City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft
Planning Commission

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

Monday, December 8, 2025 | **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. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the November 10, 2025 minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

Abstain: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

A. PC 11-10-25 **Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: November 10, 2025**

Attachments: PC Meeting Minutes: November 10, 2025

V. Public Discussion

Chair Norman opened the meeting to public comments for anyone wanting to address the Commissioners on any topic that is not on the agenda. There were no comments.

VI. Correspondence

Ms. Obert reported on her attendance at the most recent BZBA meeting and summarized concerns raised by BZBA regarding the Planning Commission decision regarding Laurel Lake. BZBA determined that the Planning Commission's Findings of Fact were insufficiently detailed, that reliance on the Comprehensive Plan was too vague, and that the definition used for a Large-Scale Living Facility did not align with the Comprehensive Plan, or the fact that some units were approved and others denied, which created inconsistencies. Ms. Obert stated that BZBA members may not have reviewed the Planning Commission meeting and emphasized a disconnect between the two boards. She suggested that staff facilitate a joint meeting between Planning Commission and BZBA to improve communication and process alignment.

Ms. Obert further discussed the need for Findings of Fact to be delivered more clearly to applicants and other boards, she suggested that a better process might assist applicants in understanding how to move an application forward. The Commissioners discussed the process for approving Findings of Fact before forwarding them to applicants or other boards and considered clarifying Findings of Fact prior to conducting a vote. Mr. Hannan explained that staff currently drafts Findings of Fact and forwards them to the chair for approval or edits.

Chair Norman reviewed the Administrative Rules that Planning Commission has used for Decisions and Findings of Fact for several past chairpersons. She clarified the rules allow a decision to be rendered at a later date. She also reviewed the Land Development Code, which requires Findings of Fact to be written, and noted that the Laurel Lake decision heavily relied on the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioners reiterated the importance of making decisions and Findings of Fact in compliance with the Land Development Code while respecting applicants' timelines and business needs. Council's review of Appendix A, a checklist of items required for application review, was seen as helpful for both Commissioners and applicants. . Staff noted that delays in rendering decisions could be handled on a case-by-case basis or that staff could draft decisions and circulate them to Commissioners.

The Board agreed that a clearer and more consistent process for drafting, reviewing, and approving Findings of Fact is necessary.

This matter was discussed

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

A. PC 2025-1022 **A Major Site Plan request to construct an addition to Village Dental**
CONTD DEC

Attachments: Letter From Applicant Requesting Continuation to the 1.12.26 Meeting
Staff Report
Site Plans
City Arborist Review
Elevations and Floor Plan
Trip Generation Analysis
Engineering Review - Updated
Fire Marshal Review
Public Comment
Supplemental Documents
Staff Report - October 13 meeting

Chair Norman informed the Commissioners that the applicant has requested this application be continued.

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by stating the applicant is working to address the Commissioner's comments from the previous meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Smith, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 1/12/2026. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

B. PC 2025-1284 CONTD **A Text and Zoning Map Amendment request to establish a new zoning district, District 11.**

Attachments: Staff Report - December
District 11 Regulations Draft - December
Staff Report - November Meeting
Imagery Photographs
Hudson Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Sugar continued the discussion on the District 11 proposal and presented an updated Redline Map which is included in the staff report. The updated map reflected changes requested by the Commissioners during previous meetings.

The Commissioners reviewed Subsection D and expressed concern about the potential for very dense development on portions of property within the proposed district. They discussed whether a cap on density might be necessary and examined examples of residential density limits applicable to District 11.

The Commissioners considered the possibility of encouraging transitioning to townhomes in the northern portion of District 5. The Commissioners also proposed edits to the District 11 purpose statement to clarify that housing should serve as a secondary use and as a transitional element on the north side of the property. The Commissioners also discussed the existing density of thirty residential units per acre in District 5 and compared how other communities regulate residential unit allowances.

Ms. Smith made a motion, seconded by Ms. McCoy, to continue the proposed Text Amendment

review to the January 12, 2026, Planning Commission meeting, with staff incorporating the comments provided during this meeting.

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

A. PC 2025-1428 **A Major Site Plan request to construct a parking area for Robinson Field Park.**

Attachments: Staff Report
Submittal Letter
Site Plans
Wetland Delineation
Trip Generation Report
Engineering Review
Hudson Comprehensive Plan
Hudson Parks Master Plan
Supplemental Documents
Public Comments

Mr. Sugar introduced the application, explaining that this is a City-led initiative for District 2 to create a parking area at Robinson Park. He reviewed the proposed development plan, noting that the location was selected to minimize clearing and grading, avoid wetlands, and provide adequate sight lines for vehicles exiting the lot. Mr. Sugar then summarized staff recommendations.

Mr. Brad Kosco, City Engineer, addressed questions from the Commissioners regarding the purpose of the proposal. He explained that this is a City Council-led project and that no parking lot has previously been established for a park without trails or amenities. Mr. Kosco stated that the site was chosen because Ravenna Street has less traffic than Stow Road, is outside the wetlands, and offers better visibility. He noted that the park is highly constrained by wetlands and will likely remain minimally developed, without features such as ball fields. Mr. Sugar noted Planning Commission has the authority to grant a modification for a reduced setbacks. TrentWash stated that this is a City Council-led project and that discussions with the Park Board are just beginning. Mr. Kosco confirmed that the proposed entrance meets City standards and that queueing is not expected. He identified where three additional parking spaces could be located and noted that there is currently no funding for developing the park in the five-year budget. He noted Ravenna Street is not an arterial road and Chair Norman referenced Section 1207.01, which requires impervious surface limits to be maintained, and cautioned that approving the project as proposed could violate the Land Development Code. Ms. Norman also stated that mitigation for tree removal would be required. Mr. Kosco explained that the proposed swale would direct water into the pond without piping or mechanical systems. Ms Norman also recommended adding a handicapped parking space to the plan.

Chair Norman opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Joe Fenicle, 2567 Ravenna Street, thanked City staff for adjusting, at his suggestion, the parking lot location for safety reasons. He expressed concern that a parking lot without a developed park could become a dumping

area or attract nighttime loitering. He noted the Akron waterline on the property is protected, that the railroad on the property is historic and should be preserved, and suggested extending the sidewalk to the park driveway. The Commissioners and Mr. Fenicle discussed the original location of the proposed parking lot.

Mr. John Bonham, 2835 Ravenna Street, questioned the need for a parking lot in an area with no amenities and recommended delaying the project until a park plan and budget are in place.

Seeing no further comments, Chair Norman closed public comment.

The Commissioners questioned Mr. Kosco about the Akron waterline, which he confirmed is five feet deep and will not be impacted. He agreed to include waterline information on the plan. Mr. Wash and Mr. Kosco stated they had no concerns about the lot security, which will not include lighting. They noted that approximately $50,000 is allocated for the parking lot project, acknowledged that this is the first time a parking lot has been proposed without a park in place, and confirmed that parks are serviced daily for trash removal. They also discussed that screening could create security issues. The Commissioners expressed concern that the project could encourage loitering and mischief.

Chair Norman closed questions.

In their discussion, the Commissioners questioned the rationale for developing a parking lot without a park plan in place. They noted that this is a use by right that should be decided by the Park Board after revisions to the application. Concerns included the driveway's location directly across from an existing home, the possibility that future park development could require removal of the parking lot, and the lack of a comprehensive design for the park. The Commissioners also emphasized the need to show utilities on the plan.

The Commissioners and staff discussed the parking lot and the Index of Ecological Integrity and how it factors into the review.

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that this Staff Report be tabled to the January 2026 PC meeting. The Commissioners requested updates the plan to include: Handicap parking, the utilities be included, eliminate encroachment related to the i.e.i., signage for the driveway access, the driveway radius enlarged, and security concerns addressed with landscaping and signage. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

IX. Other Business

A. LDC 2026 - Density DEC **Planning Commission Discussion Topic: Density**

Attachments: Staff Memo
Use and Density Chart
Available Land Map
Comprehensive Plan Research

Mr. Sugar opened the discussion by noting that four items were previously addressed at the November 10, 2025. meeting and that two new topics have been introduced, all of which are detailed in the staff report. He then reviewed the recommendations outlined in the report.

The Commissioners discussed the need to clarify the definition of an Institutional Residential Facility and requested additional information on common residential densities in other communities. Mr. Sugar noted that OHM Consultants has been retained as a consultant to provide guidance on what constitutes common density elsewhere. The Commissioners requested information regarding townhouse density and retirement living community density. The Commissioners requested the current density chart be reviewed, compared, and analyzed. It was further noted that the item currently before City Council regarding limitations on large-scale residential facilities will influence the direction the Planning Commission ultimately takes on this matter.

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Ms. Smith, that this Staff Report be tabled until City Council makes a decision on Senior Living Facilities and staff delivers comments regarding the questions raised by the Commissioners. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

B. LDC 2026 - Comp Plan DEC **Planning Commission Discussion Topic: Comprehensive Plan references within the Land Development Code**

Attachments: Staff Memo

Consultant Memo

Comp Plan References

Mr. Sugar introduced the topic originally discussed on November 10, 2025, and presented the memo of recommendations along with draft text prepared by OHM.

The Commissioners discussed the draft and agreed that references to specific sections of the Comprehensive Plan should be removed.

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, that this Staff Report be recommended as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

C. PC Growth 2026 **Growth Management Annual Report**

Attachments: Staff Memo

GM Report memo to Council for YR2026

LDC 1211

Council Resolution 25-174

Mr. Hannan introduced the Growth Management Allocation (GMA) discussion by reviewing the history of the GMA including the pause in the program in recent years. Mr. Hannan then reviewed the staff report and noted that the increased growth of 2025 is approximately 33 percent of the trigger to reinstitute a GMA.

The Commissioners discussed the map of areas that may be developed in Hudson and noted that a .5% increase

in population will not trigger the GMA, and expressed a desire for a new metric that will be inclusive in measuring how development impacts many different areas, i.e., traffic, broadband, etc., and that professional guidance is needed in determining if new metrics are needed for the GMA.

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Smith, to recommend that City Council accept the City Manager's recommendation not to implement the GMA for 2026. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

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

Staff reported that the staff updates will be expanded to include additional information about Planning Commission appeals and other relevant details. Mr. Hannan noted that City Council will hold a workshop discussion on repealing the moratorium previously requested by the Planning Commission. The Commissioners discussed why Council is considering this action and the potential impact if the moratorium is repealed.

Mr. Sugar reported that there are no new applications scheduled for the January meeting.

A. BZBA Appeal - PC Case 25-229

Attachments: Notice of Appeal - Planning Commission Case 25-229

Staff Report

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Obert, seconded by Mr. Nystrom, that this be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Romano

_____

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.

* * *