



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Ronald Stolle, Chair
David Nystrom, Vice Chair
Andrew Furbee
Melissa Jones
Sarah Norman
Matt Romano
Erik Vaughan

Greg Hannan, Community Development Director
Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
John Kolesar, City Solicitor

Monday, November 13, 2023

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Industrial Design Subcommittee (6:45 p.m.)

A. [PC 2023-557 IDS](#) The Industrial Design Subcommittee will meet prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to review case 23-557.

Attachments: [Design Packet](#)

Ms. Jones called to order a meeting of the Industrial Design Subcommittee

Representatives from the Architectural and Historic Board of Review: Ms. Allyn Marzulla, Mr. John Workley
Representative from the Planning Commission: Ms. Lisa Jones

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by: Describing the first phase of a three-phase plan on Georgetown Road, displaying photos of the proposed site, reviewing the design standards, and reviewing the staff and applicant's comments.

Mr. John Elsey, architect, GBC Design, and Mr. Aaron Stainbrook, UHC Construction: Noted the connection between the two buildings will be eliminated from the proposal, displayed photos to show the effect of part of the first floor being below grade, noted the facility will be used to store both cars and business equipment, explained the building was lowered from previous plans, and described the matching elements of the proposed building.

The Subcommittee, applicant and staff discussed: The 5,000 square foot design of each of the three phases, the proposed roof heights in relation to the existing building roof height, that each of the three phases can stand alone, the proposed building in relation to the neighboring building at the end of the cul-de-sac, alternate renderings using siding instead of brick on the building sides, the use of a reverse gables on the public facing side of the buildings, making the reverse gables smaller and to align with the windows, the Board's preference for brick as opposed to other sidings, the approximate 300 plus foot setback from Georgetown Road to the back of the existing building, that the proposed building aligns with the west side of the existing building, the possibility of using transom windows as a trim detail, Mr. Elsey showed the Subcommittee samples of the proposed brick, Hardie Board and shingle style, whether brick or Hardie Board may be used on a side or sides of the building, and that the Design Standards require a consistent look around the structure.

Mr. Workley made a recommendation, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to the Planning Commission

with the following conditions: 1) To incorporate transom type windows and a banding element under the soffit. 2) That three sides below the windows be brick. 3) That the south, east, and west sides of the structure be brick. 4) The size of the windows may be as proposed or smaller. 5) To introduce a gable on the west side of approximate 20-foot width. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: Mr. Workley; Ms. Marzulla; Ms. Jones

II. Call To Order

Chair Stolle 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.

III. Roll Call

Present: 6 - Ms. Jones, Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Romano

Absent: 1 - Mr. Furbee

IV. Swearing In

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

V. Correspondence

There was no correspondence to the Commissioners or staff.

VI. Public Discussion

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Discussion for any item not on the agenda. There was no Public Discussion.

VII. Approval of Minutes

A. [PC 10-9-23](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: October 9, 2023

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes October 9, 2023](#)

A vote on the previous meeting minutes was deferred to the December PC meeting.

VIII. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

IX. Public Hearings

A. [PC 2023-874](#) A Conditional Use request to convert an existing building to a bank with drive through facilities at 69 W. Streetsboro Street, parcel 3204020

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Use compliance letter](#)
[Elevations and floorplans](#)
[Trip generation and stacking analysis](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Engineering Review](#)
[Project Timeline](#)
[Owner Affidavit](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the staff report by displaying and explaining the property and project, reviewing the history of the property, noting that in this district, banks with an ATM are a conditional use, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Ms. Kristy Rothman, Hellyer Lewis Smith Architecture, and Mr. Paul Gagel, Citizens Bank, described the project, noted the traditional ATM will be replaced by an ITM, (Interactive).

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: The exterior lighting, traffic flow in and out of the lot, the Commissioners' desire for a traffic study, staff noted the Hudson City Engineer's comment that the existing traffic light will be helpful in controlling traffic, and that the lights are being changed to align with Citizens Bank branding. Also discussed: The possibility of transitioning one of the lanes for another purpose, that more information is needed regarding snow removal, that the outside ITM is serviced by a vendor with cash being delivered once per week to the location, that some equipment on the existing island will be repurposed for bank use, that a variance was previously granted for the parking location, that no LDC guidance exists for off street loading for a building under 10,000 square feet, that the island causes difficulty when driving in the lot, that Citizens Bank has signed a lease of seven years with options for renewal, that the Citizens Bank inside Acme will be incorporated into the proposed location, that occupancy is anticipated in July 2024, and that a walkup screen will be available in the vestibule of the bank.

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Comments. Seeing no one come forward, Public Comments were closed.

The Commission, applicant and staff reviewed the recommendation in the staff report.

The Planning Commission continued the request and requested the applicant further study the application relating to the anticipated traffic and present documentation at the December meeting.

Mr. Hannan informed the applicant that additional information must be provided to staff by November 27, 2023.

The application was continued to the December PC meeting.

- B. [PC 2023-557 Resub](#) A Conditional Use and Site Plan request for a three-phase addition to the existing building at 1931 Georgetown Road. The use would include self-storage of vehicles and automotive repair services.**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Use compliance letter](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Landscaping Plan and Tree Survey](#)
[Elevations and floorplans](#)
[Trip generation analysis](#)
[Wetland Determination](#)
[Engineering review](#)
[Applicant Response to Engineering Comments](#)
[Fire Department review and response](#)
[Storm Water Management Report](#)
[Owner Affidavit](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing the property and project, the purposes of the building and the staff determinations and recommendations. Mr. Sugar also noted there are other buildings along Georgetown Road with similar uses, that sidewalks or payment in-leu will be required, and that the residential nearness requirements do not apply.

Ms. Jones, Industrial Design Subcommittee Chair, described the Subcommittees approval and conditions .

Mr. John Elsey, GBC Design, noted the proposed building is for the owner's personal and business purposes including vehicles owned by a network of auto enthusiasts, described the building and surrounding properties, explained that the connector between the buildings has been eliminated which is how the Subcommittee granted approval, and that all the studies have been done based on building the three phases .

Chair Stolle noted that only the first phase is being considered at this meeting.

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: The money-in-leu program for sidewalks, the video submission requested by Hudson Engineering, the reason for clearing and grading for all three phases when only phase one will be built at this time, the normal business hours, the activities which are outside and in public view, and how oil and similar substances will be disposed. Further discussion involved: There will be no clearing after phase one, that the proposed lighting matches the existing lighting, the requirement for a storm water plan following the conditional approval, that there are no wetlands - therefore no bat study is required, the snow clearing plan, that the leasable space is 10,200 square feet, items missing from the application on submittal to the Commissioners, the LDC prohibition against car sales in this district, the ecological classifications on the property, that street trees are not required because it is an existing building, the fluidity of changing between the terms "warehousing and auto dealer" in the staff report, and the parking lot spaces required .

The Commissioners and applicant discussed that no sign plan was submitted because no new signs are proposed, that eight internal bays are planned for the phase one building and the next two phases will be similar, the noise level produced by the vehicles, that the event center received notice of the PC hearing, that the hours of business may be restricted by PC, the Fire Marshal's report, the potential for elevators which will stack cars, the applicant's agreement with the staff recommendations, that an island in the parking lot is not required if just phase one is built, and that the cost associated with the Industrial Design Subcommittee's recommendations are a consideration.

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Comments. Seeing no one come forward, Public Comments were closed.

Mr. Aaron Stainbrook, UHC Construction Services, spoke regarding the noise level at the proposed building .

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed the timeline of building the three phases, the additional costs of building the three phases, and the metrics to determine if the building is going well.

The Commissioners commented on the services permitted by right in District 8 and possible unintended consequences of the LDC regulations, that cars may not be sold on the property, that the site plan does not show what is to be done for phase one, that only the Conditional Use be approved, a review of the staff recommended conditions and discussion regarding what constitutes car sales on the property .

Mr. Stainbrook, asked if the proposed building(s) were moved so as not to be visible from the street, could Hardi Board be used. The Commissioners responded that because the public will be on the property, the three sides must be bricked.

The Planning Commission continued the request and requested the applicant to revise the submitted documents to reflect the first phase of development. The applicant was also requested to provide additional documentation regarding anticipated vehicle sales.

Staff noted revised submittals will be due on November 27, 2023.

The Commission decided to continue this application to the December PC meeting so long as new submittals are received by November 27, 2023.

This application was continued to the December PC meeting.

C. [PC 2023-893](#) **A Preliminary Subdivision request for Pine Ridge, a 13-lot, single-family subdivision. The proposal would re-plat the undeveloped existing subdivision, The Reserve at River Oaks Phase 1A**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Site Plans](#)
[Planting Plan and Tree Survey](#)
[Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination and Wetland Delineation](#)
[Traffic Analysis](#)
[Geotechnical Report](#)
[Engineering Department Review](#)
[Owner Affidavits](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application for a Preliminary Subdivision Plan, noted the revisions in the plans from the previous submittal, and reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Chris Brown, Prestige Homes, requested the previous plat be vacated in lieu of the new plat .

The Commission, applicant and staff discussed: Appreciation for the quality of the submission, that a chemical process not be used to dry the surrounding land, that the site will have a net import of soil, that basement spoils will not be used to reach grade, that two stand-alone lots were excluded from the subdivision to help with the approval process, the purpose of subplot 6 being so large, the ownership of the marked wetlands and that they might be open space, that stormwater ponds will be maintained by the homeowner's association, the reason the stormwater pond near Streetsboro Road is divided into two ponds, that the open space will be for the residents, that the Army Corps will reevaluate the wetlands every five-years, that compliance with the Open Space Conservation should be reviewed by the Park Board and submitted with the final review, that the lots have been

made smaller and the home plans will be approximately 2800 to 3200 square feet, Mr. Brown stated he would like to review staff recommendations regarding the limits of disturbance and the front pond, and he has no other objections to the staff recommendations.

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Comments.

Ms. Alina Petrenko, 522 W. Streetsboro Street, stated her objections to the project on the basis of the wildlife.

Ms. Laurie Main, 489 W. Streetsboro Street, stated her concern regarding saving the pine trees having bright lights along the driveway, that the greenery around the pond be preserved, that fencing not be allowed, and inquired about the size of the wetland's conservation easement.

Mr. Brown responded to the Public Comments: Mature trees will be placed around the property, that he would like discussions regarding enlarging the pond, that the homeowners covenant will allow certain types of fence but not chain link fencing, and that there will be approximately 57 acres of open space which is 70 percent of the land.

Seeing no one else coming forward, Chair Stolle closed Public Discussion.

The Commissioners, staff and applicant discussed: Fencing allowed per the Land Development Code verses fencing regulated by HOAs, that the requirement for homeowners to plant trees will be embedded in the LDC, and that the property is staked.

The Commissioners discussed: The nine recommendations in the staff report and recommendation number three's use of the word 'feasible'.

Mr. Vaughn made a motion, seconded by Mr. Romano, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission and the plans received September 8, 2023, that the Planning Commission finds the application is in compliance with the Preliminary Subdivision standards of Section 1204.05(b), the Open Space Conservation Subdivision standards of Section 1207.06, and the Conditional Use standards of Section 1206.02.

The Planning Commission decision shall be subject to the following conditions:

- 1. A declaration of covenants and restrictions that will govern the association shall be submitted for review by the City Solicitor.**
- 2. Revise the limits of disturbance at the front of the property along the proposed street entrance to protect the significant, mature pine trees.**
- 3. The City Arborist shall review the submittals for each individual house lot and make recommendations for protecting significant trees.**
- 4. Verify the proposed ponds will be stormwater wet basins and revise the landscaping plan to depict native plantings to permit disturbance within a wetland setback as stipulated in Section 1207.03.**
- 5. Revise the location of the pond closest to W. 303 so as not to be located within the required 100 ft landscaping setback. Revise the landscaping plan for the 100 ft setback area to include the following requirements from Section 1207.04.**
 - Plantings for every 100 feet of bufferyard length: four small trees and two large or medium trees from the Tree Plant List in Appendix C.**
 - Trees shall be planted in a random pattern, interspersing sizes of trees large, medium, and small.**
 - Only the native plant species for each of these categories of trees as set forth in Appendix C shall be utilized.**

- Revise the design of the sublots along W. 303 to depict one lot to meet the wetland bufferyard requirements of Section 1207.03
- 6. Revise the landscaping plan to align with the City Arborist’s recommendations for street tree plantings as depicted in Figure 5 of this staff report.
- 7. Incorporate additional amenities including a loop crushed limestone path around the large stormwater basin and an open land gathering space adjacent to the mail kiosks. The plan shall also be presented to the Park Board for comment on public open space prior to the submittal of a Final Subdivision application.
- 8. Submit an exterior lighting plan in compliance with Section 1207.14.
- 9. The comments of Assistant City Engineer David Rapp shall be addressed per the November 7, 2023 correspondence.

Aye: 6 - Ms. Jones, Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Romano

X. Other Business

- A. [PC ADMIN](#) Updates to the Planning Commission’s Administrative Rules - Conflict of Interest Second Reading
[REVIEW FALL](#)
[2023 FIN](#)

Attachments: [Staff Memorandum](#)
 [Admin Rules Draft](#)

The Commissioners discussed if ORC Section 102 gives adequate guidance regarding conflict of interest or if 102.03 should be cited.

Following a second reading of the administrative rules they were approved by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Jones, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Romano
Nay: 1 - Ms. Norman

- B. [PC 2024 Sched](#) 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Attachments: [PC Schedule 2024 \(DRAFT\)](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Norman, seconded by Ms. Jones, that the 2024 Commission Meeting Schedule be approval as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ms. Jones, Ms. Norman, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Romano

XI. Staff Update

Chair Stolle noted: 1) Because of a lack of quorum at the Comprehensive Plan meeting, no proposed plan was presented to City Council. 2) A community workshop will be held in January or February regarding the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff noted: 1) There are applications for the December meeting. 2) The golf cart storage barn at Hudson Country Club appeal was upheld at the BZBA meeting with additional setbacks.

XII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Ms. Jones, that this be adjourned. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

Ronald H. Stolle, 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.

* * *