



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, April 13, 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: 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

A. [PC 3-9-26](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: March 9, 2026

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes: March 9, 2026 \(DRAFT\)](#)

approved. by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ms. McCoy

Abstain: 2 - Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Smith

V. Public Discussion

Ms. Pam Schuellerman of 7708 Huntington Road spoke regarding the District 11 Open House. She criticized the information presented. She believed Council members redirected responsibility to past Councils instead of providing personal views. She challenged the City's claim that companies avoid Hudson due to limited amenities, noting that gyms and restaurants are nearby, and argued that worker preference is driven primarily by salary. Ms. Schuellerman disagreed with the amount of residential housing proposed in District 11 and disputed the assertion that previous Councils supported such density. She also expressed concern about the property

owner's leverage given its extensive holdings in Ohio and stated that the initiative appears driven by City staff, economic development leadership, and most Council members. She said that replacing lost revenue does not justify ignoring the repeated will of the citizens.

No one else came forward.

This matter was discussed

VI. Correspondence

Ms. Obert stated she represented the Planning Commission at the last City Council meeting regarding updates to align LDC language with the Comprehensive Plan.

VII. Old Business (including continuation of 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.** [APRIL](#)

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](#)

Chair Norman stated that WRA requested their application be continued to the May 11, 2026, Planning Commission meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Romano, that this application be tabled to the Planning Commission meeting on 5/11/2026. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ms. McCoy

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

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Memo From Applicant](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Revised Traffic Impact Study and Response Memo](#)
[Previous Staff Report From March 2026 Meeting](#)
[Geotech Report](#)
[Wetland Delineation and permit](#)
[Previous ACOE Wetland Permit](#)
[Fire Department Review](#)
[Engineering Department Review](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application and reviewed: Updates to the site plan, traffic study, engineering report, and that the wetlands were confirmed as Level 1. Mr. Sugar stated the arborist visited the site to review existing trees, and the applicant modified the location of the playground.

The Board discussed the concept site plan review process with Solicitor Pitchford.

Mr. Jeff Durban, Crossland Development Company, summarized revisions to the plan. He stated that the playground remains at least 100 feet from neighboring homes, most tree removals occur on the west side, the retention pond has been relocated west to improve the city entrance aesthetic, the landscaping and building design will be further studied, and parking has been adjusted so spaces no longer face Terex Road. He explained playground square footage requirements and the decision to design for 5000 square feet. He noted the corner building entrance improves appearance and parent convenience. He submitted a written communication discussing why the applicant believes the revision meets the Conditional Use criteria and noted the project budget is approximately \$5.3 million.

Commissioners questioned whether relocating the building southwest would further reduce wetland disturbance. Mr. Durban responded that such a move would be extremely costly. Utility details were addressed by Mr. Jeff Jardine of Riverstone Company, including relocation of the existing 12 inch HDPE line, uncertainty regarding the sanitary force main, and fire flow considerations. Approximately \$1.2 million in site improvements are anticipated.

Commissioners discussed entrance locations, retention pond safety, fencing requirements, parking proximity to the road, and comparison to other area daycares. Mr. Durban stated TLE requires fencing around the pond despite the LDC not explicitly requiring it and the applicant will fund any required right-of-way changes.

There was extensive discussion regarding: Traffic conditions, a one-way traffic flow, adequate parking, snow storage, playground sizing (which Hudson defines at 6000 square feet for daycare/preschool), lighting, and tree health based on the arborist's assessment. Commissioners emphasized the complexity of the site, concerns about traffic volume for a daycare, the importance of architectural quality, and difficulty aligning the use with Comprehensive Plan recommendations. Some commissioners felt a Use-by-Right development would fit the site more easily.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public comments from those with standing and then from the general public. Both opened and closed with none offered.

Additional discussion took place regarding the City Engineers' plan showing removal of an existing traffic lane for a turn lane. Mr. Rapp, Hudson City Engineer, explained how the lane is currently used and that the proposed design could improve traffic flow. Staff noted that work continues on returning Martin Drive to residential status.

Commissioners noted that building on this property will be difficult but that a daycare may serve community needs. They expressed appreciation for the applicant's transparency and responsiveness. Some commissioners

expressed concern about project feasibility and traffic intensity. Others noted that additional buffer trees would benefit the site, that the LDC is often challenging but must be enforced, and that daycares are in demand. The potential positive influence of the project on the west entrance to Hudson was also highlighted.

Chair Norman and Mr. Sugar reviewed recommendations and clarifications.

Ms. Obert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nystrom to adopt the preliminary Findings of Fact from page 4 of the staff report, the staff recommendations on page 5, and meeting comments. The motion passed by the follow vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ms. McCoy

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

Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)
[Draft Planning Commission Memo to Council](#)
[District 11 Text and Map Regulations as Amended 2.25.26](#)
[Staff Memo - Planned Development Process](#)

Mr. Sugar summarized the prior meeting and staff recommendations. Commissioners discussed whether District 11 should exist at all or remain District 8. They expressed concern that Council may not follow PC recommendations, that District 11 does not align with the Comprehensive Plan, and that residential uses should be limited. They emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan reflects citizen will and that the District 11 proposal lacks clarity and may create legal risks. Commissioners felt the Open House materials were not transparent and that public questions remain unanswered. They also noted misinformation circulating about possible demolitions and questioned whether the District 11 text removes PC oversight.

A Commissioner stated a residential overlay map displayed by staff at the public open house was inaccurate relative to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioners reviewed how twenty units per acre could be achieved through various parcel combinations. Mr. Hannan added that public comments have slowed Council's process and that additional clarification from PC will be useful.

Commissioners discussed potential conditions for residential development, limitations in the Comprehensive Plan survey, the corridor-wide nature of CP discussions, and concerns over allowing forty thousand square feet of retail in District 11.

After reviewing and editing the staff summary of the March recommendations, Chair Norman outlined the suggested final recommendations. These will be forwarded to City Council to express Planning Commission concerns that the 2026 Text and Map Amendment may expose the City to legal challenges and does not sufficiently align with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Obert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, to approve the final recommendations and forward them to City Council to express Planning Commission concerns that the 2026 Text and Map Amendment may expose the City to legal challenges and does not sufficiently align with the Comprehensive Plan. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Ms. Smith and Ms. Obert

Nay: 2 - Mr. Romano and Mr. Innamorato

Absent: 1 - Ms. McCoy

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

IX. Other Business

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

Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)
[Draft Ordinance in bold strikethrough format](#)
[Expanded Housing Chart with Proposed Amendments](#)

Staff presented the updated Use Table, noting there are no changes from the prior meeting and explaining that assisted living densities remain unchanged due to complexity.

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Obert, to send the density recommendations to Council. 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

B. [DISC - PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS](#) Planning Commission Discussion Topic: Planned Developments

The discussion focused on maps showing where Planned Developments are allowed and on the parcels of two or five acres eligible for such development. Commissioners reviewed LDC guidance on Planned Developments, including exceptions, and the Standards for Preliminary Review. They expressed concern that the standards are vague and questioned what happens if PC and Council disagree under the current framework.

Commissioners agreed to send individual comments to staff for compilation, with OHM consulting on review. Mr. Hannan explained the process through which PC recommendations proceed to City Council.

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, that this Staff Report be tabled to the next meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ms. McCoy

Abstain: 1 - Mr. Innamorato

X. Staff Update (upcoming agenda items, appeals)

Mr. Sugar reviewed the possible applications for the May meeting.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Romano, seconded by Ms. Smith, that this be adjourned at 10:55 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.

* * *