



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, August 11, 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: 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. McCoy and Ms. Obert

Absent: 2 - Mr. Romano 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 7-14-25](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: July 14, 2025

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes July 14, 2025](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Innamorato, seconded by Ms. McCoy, that the July 14, 2025, minutes be approved as amended. The motion failed and was continued because of a lack of eligible voters.

Aye: 2 - Mr. Innamorato and Ms. McCoy

Recused: 3 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom and Ms. Obert

V. Public Discussion

There was no Public Discussion.

VI. Correspondence

Correspondence - Chair Norman asked the Commissioners to disclose any communications outside of a public meeting.

Ms. Obert disclosed a discussion with a property owner looking for guidance regarding the townhomes as discussed at the last PC meeting.

Chair Norman disclosed a discussion with a member of the public regarding the staking at the middle school regarding the previous application.

VII. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)

There was no Old Business.

VIII. New Business (including public hearings)

A. [PC 2025-904](#) A Text Amendment request relevant to regulations applicable to Assisted Living, Continuing Care Retirement Communities, and Institutional Care (nursing).

Attachments:

[Staff Report](#)

[City Council Memo](#)

[Map of Existing Facilities](#)

[EMS Incident Report](#)

[Hudson Comprehensive Plan](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the proposed zoning amendment, emphasizing that it is a City-led initiative aligned with the Comprehensive Plan's directive to limit "large-scale living facilities." The primary objective is to reduce the volume of emergency service calls by reducing the allowances for such facilities. Mr. Sugar also reviewed the accompanying staff report, which supports the amendment and outlines its rationale.

Commission and Staff Discussed:

Occupancy Data: Commissioners inquired about the City's review of occupancy rates for existing facilities.

Licensing: There was discussion regarding the proposal to only require facilities submit current licensing upon request vs. the current requirement to submit licensing annually.

Redwood Apartments: Staff clarified that the Redwood Apartments are excluded from this amendment due to unique conditions established at the time of their approval.

Emergency Response Times: Commissioners asked about emergency response times specific to the Redwood Apartments.

Scope of Reporting Requirements: Questions were raised about which businesses would be affected if the reporting requirements were revised as proposed by staff.

Equity and Market Impact: Concerns were raised about whether the amendment could unintentionally grant special privileges to certain existing facilities, potentially creating inequities in the market.

Comparative Facility Analysis: The Commissioners and staff discussed the locations of current facilities in relation to emergency services.

Zoning Context: Staff emphasized that schools, churches, and residential care facilities are all considered businesses operating within residential areas.

Tax Revenue Data: Staff indicated that income tax data was not available at the time of the meeting.

Overlay District Considerations: Commissioners questioned why certain facilities were excluded from the District 7 overlay and discussed the implications of the District 2 recommendation, which spans from the west to east sides of Hudson.

Cost Per Emergency Call: Understanding the average cost to the City per emergency response.

Laurel Lake's Impact: Laurel Lake accounts for 12% of HEMS (Hudson EMS) calls, prompting questions about its annual cost to the City.

Public Comment:

Mr. David Szeles, 5278 Darrow Road, expressed concern that the proposed amendment would limit what can be built on his property, negatively affecting its marketability. He also questioned the percentage of emergency calls from elderly residents that generate revenue and raised concerns about whether the proposed text amendment could be considered discriminatory.

Financial Impact of Senior Calls: Whether emergency calls from senior citizens result in a net gain or loss for the City.

The Commissioners' Final Thoughts:

Zoning Concerns: These types of facilities are businesses and may be more appropriate in commercial rather than residential districts.

Comparison to Danbury: Laurel Lake and Danbury operate under different business models, making direct comparisons difficult.

Cost Transparency: There's a need to fully understand the costs and expenses associated with these facilities.

Zoning Legitimacy: The City may have legitimate reasons to limit the number and placement of such facilities.

Proximity to Emergency Services: A proposed condition for facility approval could be that they must be located within one mile of emergency services.

Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Ms. Obert, that the Text Amendment be tabled to the September PC meeting in order for staff to respond to the Commissioner's comments. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

IX. Other Business

A. [PC 2025-905](#) Discussion and PC initiation for a Text Amendment request to Appendix A of the Land Development Code relating to submittal requirements.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Redline Changes](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application, which began in February 2025 and included 3 meetings of a subcommittee, with a result of a redline draft to the PC, and communication with other boards regarding submittal requirements. Mr. Sugar then stated that the Commissioners' recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council.

The Commissioners and staff discussed: The requirements for site staking for minor site plan applications, the change in item 16 from Hudson Engineering to City Staff, overall format changes, and adding a requirement for applicants to disclose contracts on a property.

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Obert, that this Staff Report be returned to staff for updates and brought back for Planning Commission consideration. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

B. [PC DISC 8.11.24](#) and Development Code Discussion

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
 [Housing Chart](#)

The Commissioners had a wide-ranging and detailed discussion about density concerns, especially in relation to senior living facilities and townhouses, and the potential for a moratorium on certain types of development applications, including:

Density, which was a common theme among the comments submitted, that there are no limitations on the number of units in a senior living facilities, that the density requirements currently do not apply to senior care facilities, how building codes are administered and the uncertainty of Hudson's ability to change the building standards set by Summit County.

The Commissioners discussed requesting a moratorium on applications that would come before Planning Commission, that a moratorium must be approved by City Council, that the Commissioners feel that by addressing discrepancies in the LDC - it will assist all citizens in the future, the length of a requested moratorium request was discussed as was the length of time before Council could set a moratorium, and how applicants might be affected by a moratorium.

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, to forward the list of recommendations regarding the LDC to City Council and request a 90-day moratorium. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

X. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar reviewed the applications for the September PC meeting.

Discussed

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Obert, that the meeting be adjourned at 8:46 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.

* * *