



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Board of Zoning & Building Appeals

Lydia Bronstein, Chair
Robert Kahrl, Vice Chair
Robert Dyer
Keenan Jones
Cory Scott

Nick Sugar, City Planner
Mary Rodack, Associate Planner

Thursday, July 16, 2026

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call to Order

Chair Bronstein called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals 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: 4 - Ms. Bronstein, Mr. Jones, Mr. Kahrl and Mr. Scott

Absent: 1 - Mr. Dyer

III. Identification, by Chairman, of City Staff.

Chair Bronstein identified, City Planner Nick Sugar, Associate Planner Mary Rodack, and City Solicitor Chris Thomas.

IV. Swearing in of Staff and Audience Addressing the Board.

Chair Bronstein swore-in staff and all the persons wishing to speak under oath.

V. Approval of Minutes

[BZBA 6.18.26](#) Minutes of Previous Board of Zoning & Building Appeals Meeting: June 18, 2026

Attachments: [June 18, 2026 BZBA Meeting Minutes - Draft](#)

The Board continued the approval of the June meeting to the August meeting.

VI. Public Hearings - New Business

[BZBA 26-816](#) The subject of this hearing is a variance request of ten (10) feet from the

required minimum lot width of two-hundred (200) feet, resulting in a lot width of one-hundred and ninety (190) feet pursuant to section 1205.05(d) (4)A, “Property Development/Design Standards - Lot Width” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to complete a lot split to build two single-family residences.

The applicant is Chris Brown of 778 McCauley Rd, Suite 140, Stow, OH 44224. The property owner is GVI LLC, 410 Dunwoody Dr, Aurora, OH 44202 for the property at 549 W Streetsboro St in District 2 [Rural Residential Conservation] within the City of Hudson.

Attachments: [26-816 549 W Streetsboro St - Staff Report](#)

Ms. Rodack introduced the application by describing the lot configurations and sizes, outlining the requested variance, and reviewing the applicable standards. She noted that the applicant previously appeared at the June meeting but withdrew the application to consider alternative lot separations. She also explained that information from Hudson Public Power had been reviewed and confirmed that the driveway is eleven feet wide.

Mr. Chris Brown, representing GBI, LLC., explained that the proposed property lines were adjusted so that only a ten-foot variance is now required. He added that the electric box is eleven feet from the driveway, which meets Hudson Public Power’s request.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed several matters. They reviewed the interpretation of the lot-width standard, which appears differently in three LDC locations but is officially defined as the minimum width at any point. Mr. Brown noted that no adjacent property owners had contacted him with concerns. It was also clarified that this is a minor lot split handled administratively. The Board discussed how the wetlands on the existing 400-foot property create the need for the variance. Mr. Brown emphasized that he has attempted to follow the Board’s earlier recommendation to avoid disturbing the identified wetland. Board members observed that the proposed solution appears preferable to filling a portion of the wetlands.

Mr. Brown thanked the Board for allowing him the opportunity to explore alternative options following the first BZBA meeting.

Ms. Bronstein opened the meeting for public comment from individuals both with and without standing, there were no public comments.

Mr. Kahrl raised two points regarding Mr. Brown’s statements, noting that the variance represents only five percent and that the water-related issues create an exceptional circumstance justifying the variance.

A motion was made by Mr. Scott seconded by Mr. Jones that this Variance be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Bronstein, Mr. Jones, Mr. Kahrl and Mr. Scott

Absent: 1 - Mr. Dyer

[BZBA 26-38](#) **The subject of this hearing is a request for four variances in order to fill**

approximately 293 square feet of wetlands for the construction of a driveway and a new home. The variances are:

1. A variance from the prohibited activity of disturbance within stream corridors, wetlands and their setbacks pursuant to section 1207.03(c), “Prohibited Activities” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code.
2. A variance from prohibited activity that would “disturb, remove, fill, drain, dredge, clear, destroy, or alter any area, including vegetation, within a wetland as delineated or would be delineated by the procedures of this section” pursuant to section 1207.03(d)(1) “Compliance with Applicable Federal Wetlands Laws or Regulations” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code.
3. A variance of twenty-seven (27) feet from the required thirty (30) foot stream corridor setback resulting in a three (3) foot setback pursuant to section 1207.03(e)(1)D “Wetland/Stream Corridor Protection - Stream Corridor Setbacks” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code.
4. A variance of fifty (50) feet from the required fifty (50) foot wetlands setback resulting in a setback of zero (0) feet from the delineated edge of the wetlands pursuant to section 1207.03(e)(2), “Setbacks - Wetlands” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code.

The applicant is Matthew Neff of 6830 Chaffee Court, Brecksville, Ohio 44141. The property owner is Bektic Capital Holdings LLC, 5079 Akron Cleveland Rd, Peninsula. Ohio 44264 for the property at 1957 Norton Rd in District 1 [Suburban Residential Neighborhood] within the City of Hudson.

Attachments: [26-38 1957 Norton Rd - Staff Report](#)

Ms. Rodack introduced the application by describing the 5.9-acre property, outlining its history, reviewing the requested variances, noting the presence of numerous wetlands, questioning the category of those wetlands, and summarizing staff comments.

Mr. Matthew Neff of M. Neff Consultants and Mr. Ben Latuee of HZW Environmental Consultants in Medina,

Ohio, explained that the site is significantly affected by streams and wetlands, and that without the requested variances the lot would not be buildable. Mr. Neff stated that he believes the impact of the variances will be minimal, noting that only 0.06 acres of wetlands would be filled. Mr. Latuee added that the Army Corps of Engineers must also approve the wetland fill, and he expects approval because the impact is under one-tenth of an acre.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed several issues. It was noted that the neighbors on both sides of the property have objected to the variances. Mr. Neff responded that the neighbors do not own the property and, if they object to development, they should consider purchasing it. The Board emphasized that the Land Development Code is intended to protect neighboring properties.

Chair Bronstein informed the applicant that he must demonstrate that the only way to build on the property is through the requested variances. Mr. Neff stated that the property owners have specific requirements for the home and have already moved the house location and modified the architecture. Chair Bronstein noted that purchasers are expected to understand the applicable laws when acquiring property.

Mr. Latuee referenced the preamble to the wetland and riparian setback ordinance, which emphasizes maintaining proper floodways and ecological diversity. He stated that the project qualifies under a nationwide Army Corps ruling and that the Corps considers the impact minimal. The Board noted that the wetlands have not been categorized, making determinations difficult. They also pointed out that Hudson LDC 1204.03 states that no variance may be granted if it risks reducing ecological integrity, and that the ordinance requires mitigation-none of which is included in the application.

The Board further emphasized that its decisions are independent of the Army Corps' opinions. Mr. Kahrl described concerns about the topography and questioned how stormwater exits the property without additional information.

The Board noted that the original house, since demolished, was located on the east side of the property, while the proposed new house would be built in a different location. Staff reported that GIS measurements indicate the former house was approximately 2,000 square feet.

The Board discussed the proposed house location relative to the former house, confirmed that the applicant intends to use the same driveway alignment, and noted that a detailed stormwater study has not yet been completed. The applicant stated he is willing to conduct such a study at the Board's request.

The Board and staff reviewed the property's 1996 IEI rating, noting that it was high, which indicates disturbances could have a greater environmental impact.

The applicant explained that the proposed driveway location was chosen because existing gravel is already present, and because the homeowner preferred not to cross the creek to avoid additional environmental impact. Staff noted that shifting the driveway toward the north property line results in less impact than crossing the stream, and also pointed out that moving closer to the road would increase impacts on the riparian corridors.

The Board, staff, and applicant then reviewed the four requested variances. The first two are inter-related and concern the buffer area, the third involves wetland fill required for the driveway, and the fourth involves fill within the setback. The applicant stated that several driveway options were explored but resulted in greater impacts to the setbacks. He noted that while the turnaround could be relocated, the preferred location is more convenient. He also referenced the red line marking the limits of disturbance, which cannot be crossed without a variance.

Chair Bronstein opened the meeting for public comment from individuals with and without standing; none were offered. She then noted that two correspondences had been received, both opposing the variances.

The applicant stated he is willing to discuss possible modifications with the property owner. The Board noted that if the application is denied, it may not be resubmitted. The applicant and Board discussed whether onsite mitigation could be considered in granting a variance; the Board noted it has been considered in past applications, and that the categorization of the wetlands will be essential for determining mitigation requirements.

The applicant requested a continuance.

Mr. Sugar then read a list of items discussed during the meeting that the applicant may wish to consider if revisions are submitted.

A motion was made by Mr. Jones seconded by Mr. Kahrl, that this Variance be continued. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Bronstein, Mr. Jones, Mr. Kahrl and Mr. Scott

Absent: 1 - Mr. Dyer

VII. Other Business

Ms. Rodack reviewed the upcoming application for the August meeting.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Kahrl, seconded by Mr. Scott that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Bronstein, Mr. Jones, Mr. Kahrl and Mr. Scott

Absent: 1 - Mr. Dyer

Lydia Bronstein, Chair

Robert Kahrl, Vice Chair

Joe Campbell, Executive Assistant

Upon approval by the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals, 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.

* * *