding the cumulative impact of the District 11 Map Amendment and the Clinton Crossings development, which together could increase Hudson's housing stock by approximately 500 units. Chair Norman emphasized that density discussions should ideally be resolved before the District 11 decision to avoid future complications. Mr. Hannan noted that City Council had a first reading regarding density before referring the application to the Planning Commission. The Commission then deliberated on the possibility and ramifications of requesting an extension on the District 11 application as permitted by the LDC.

Mr. Hannan underscored the importance of passing the amendment in a timely manner to prevent heavy industrial uses from being established and to allow the 1.4 million square feet of existing space to be utilized. Both staff and the Commission recognized the need to balance a thorough review with the urgency of starting this large-scale development. Economic Development Director Ms. Katie Bankie noted that the City does not own the property and is currently working with a developer who is awaiting the amendment decision to begin work.

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, to return the District 11 Map Amendment application to Council with a recommendation from PC to return it to PC for a continued review of: Density, Setbacks, Buffer Yards, and incorporation of the January 2026 staff recommendations to PC. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, Romano and Norman

Absent: 2 - Ms. Obert and Innamorato

IX. New Business (including public hearings)

There was no New Business.

X. Other Business

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

Attachments: [PC Memo](#)
 [Consultant Memo](#)
 [Potential Future Housing Sites](#)
 [Comprehensive Plan Research](#)

Chair Norman acknowledged receipt of an email from the City Solicitor concerning the Planning Commission's (PC) subpoena power. A comprehensive discussion of this topic is scheduled for the February PC meeting.

Regarding the matter of density, Chair Norman referenced conditions from a previous motion stating that density discussions should be postponed until City Council reaches a decision on senior living density. Mr. Hannan confirmed that the density discussion is scheduled for the February 3, 2026, City Council workshop.

This matter was discussed

XI. Staff Update (upcoming agenda items, appeals, city events)

Mr. Sugar informed the commission that OHM representatives are available to attend the February PC meeting.

Mr. Sugar reported that the Robinson Park project will undergo review by the Park Board before returning to the Planning Commission for further action.

Chair Norman and staff discussed the process for incorporating the Comprehensive Plan references into the LDC. It was noted that this initiative will begin with City Council before being referred back to the Planning Commission for formal action. Finally, the Commission discussed scheduling a special joint meeting between the Planning Commission and other City boards.

This matter was discussed

XII. Adjournment

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Ms. McCoy to adjourn the meeting at 9:48 p.m. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy, Romano and Norman

Absent: 2 - Ms. Obert and Innamorato

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.

* * *