

Meeting Date:  
September 8, 2025

Location:  
86 Owen Brown St.

Parcel Numbers  
3201121; 3201120

Request:  
Concept Site Plan -  
Townhomes

Applicant:  
Rhonda Singer,  
Fairmount Properties

Property Owner:  
RLM Investments II  
LLC

Zoning:  
D5- Village Core  
District

Case Manager:  
Nick Sugar, City Planner

Staff Recommendation  
Approval subject to the  
recommendation on  
page 10.

## Contents

- Applicant Memo, 8.11.25
- Site Plans, 8.21.25
- Inspirational Design Images
- Title Commitment
- Current Deed
- Asst. City Engineer review dated 9.2.25
- Site Photos



City of Hudson GIS

**Project Background:** Fairmount Properties is proposing a townhome development at 86 Owen Brown Street. The property has frontage along Clinton Street, Morse Road and Owen Brown Street. It is comprised of two parcels totaling 1.31 acres. The property is zoned District 5: Village Core District.

A previous application for this property was submitted per application #25-716. The public hearing was held on July 14, 2025 and was denied. The primary changes with this proposal include the following:

- Reduction in the number of townhome units from 21 to 18 units
- Reduction in number of units fronting Owen Brown Street from 6 to 2
- Addition of the Veterans Trail multi-purpose path extension
- Reduction in impacts to the riparian corridor, including removal of a proposed driveway.
- Expansion in parking count
- Revision to remove dwelling unit from the floodplain

Townhomes are a permitted use by right in D5 with the following definition: (111) "Dwelling, townhome" shall mean a single-family dwelling in a row of at least three such units in which each unit has its own front and rear access to the outside, no unit is located over another unit, and each unit is separated from any other unit by one or more vertical common fire-resistant walls.

The applicant has submitted for concept site plan review/approval at this time, with the intention of then pursuing a major site plan application. The concept site plan process is more thoroughly described on the following page.

Hudson Planning Commission	CONCEPT SITE PLAN REVIEW - TOWNHOMES
Case No. 25-1027	September 8, 2025

Staff notes the applicant studied the options for Planned Developments, Subdivisions, and site plan applications. Each follow different review schedules and code determinations. The anticipated site plan application establishes a single parcel with the units functioning under condominium ownership.

**Adjacent Development:** The property is adjacent to single family residential to the north and northeast (District 4), townhomes to the southeast (District 5), vacant city owned property to the west (District 5), and commercial retail to the south (District 5).

## Chapter 1204 – Concept Plan Process

### ✓ Site Plans 1204.04

The applicant has requested a concept plan review prior to a formal Major Site Plan submittal. This is a “Major Development” as it does not fit the definition of minor or basic, which are focused on small residential projects, with the most intensive being proposals for single family homes, and nonresidential accessory structures and additions. The concept plan review process is described as follows:

*(b) At the option of the applicant and prior to final site plan review by the Planning Commission, or by City Council when the application is for a major development that is called up by Council, the applicant may request in writing to obtain concept plan review and approval. The Planning Commission, or City Council, shall review the submittals as required for concept plan review in Appendix A of this Code and evaluate them to determine their preliminary compliance with the standards set forth in divisions (a)(1) through (a)(6) of this section, subject to final site plan review and approval.*

*(c) The purpose of the concept plan approval procedure is: (1) to afford the applicant an opportunity to receive guidance of the Planning Commission, or Council when the application is for a major development that is called up by Council, on the major features of the site design for the development plan prior to the submission of engineering details for the project; and (2) to obtain a decision on the concept plan by the Planning Commission or City Council, conditioned upon review and satisfaction of the requirements for final site plan review by the Planning Commission or City Council. Approval of a concept plan does not constitute a final decision on the site plan application since the plan may require revisions based upon a review of the submissions for final site plan approval by the Planning Commission or City Council.*

The above code section acknowledges the Planning Commission shall determine preliminary compliance with standards (a)(1) through (a)(6) of this section, subject to final Major Site Plan approval. Staff has documented compliance with each of these six standards within this staff report.

## Section 1201.03 Purpose and Intent

Staff has reviewed the purpose and intent of the Land Development Code and notes the following:

- The proposal is responsive to *preserve and protect environmental resources* by removing impervious surface from the stream corridor and floodplain.

- The exterior facades can be designed to *preserve and protect the architecture, history, and small-town character of the historic village core.*
- The proximity of the site to downtown and the adjacent multi-purpose trail promote a walkable environment, and reduce the dependence on automobile travel.
- The proposal is responsive to the following purpose/intent statement: *Encourage innovative residential development so that growing demand for housing may be met by greater variety in type, design, and layout of dwellings, and by conservation and more efficient use of open space ancillary to such dwellings.*
  - The site plan design includes an extension of Veterans Trail, a planned multipurpose trail. A central courtyard with walking paths would connect to the trail.
  - The site plan layout would minimize the view of contiguous townhome units with no more than two connected units being oriented to each public view, reducing the scale of the development.
  - The concept plan creates the presence of a single unit (Unit#4) being adjacent to the historic homes on Owen Brown Street rather than a row house.
  - The development included units with first floor master bedrooms.
- The proposal would provide enhanced greenspace for a downtown townhome development.

### Chapter 1203 Development Review and Administrative Procedures

Staff notes the following review schedule would be applicable to the proposal:

1. Concept Site Plan review through the Planning Commission (Public Hearing).
2. Major Site Plan review through the Planning Commission (Public Hearing).
3. Design Review through the Architectural and Historic Board of Review (Public Meeting).
4. Final Zoning Certificate Review (Administrative - Staff).

### Chapter 1204 – Site Plan Review Standards

#### ✓ Site Plans 1204.04

*All reviewing agencies, the City Manager, the Planning Commission, and the City Council shall review site plan applications, and all submitted plans and reports, and evaluate them to determine their compliance with the following standards:*

- (a) *The development shall be consistent with the purposes and intent of this Code, and with the policies, goals, and objectives of any applicable community plan, including the City Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time.*

Staff Comments: Staff notes the following:

- The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Plan classifies this parcel as the “Downtown” land use. The use is described as follows:



#### Downtown

The historic and commercial center for Hudson and an area for compact and pedestrian-scale retail, services, mixed-use, and public uses. Typically, buildings are and should remain on zero lot lines with parking to the side and rear, with shared parking encouraged. New development should reflect appearance, form, pattern, and design of the historic district, and to the extent possible, preserve and protect natural landscape qualities and historic and cultural elements. Pedestrian connections within, and to and from the district should be a high priority.

While the description suggests the use should be business or mixed-use, staff recommends the proposed townhome use as appropriate based on the

Hudson Planning Commission	CONCEPT SITE PLAN REVIEW - TOWNHOMES
Case No. 25-1027	September 8, 2025

surrounding residential uses. The use would effectively transition the single-family homes along Owen Brown Street with the existing townhomes and commercial uses along Clinton Street. The establishment of street front buildings with entrances facing the street along all three frontages enhances the smalltown character over the current site configuration. Staff notes the current site includes parking lots fronting Clinton Street, no pedestrian access points along Morse Road, and a metal sided building with limited architectural detailing.

Objective 1.2.1 states: *Limit new residential development in undeveloped areas while protecting open spaces, and being compatible in scale, density, and design to surrounding homes.*

Staff Comment: The proposal consists of redevelopment of an existing developed property. Density, design compatibility, and landscaping are further described in this staff report.

Objective 1.3.1 states: *Progress development that supports existing downtown businesses by increasing foot traffic while minimizing vehicular traffic impacts. Maintain the existing character and charm of downtown.*

Staff Comment: The proposed street front townhomes support this action item with a proposed streetscape that complies with the LDC vs current development, anticipated reduced traffic generation, and supporting the character and charm of downtown.

1. *The development complies with the use regulations set forth in Chapter 1206*

Staff Comment: Acceptable. Townhomes are a use by right in District 5 with no special conditions.

2. *The development complies with all applicable requirements set forth in Chapter 1207, "Zoning Development and Site Plan Standards," except to the extent modifications, variances, or waivers have been expressly allowed.*

Staff Comments: Staff notes the following:

- **Lots:** The two lots comprising the project area would need to be consolidated prior to the issuance of any zoning permits. Staff understands the development would be a condominium-based development on a single underlying parcel.
- **Impervious Surface:** The proposal would result in 72.2% impervious surface, which would comply with the maximum allowance of 75% for townhomes.
- **Tree Protection:** Minimal tree clearing is proposed as the existing site is developed and comprised primarily of buildings, parking, and lawn.
- **Wetland/Stream Corridor Protection:** Brandywine Creek is located on the adjacent parcel to the east of the property. Wetlands are also anticipated. A current wetland delineation will be required at time of final site plan application. The stream has a 75 ft setback and wetlands

Hudson Planning Commission	CONCEPT SITE PLAN REVIEW - TOWNHOMES
Case No. 25-1027	September 8, 2025

a 50 ft setback in which *no person shall engage in any activity that will disturb, remove, fill, drain, dredge, clear, destroy, or alter any area, including vegetation, within stream corridors, wetlands, and their setbacks, except as may be expressly allowed in this Code.*

The applicant is proposing to convert a large area of paved asphalt which drains into Brandywine Creek with no stormwater treatment (currently within the riparian setback area) and return such to a natural area. The following would be within the stream corridor setback:

- Two wet detention ponds  
Staff Comment: Permitted within a stream corridor setback provided native plantings are utilized.
  - A sidewalk extension from unit #18:  
Staff Comment: Suggest relocating the entrance to the west side of the unit to remove the impervious sidewalk from the stream setback.
  - A sidewalk extension from the courtyard to the multipurpose trail:  
Staff Comment: Staff sees merit in the proposed extension to the multipurpose trail and notes this area is currently developed as paved parking. Staff suggests impervious pavers be considered for the portion of the proposed sidewalk within the stream setback to meet the intent of the requirement and facilitate the pedestrian connection to Veterans Trail.
- **Landscaping/Bufferyards:** A Bufferyard (B) of 10 feet is required where adjacent to single family residential. Staff recommends plantings be primarily concentrated in the northeast corner of the property to provide buffering tithe single family homes along Owen Brown. This should be considered in the final design of the proposed wet detention basin.
  - **Open Space:** Open Space dedication is applicable. Staff notes the Veterans Trail multipurpose path is planned to run through this location and continue the existing path within the adjacent library property to the south. This extension could be constructed by the applicant on the adjacent city owned property to the east to fulfill the required open space dedication. Staff recommends a work agreement be established to facilitate the trail extension.
  - **Stormwater Management:** The Engineering Department has reviewed the preliminary stormwater plan and has provided the attached preliminary review letter. Further study of the stormwater including the regulations of 1207.07 would be applicable to the final site plan application. Staff notes the proposed stormwater basins should be designed as part of the final site plan application to integrate with the adjacent city land and trail to establish an open space enhancement.



Hudson Planning Commission	CONCEPT SITE PLAN REVIEW - TOWNHOMES
Case No. 25-1027	September 8, 2025

- **Utilities:** Staff notes the following:
    - **Electric:** Hudson electric serves the site. Hudson Public Power (HPP) has identified an electric pole along Owen Brown Street that would need to be relocated.
    - **Water:** The property is served by Hudson Water.
    - **Sanitary:** The property is served by Summit County Sewer. City staff and the applicant have held preliminary discussions with Summit County DSSS and the OHEPA regarding the sewer capacity for the proposed townhome development. Staff notes the following:
      - Summit County DSSS and the EPA would consider the proposal a net trade of sewer capacity/credits between the existing buildings and the proposed townhomes. This is subject to a final review by DSSS and Permit-to-Install (PTI) review by the Ohio EPA. This would occur with final design. Preliminary calculations of anticipated sewer usage were taken from the existing townhome development to the east.

The applicant should submit written correspondence from Summit County DSSS at time of major site plan review verifying their acceptance of the proposed sewer capacity and that this capacity would not affect the adjacent city owned property to the west.

    - The timeline of the proposed townhomes aligns with future planned DSSS sanitary sewer upgrades to Clinton Street with a future Pump Station and force main project.
- **Traffic:** A trip generation study will be required at time of application.
- **Parking:** The development would provide 54 total parking spaces including:
  - Each unit would be designed with a two-car garage to meet minimum parking requirements. 6 additional private parking spaces are depicted within the development
  - The proposed site plan depicts 12 on-street parking spaces.
  - The proposal would result in 18 parking stalls beyond the base code requirement.
- **Exterior Lighting:** An exterior lighting plan will be required at time of formal application depicting all exterior fixtures and lighting levels. All exterior fixtures shall be shielded to eliminate glare.

Hudson Planning Commission	CONCEPT SITE PLAN REVIEW - TOWNHOMES
Case No. 25-1027	September 8, 2025

3. *The development complies with all applicable federal, state, or county development regulations, standards, and requirements, or plans, including but not limited to wetlands, water quality, and wastewater regulations.*

Staff Comments:

- A current wetland delineation will be required at time of formal application.
- As previously stated, the applicant should submit written correspondence from Summit County DSSS at time of major site plan review verifying their acceptance of the proposed sewer capacity and that this capacity would not affect the adjacent city owned property to the west.

4. *The proposed development shall avoid or minimize land disturbance and grading and preserve the original contours and other natural topographical features of the site to the maximum extent feasible and shall incorporate measures to minimize soil erosion during all construction phases.*

Staff Comment: The proposal would require limited land disturbance as the property is currently developed. As previously stated, impacts to the adjacent stream corridor setback should be minimized and additional plantings should be incorporated to restore the area. No construction staging should occur along the eastern property line.

5. *The development must protect and enhance historic structures, sites, and archeological features designated by federal, state, and local agencies, and the applicant shall commit, to the maximum extent feasible, to protecting and enhancing any such structures, sites, and features eligible for designation discovered during the development process.*

Staff Comment: Staff notes, while the site is not located within the historic district, it is in close proximity. The proposed development should be designed with consideration to the adjacent historic structures.

**Additional Review Comments (Section 1205.08; Appendix D – Architectural Design Standards)**

- **District 5 Purpose Statement:** *This district is intended to preserve and protect the Village Core, which is the historic and commercial center of the City of Hudson. This district contains portions of Hudson's Historic District, and all new development in this district shall be consistent with the historic core plan as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. While a wide range of uses currently exists within the district, including several non-conforming industrial and office uses, the regulations contained in this district are intended to encourage a predominance of compact and pedestrian-scale retail, service, and office uses in the Village Core. The visual focus of the Village Core is the Village Green and Village Green Extension, and all uses located on streets adjacent to the Village Green or Village Green Extension shall be required to face these open spaces. New commercial and retail development will be required to reflect the overall appearance, form, pattern, and design of the Historic District. To the maximum extent feasible, new development in the district will be required to preserve and protect the scenic and natural landscape qualities, as well as the drainage and flood control functions, of Brandywine Creek. Regional and local traffic congestion at the intersection of Routes 91 and 303 has hampered accessibility into and out of the Village Core; accordingly,*

*alternate access routes will be encouraged in this district, including pedestrian ways and bikeways, and new development will be required to submit proposed parking programs, access plans, and traffic impact studies for review.*

**Staff Comments:**

- The proposal would develop stormwater improvements on a currently developed site that has none.
  - The proposal would remove existing impervious surfaces from the floodplain and stream corridor that currently drain untreated into the creek.
  - The proposal would encourage alternative travel, with pedestrian sidewalks and a multipurpose trail extension.
- **Density:** Townhomes are permitted with a maximum net density of twenty units per acre. The applicant will provide a formal calculation on a surveyed, engineered site plan at time of application. Staff has prepared the following preliminary calculation based on the concept site plan:

	Acres (approx. within D5 Zoning)
Gross land area:	1.3195
Proposed ROW (to accommodate on-street parking)	0.0472
Easements	TBD
Public Open Space dedication	TBD
Land under water and floodplains	.14 acres (approx.)
Net Area	1.1323
Max Townhome Units (Net area x 20)	22
Total unit Count	18

Staff notes the following gross density for comparison to other non single-family developments in the area.

Development	Units	Acres	Units per Acre (Gross Density)
Hudson Commons	53	7.2	7.4
First and Main Townhomes	12	0.9	13.3
Surrey Park	66	4.9	13.5
Hudson Station	16	1.1	14.5
Current Proposal	18	1.32	13.6
Versailles	144	9	16.0

- **Setbacks:** The concept site plan complies with the following setback standards:
  - Minimum front yard setback: 5 ft. Staff notes Section 1201.07 permits porches/entryways to extend into the front yard setback per the following: *Steps to the principal entrance to enter the structure, together with railings no more than three feet in height, and associated roofs, provided they do not extend more than six feet into the required yard setback;*
  - Minimum rear yard setback: 25 ft
  - Minimum side yard setback: 8 ft
- **Property Development Standards:** The proposal would become compliant with the following development standards if the existing two parcels are consolidated:



Hudson Planning Commission	CONCEPT SITE PLAN REVIEW - TOWNHOMES
Case No. 25-1027	September 8, 2025

- Minimum lot width: 24 ft
  - Maximum building coverage 80% of total gross lot area
  - Maximum structure height: 35 ft
  - Minimum distance between residential buildings: 10 ft at their closest point.
- **Building Siting and Orientation:** Staff notes general compliance with the following building, siting, and orientation requirements. Interior buildings and garages would be obscured by perimeter units:
    - *The entrance to at least one dwelling unit within each building shall face the street.*
    - *The front wall of the principal structure, or the front wall of at least one principal structure in a multi-building development, shall be parallel to the street or perpendicular to a radius of the curve of the street extended through the approximate center of the main mass, if the street is curved.*
    - *On corner lots, the structure shall face one of the streets and not the corner.*
    - *Doors of attached garages shall not face the street.*
    - *An attached garage shall be sited so that its door is not visible from the primary direction of approach.*
    - *All new residential development shall connect the front entrance of the principal structure to the sidewalk with a private connecting walkway surfaced with either concrete, brick, or stone.*
  - **Driveway Curb Cuts:** The LDC states the following:
    - Townhomes and duplexes shall have no more than one driveway curb cut per “lot”
    - Single-family attached and multi-family shall have no more than two driveway curb cuts per “development site”.
    - Non-residential uses shall have no more than one driveway curb cut per “lot”.

Staff notes the application proposes two curb cuts; however, as this is a single parcel site plan, it would be more appropriate to allow two curb cuts. Additionally, Hudson EMS/Fire has noted two curb cuts would be preferred from an emergency services access standpoint. Staff understands the applicant intends to apply for a variance to permit two curb cuts.

- **Sidewalks/Walkways:** The Land Development Code states, *To the maximum extent feasible, provision shall be made in the design of developments for connections with existing or future pedestrian systems on adjoining properties, including but not limited to connections to existing or future sidewalks, bikeways, walkways, and any existing or planned trail systems along Brandywine Creek.* Staff notes sidewalks are depicted along the property frontages and through the proposed internal courtyard. The planned Veterans Trail extension is also included in the project scope.
- **Floodplain:** Minor grading, minor sidewalk extensions and two wet detention basins are proposed within the floodplain. The City’s floodplain administrator has provided preliminary comments and recommends if any fill is proposed in the floodplain as part of the final site plan application, such should be compensated and removed elsewhere onsite within the floodplain area. Therefore, the site’s floodplain area would be balanced.
- **Architectural Design:** The Architectural and Historic Board of Review would review the design of the buildings. Preliminary staff comments include:

Hudson Planning Commission	CONCEPT SITE PLAN REVIEW - TOWNHOMES
Case No. 25-1027	September 8, 2025

- Applicant to refer to the Architectural Design Standards Appendix D – Type Standards for Townhomes.
  - Design should be compatible with adjacent Clinton Street townhomes and residential development along Owen Brown Street. Materials, roof shapes, and porch designs for Units #1-#4 should specifically look to be compatible with Owen Brown Street.
  - Design should incorporate a high level of architectural detailing. Use of hardi-board(or similar siding) and wood clad windows would incorporate materials compatible with adjacent townhomes.
  - Design should include a variety of styles.
- The applicant has provided preliminary inspiration images.

### City Departments:

- ☒ **Engineering**      Assistant City Engineer David Rapp has submitted the attached review letter dated September 2, 2025
- ☒ **Fire Department**      Fire Marshal Shawn Kasson has reviewed the proposal and acknowledged the two proposed curb cuts would be preferred for Fire/EMS access. Fire Marshal Kasson also stated he will coordinate with the applicant to address specific details related to fire apparatus access.
- ☒ **Hudson Public Power**      Assistant Public Works Superintendent Dave Griffith has reviewed the proposal and notes an electric pole that would need to be relocated along the Owen Brown Street frontage. Electric and telecommunication infrastructure would need to be relocated before actual construction of the parcel could begin. HPP would work closely with the applicant’s design team to ensure everything is built to City specifications

### Required PC Action

The PC shall consider the development application, the staff report, public testimony, and then take final action. PC shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application based on its compliance with the appropriate review standards. All decisions of the Commission shall be based on findings of fact related to the relevant standards of the Code.

### Recommendation

Approve the Concept Site Plan Application based on preliminary compliance with the general review standards for site plans stipulated in Section 1204.04. Approval of the concept plan does not constitute a final decision on the site plan application. The applicant shall address the comments of the Planning Commission and those documented within the staff report for the formal submittal of a Major Site Plan application.