



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, March 9, 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 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Absent: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 2-9-26](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: February 9, 2026

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes: February 9, 2026](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the February 9, 2026, Minutes be approved as edited. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

V. Public Discussion

Ms. Cynthia Curtin, 1102 Cutler Lane, addressed the Commission regarding the proposal to create zoning District 11. She expressed her opinion that the area should remain District 8. However, if a new District 11 is created, Ms. Curtin offered several suggestions. She stated that the Planning Commission is bound by the Comprehensive Plan, which does not designate the proposed District 11 area for mixed-use development and makes no allowance for residential housing there. She noted that development along the Darrow Road corridor is intended to complement rather than compete with the historic area downtown. Ms. Curtin also referenced the Comprehensive Plan's emphasis on traffic concerns and stated that additional residential housing would worsen

existing traffic issues. She stated that if housing is permitted, it should only occur within a Planned Development and only as a conditional use.” Ms. Curtin urged the Planning Commission to recommend that Council not approve the proposed changes, stating that Hudson needs light industrial and commercial uses to generate tax revenue, and that citizens should contact their Council representatives.

Mr. Andrew Meldrom, 290 Aurora Street, representing the Hudson Heritage Association, addressed the Commission regarding District 11. He stated that this is not a routine zoning decision, but a broader question of whether the City will uphold the spirit and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. He emphasized that the Plan was developed through extensive research, public meetings, and community input, and reflects the collective voice of Hudson. Mr. Meldrom noted that the Plan is intended to guide Council’s zoning decisions. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan recommends strengthening the Darrowville Corridor with a light industrial base for tax purposes and that the proposed legislation does not align with those recommendations. He further noted that several elements of the proposed District 11 were not referenced in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Meldrom stated that the Plan represents a ten-year vision for Hudson’s future, while the proposed legislation disregards the work and direction set by the community. He urged Council to honor the intent and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Newman, 2694 Stonebridge Court, addressed the Commission regarding District 11. She noted that while the Comprehensive Plan includes a reference to mixed-use development on page 68, this applies to an area far outside the boundaries of the proposed District 11. She further noted that page 69 contains a diagram of recommended future land use that does not identify a large scale, multi-phase development in this location. Ms. Newman also observed that many residents did not initially understand the potential scale or implications of proposed development within District 11. She requested that any zoning changes remain closely aligned with the Comprehensive Plan.

VI. Correspondence

Ms. Norman reported the following items. 1) She received communication from a neighbor of WRA regarding whether a sound system was permitted at the new athletic field. The concern was referred to staff, who stated that noise readings had been taken and that WRA has adjusted its sound system accordingly. 2) An inquiry from Mayor Anzevino regarding the landscaping at CEIA, Mr. Sugar noted that staff is looking into the matter. 3) She met with Councilman Kyle Brezovec to discuss District 11. 4) She attended the City’s Capital Improvement Projects review. 5) She and AHBR Chair Caputo discussed holding a joint AHBR and Planning Commission meeting.

This matter was discussed

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

There was no old business.

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

- A. [PC 2026-72](#) A Conditional Use and Major Site Plan request for Western Reserve Academy to construct an addition to the Wang Innovation Center.**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Applicant Narrative](#)
[Civil Plans](#)
[Elevations and Floor Plan](#)
[Landscaping Plan](#)
[Photometric Plan](#)
[Engineering Review](#)
[Emergency Access and Site Logistics Plan](#)
[Supplemental Documents](#)
[Survey](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing the proposed 7,620-square-foot addition and displaying the location of the project on the WRA campus, which is within the Historic District and in District 4. He reviewed the history of the existing building and surrounding structures, explained that the addition expands the Innovation Center, and summarized the stormwater considerations, sidewalk extension, and tree preservation recommendations described in the staff report.

Mr. Jason Boltz, architect, and Mr. Jeff Jacot, representing WRA, presented the application for an approximately 8,000-square-foot building. They described the property and the existing structure, reviewed the building's floor plans, and noted that current rooms are overcrowded. They showed the additional at-grade entry from Brick Row, explained the stadium-style seating area that will connect both sides of the building, presented renderings of the interior and exterior spaces, described the use of traditional brick for the exterior, and explained the more modern "glass box" entryway. They stated that 400 of WRA's 430 students will take classes in this building, which is the primary reason for the expansion.

The Commissioners, applicants, and staff discussed AHBR's informal review, including the request that the glass-box entry be further evaluated. They discussed the possibility of preserving the Norway spruces; confirmed that the project does not involve an increase in student population or staff; reviewed the materials logistics plan; and noted that the construction manager will oversee the site with the goal of maintaining a clean, orderly, and well-coordinated work area. The construction manager has experience working on active campuses and keeping classrooms open during construction. Discussion also addressed the challenges posed by site utilities and limited space, the timing and routing of truck deliveries, worker parking, and the requirement for background checks for construction workers.

Mr. Mike Wohlwend, Wohlwend Engineer Group, stated his agreement with staff's recommendation to enlarge the existing stormwater retention area rather than create a new detention pond. He also noted that the increase in impervious surface area is approximately 3,000 square feet.

The Commissioners and applicant discussed the donor's request for aesthetic elements reflecting a more contemporary style than typical Western Reserve architecture, noting that the request is being incorporated in a moderate way and that the donor is satisfied with the plans. Additional discussion addressed student safety during construction and the Commissioners' appreciation for the stadium-style seating area.

The Commissioners discussed the complexity of the site's topography, and the proposed lower-level windows (which match features on other campus buildings with the intent to provide natural light while helping the building feel more appropriately scaled). The Commissioners discussed the entrances to the building as they

relate to the "main" entrance. Staff stated their interpretation is Oviatt Street would remain the primary point of entry. It was noted that the distance from Oviatt Street to the building is approximately 60 feet. The intended use of the building was clarified, including that no room would contain students without a teacher present. The applicant reviewed the types of machinery to be added or relocated to the new space. Sidewalk and street-tree installation on the north side was discussed. The applicant clarified that the two levels together total just under 16,000 square feet. It was noted that the stadium room will be illuminated at night using automatic lighting. The Commissioners discussed LDC emphasis on preserving significant trees and expressed concern about the Norway spruces. The percentage of the landscaping budget devoted to trees is unknown. Staff noted that buffering is not required for this project.

Chair Norman commented on the donor's design preferences. She remarked on the difficulty of having individuals with no direct connection to the community or campus influence the building's design.

Discussion also took place regarding the café component and its relation to safeguarding local businesses. The applicants explained that the café is part of the food-science curriculum and is not tied to kitchen service operations; it will be student-run and may be open for only one hour per day. Staff noted that engineered drawings will be provided and that staff will determine whether they must be included in the plat notes. The applicants stated their agreement with all items in the Engineer's report.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for citizens with standing. Seeing none, she closed public comments. She then opened the meeting for citizens without standing. Seeing no one come forward, she closed public comments.

The Commissioners and applicants discussed the depth of the building's foundation and the need to address water issues near the foundation. Soil borings were reported to be as expected. It was noted that openings will constitute the primary demolition work in the existing building.

The applicant had no further comments.

The Commissioners stated that the project is well thought. They noted the applicant should further finalize the details summarized in the staff recommendations prior to PC making a formal motion. Staff recommended continuing the application to the next meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. McCoy, that this Staff Report be tabled Planning Commission, due back on 4/13/2026. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

B. [PC 2026-73](#) Conceptual Site Plan Review for a Day Care Center

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Traffic Study](#)
[Traffic Study Review](#)
[Current Wetland Delineation and ACOE Permit](#)
[Engineering Dept. Review](#)
[Fire Dept. Review](#)
[Geotech Report](#)
[Previous ACOE Wetland Permit](#)
[Survey](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the Concept Site Plan review by describing the location of the proposed project, the parking layout, and other site details. He reviewed staff comments and recommendations, noting that the included traffic study was evaluated by a third-party reviewer whose comments were attached. Because this was a Concept Site Plan review, analysis of the conditional use criteria were not included as part of staff's analysis.

Mr. Jeff Durbin, representing Crossings Development Company and the potential builder, described his role in the proposed project.

Chair Norman questioned the applicant's name and the corporate name, noting that Crosslands Companies are not registered with the State of Ohio. Mr. Durbin stated that the franchise would be locally owned. He described the building, the kitchen, and the 5,000-square-foot playground component.

Michael W. Schweickart, TMS Traffic Group, introduced himself.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed: The proposed vehicle circulation. Mr. Schweickart stated that the existing turning lane is not long enough and that the driveway onto Terex Road will need to be moved farther from the traffic light. He noted that the median between lanes will need to be opened to allow for the new driveway location. He also stated that the City's traffic review indicated church traffic would not be a concern. Child drop-off procedures were discussed, with the applicant noting that parents will park and walk children inside. The roughly 2.4-acre site was compared to a typical 1.2-acre buildout, allowing most existing trees to remain. Staff recommended moving the building closer to Streetsboro Street. It was noted that only refuse trucks will access the site. The land is currently under a purchase agreement.

It was clarified that the Commission will need to take some form of action for the Concept Site Plan review. Mr. Durbin stated that the developer has constructed this type of building approximately 460 times nationwide and continues to refine the design with each project. The building design and architectural process were discussed. The Fire Department has stated the plan is compliant. The Planning Commission serves as the design review body for District 6 through the Industrial Design Subcommittee, and the Western Gateway contains unique building requirements.

Mr. Durbin expressed confidence that he could come to agreement with the City on a design appropriate to Hudson's standards. He noted that the company intends to be part of the community, which will help ensure the design aligns with local expectations. He also acknowledged that TLE's branding uses bright colors, which may not fully align with Hudson's design standards. The lot is a corner parcel and the building will be oriented toward Terex Road. The proposed building is 10,000 square feet. The Commission discussed the number of parking

spaces permitted in front of the building. It was noted that the Hudson requirement for a playground is 6,000 square feet. Commissioners questioned whether the number of parking spaces is adequate for the expected number of students; Mr. Durbin stated that other franchises have not experienced parking problems. He also noted that drop-offs typically occur between 6:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. and are spread over that period. The amount of time children spend outdoors during the day was reviewed. The goals and objectives for District 6 emphasize high standards for existing trees and preservation of the natural environment. Mr. Durbin stated that the building will be of high quality. A current wetlands delineation was submitted by the applicant. The applicable setbacks for Category 1 wetlands were discussed.

Mr. Chris Brown, Prestige and Premier Companies, stated that the wetlands are Category 1.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff continued their discussion and noted that the lot consolidation has been completed.

Mr. Dave Rapp, City of Hudson Engineering, stated that left turns could be prohibited when exiting the proposed driveway and that lane modifications on Terex Road could make left turns more feasible. He also stated that he is consulting with the traffic-study firm regarding best practices. Mr. Rapp noted that alternatives to the planned retention pond may be available for stormwater management, though such details are not typically addressed at the conceptual stage, and that a one-way circulation pattern around the building may help with traffic queuing.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comments from individuals with standing. There were no comments. Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comments from any individual.

Mr. Patrick Hagin, 5834 Martin Drive, expressed concern about increased neighborhood traffic if the daycare is approved. He also asked whether city water and sewer service would extend to the site and what route it would take. Mr. Durbin stated that water and sewer service would come from Terex Road.

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

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff discussed the number of vehicles attempting to turn left onto Terex Road. Mr. Durbin noted that a typical franchise draws customers within a five-mile radius, and that fewer than two percent of the 460 franchises nationwide have defaulted on their loans, and reviewed the history of TLE.

Staff noted that the houses on Martin Drive have not been rezoned as residential.

The applicant thanked the Commissioners and staff for their work.

The Commissioners stated that traffic is the primary concern. They noted that the site is a gateway entry similar to Christ Community Chapel and the Goldfish building across the street, and that this proposal may be too intensive for the location and may not benefit the community. They discussed that other daycare centers successfully manage left turns onto busy roads and that solutions may exist for this location. It was noted that the property is challenging due to the presence of wetlands and that this use may be the most appropriate. The increasing demand for daycare in Hudson was acknowledged, and that the proximity to Route 8 may be beneficial for families. Commissioners cautioned that significant challenges may arise as the project proceeds and noted that the applicant will be responsible for any required street modifications. Concerns were raised that a fenced stormwater-retention pond could detract from the appearance of a City gateway.

Staff clarified that the application timeline begins after submission, not during the Concept review.

Discussion took place regarding the landscaping methods utilized by Christ Community Chapel to protect the wetlands on their property.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that this Conceptual Site Plan be tabled and return to the Planning Commission , due back on 4/13/2026, with the following items studied: Responses to the staff analysis concerning traffic, wetlands, and tree preservation . The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Mr. Romano, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Nay: 1 - Ms. Norman

Absent: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

C. [DISTRICT 11](#) **District 11 Code Amendment**
[MAR](#)

Attachments: [Staff Memo - District 11](#)
[Staff Memo - Planned Development Process](#)
[District 11 Text amd Map Regulations as Amended 2.25.26 \(003\)](#)

Mr. Hannan introduced the discussion by noting that at the February 17 and March 3, 2026 City Council meetings, a total of 17 residents spoke regarding concerns about the proposed District 11 . He summarized that City Council discussed returning District 11 to the Planning Commission, which did not pass, though a motion to continue the matter to a date certain did pass. Additional community input was discussed, and a Public Hearing will likely be scheduled for May 5. Mr. Hannan added that public comments will be reviewed and that any information the Planning Commission wishes to have relayed to City Council will be communicated .

Chair Norman noted that the definition of a Planned Development contains broad language and relies heavily on exceptions, including the use of the term “years,” that bonuses that may be granted, and the option to remove bonuses, though the Planning Commission previously stated that bonuses should not apply in District 11 . Mr. Hannan stated that staff has recommended to Council that bonuses be removed in the current draft .

Chair Norman also noted that there are limited checkpoints between the preliminary site plan and final site plan stages. Regarding Conditional Uses, the Commissioners agreed that Institutional Uses should be removed from the draft, and they discussed the need to review Number 4 under Uses by Right and Conditional Uses . Chair Norman stated that Planned Development should be listed as a Conditional Use .

Regarding Maximum Net Density, Chair Norman noted that the Planning Commission’s recommendation of 15 homes per net acre was not reflected in the draft due to staff modifications . Mr. Hannan explained the rationale for these changes. Chair Norman asked why Planning Commission notes were not forwarded to Council . A discussion followed regarding the information that was relayed to Council .

Chair Norman noted that the amendment could allow up to 400 additional residences and questioned whether 15 or 20 units per acre could be built. Mr. Hannan stated that both parcels are 46 acres, thereby preventing two 50-acre planned developments. Commissioners discussed increasing the minimum required size to 75 acres. Solicitor Pitchford noted that Council did receive a memo communicating the Planning Commission’s recommendation of 15 units per acre.

Chair Norman also stated that the Planned Development sections of the LDC are problematic and contain

conflicting codes, and recommended that Planned Developments be removed from District 11 discussions .

The Commissioners discussed: Differing opinions among Hudson residents regarding District 11, challenges experienced in neighboring communities with large developments, and whether the JoAnn property is the most appropriate location for Mixed Use Development. They discussed the difficulty of attracting industrial development in Northeast Ohio, the importance of adhering to the Comprehensive Plan, and the risk of losing public trust if the Plan is disregarded. Commissioners noted that the Comprehensive Plan did not envision residential use on the JoAnn property, emphasized that the goal was to increase the tax base, not residential development, stated that a Planned Development would increase traffic (a major concern cited in the Plan), and observed that the Comprehensive Plan does not encourage townhomes or condominiums .

Commissioners and Solicitor Pitchford discussed whether the legislation should be rewritten and whether additional Planning Commission comments should be forwarded to Council . Commissioners reiterated that residential uses for the JoAnn property were not part of their Comprehensive Plan deliberations and emphasized the importance of transparency among City Council, Boards and Commissions, and the public .

Mr. Hannan reviewed earlier discussions about creating more flexibility in District 8, noting that this broader review eventually led to the proposed District 11 amendment. He stated that the Planning Commission held Public Hearings and received comments, noted that a Pinecrest-style development would conflict with the proposed amendment, and explained that the proposed uses are intended to support industrial development and provide amenities. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan references retail use along Darrow Road and includes mixed public feedback regarding residential uses.

The Commissioners noted that the residential component now under consideration for District 11 represents a significant change from the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Norman discussed requesting that staff prepare a memo to Council summarizing the Planning Commission's discussion.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. McCoy, that a memo be prepared by staff for City Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

IX. Other Business

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

Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)
 [Draft Ordinance](#)

Mr. Sugar reviewed the next steps outlined in the staff report.

The Commissioners discussed several items, including the rezoning of eight undeveloped acres within the District 8 Overlay and the proposed removal of housing from District 9, which staff noted may be impractical . Additional topics included preparing a Planning Commission recommendation to Council regarding residential densities across the city, the challenges associated with Open Space Conservation requirements in the LDC, the removal of duplexes, and reducing the maximum number of single-family attached units permitted in District 4

from five to four.

The Commissioners requested that staff update the memo accordingly.

This matter was discussed

B. [PC ADMIN](#) [RULES](#) [SUBPOENA](#) [MAR](#) Planning Commission Discussion: Subpoena Power

Attachments: [Draft Admin Rules Edits](#)
[PC Admin Rules - Current](#)

The Commissioners conducted a second reading of Planning Commission's subpoena power.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, to approve a second reading of Planning Commission's subpoena power. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

X. Staff Update (upcoming agenda items, appeals)

Mr. Sugar noted that a Finding of Fact document regarding the Village Dental decision had been sent.

He also stated that a potential joint meeting of Hudson Boards and the PC is tentatively scheduled for April 27, 2026, and will be confirmed. In addition, he noted that a recommendation regarding revisions to the LDC relative to the Comprehensive Plan had been sent to City Council in December.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:42 p.m.. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

Public Hearings by the Commission will be undertaken for each case in the following order:

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.

* * *