



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, August 28, 2023

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. 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.

II. Roll Call

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

Absent: 1 - Mr. Nystrom

III. Swearing In

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

IV. Correspondence

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for the Commissioners or staff to make note of correspondence received.

Ms. Norman noted a call from a resident regarding parking for Ohio Turnpike construction and requested Mr. Sugar add this as a future discussion item in light of LDC Section 1203.09 (g) (3), the ability of PC members to review applications for minor developments.

V. Public Discussion

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Comments for any item not on the agenda. There were no Public Comments.

VI. Approval of Minutes

- A. [PC 8-14-23](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: August 14, 2023

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes August 14, 2023](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Vaughan, seconded by Mr. Romano, that the August 14, 2023 minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain: 1 - Mr. Furbee

VII. Old Business

Ms. Jones received a reply from the Ohio Ethics Commission and stated she will recuse herself from the Canterbury Crossing application.

Ms. Jones also recused herself from PC 2023-556, A Conditional Use and Site Plan request for a golf cart storage barn at The Country Club of Hudson. The reason for the recusal is that a neighboring homeowner's legal representation is a partner of Ms. Jones at Frantz Ward, LLP.

Ms. Norman informed the Commission that a conflict of interest may exist regarding PC 2023-556, because Mr. and Ms. Norman are members of The Country Club of Hudson, with Mr. Norman as the voting member of the club. Ms. Norman requested guidance from the Commissioners regarding her participation in the meeting. Ms. Norman ultimately made the decision to recuse herself from the meeting.

VIII. Public Hearings

A. [PC 2023-556](#) A conditional use and site plan request of a golf cart storage barn at the Country Club of Hudson

Attachments: [Staff Report 2023-556](#)
[Statement of Compliance](#)
[Site Plans/Elevations](#)
[Engineering Department Review](#)
[Fire Department Review](#)
[Electric Department Review](#)
[Lighting Specifications](#)
[Landscape Estimate](#)
[Environmental Principles for Golf Courses in the United States](#)
[Public Comments](#)
[Ownership Consent](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by providing the background of the project, displaying the location, noting the proposed stormwater pond, and providing a synopsis of the staff report. Mr. Sugar also noted if PC approves the application that the project will go to the AHBR.

Chair Stolle noted correspondence received by the Commissioners regarding the application.

Mr. Mark Rose, Hudson Country Club General Manager; Mr. Joe Matava, Peninsula Architects; Ms. Laurie Hass, The Country Club of Hudson legal counsel; Mr. Brandon Rouhier, Rockaway Civil; and Mr. Craig Kachline, Hudson Country Club, were present for the meeting.

Mr. Rose noted: The country club's existing storage area is open with a gas tank and sixty golf carts. The proposed plan is to purchase electric carts which need an indoor facility. This will reduce noise and allow the gas tank to be removed. Mr. Rose also noted the longstanding problem of not having a cart facility, the antiquated gas golf carts, the facility which will be used from about 7 a.m. to 9 p.m., that the three doors will only be used to pull the carts out in the morning, that the proposed facility will move morning activity approximately thirty-feet further away from the neighboring house, and that the cart wash area will be moved from outside to inside further reducing the noise level. The landscape buffer was noted by Mr. Rose as substantial, and he expressed his willingness to accommodate the neighbors.

The Commissioners, staff and applicant discussed: The garage doors not facing the golf course is due to topographic issues and the current use of the area by the golf course, the hours of operation possibly necessitating lighting - which will be minimal, mainly for security purposes and oriented away from the neighbors, that the barn is designed for storage of 60 carts, that the current storage area is outside and paved and the pavement will be extended to the proposed barn area, that the only maintenance in the barn area will be washing the carts, and the expected main golf use is April through November.

Mr. Matava discussed the determination of the overall height of the building is not affected by the height of the cupola, that the structure was moved 8 to 10 feet back from the required setback in order to avoid harming any of the existing trees, that the existing neighbors fence will not be affected by the proposed building, the estimated cost at approximately \$650,000, that the cart barn will tie into the existing water and sewer system, and that no restroom or office facilities will be in the structure.

Chair Stolle opened the meeting for Public Testimony.

Mr. Mark Stockman, attorney representing Mr. and Ms. Emery, 2199 Middleton Road, distributed handouts of the LDC and noted two areas the proposed structure does not meet the LDC: 1) That the cart barn is an accessory use to the primary use of the property as a golf course and that only four accessory structures are permitted, with this being the tenth accessory structure. 2) Conditional Uses must meet all the requirements of table 1206.01. Mr. Stockman also noted his clients will have this building as the predominant view from the rear of the property with a great deal of activity beginning early in the morning. Mr. Stockman also detailed the difference between accessory use structures and primary use buildings and the necessity of PC determining which of these is being proposed, and the LDC that requires when the Code is unclear - the more stringent code must be applied. Mr. Stockman also noted the proposed cart barn must meet the requirements of 1206 as both a golf cart structure and a vehicular building operated as a commercial business, and the LDC requiring a vehicular building being 500-feet away from a property line. Mr. Stockman also detailed how 1201.03 affects this proposed structure especially when adjacent to residential structures.

Ms. Marlene Emery, 2199 Middleton Road, stated she has lived at this property for over 50 years and objects to the cart barn being placed next to their property and that PC must deny the request based on Mr. Stockman's comments. Ms. Emery also noted the cart barn will not benefit their property, and that she objects to the large building in her backyard. Ms. Emery distributed documents to the Commissioners showing: Previous City of Hudson requirements that have not been complied with, and that buildings were constructed without permits and of poor quality. Ms. Emery also detailed a June 11, 1980, pro shop application with conditions that have not been complied with and that the applicant exceeded what was permitted by BZBA. Ms. Emery also noted and displayed letters to The Country Club of Hudson regarding the ball washing machine which produces loud noise and disrupts the use of their property. Ms. Emery described the delivery of golf carts via large lift truck which sometimes occurs early in the morning, the buffer zone belongs to the Emerys, the increased noise if a larger facility is build, that electric golf carts will not be silent, that the delivery of golf carts will be loud, that the applicant is building a road behind the Emery's property, and that additional deliveries will not be monitored. Ms. Emery also displayed a rendering of the proposed building behind her property and disputed the claim that her property will not be adversely affected. In summary Ms. Emery stated the cart barn needs to be 500-feet away from any residential property in order to preserve the green space and enjoyment of her property and ensure that stormwater does not affect neighboring properties.

Mr. Chris Beegle, 2217 Middleton Road, expressed his hope that the Commission will follow the law and not allow this structure as proposed. He also noted he works at a golf course and the testimony that the carts will be moved out once per day is not his experience.

Ms. Amy Rayer, 7590 Wake Robin Drive, noted her sight of the golf course will be affected by the proposed building and that a storm water basin and associated parts will be installed near her property and affect the value of their house. Ms. Rayer also noted the country club does not aid the residents in maintaining the creek. Ms. Rayer also made requests for how the stormwater creek is protected and that all structures are 50-feet from the riparian setback.

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

The Commissioners, applicant and staff discussed: 1) The stormwater management basin location. 2) If the three doors can face the opposite direction. 3) Whether the proposed building is a primary or accessory use. 4) Whether or not the doors of the facility will remain closed throughout the day. 5) The rendering provided by Ms. Emery of the view from her backyard and Mr. Rose's comment that the additional landscaping provided by Hudson County Club will soften the image. 6) That \$35,000 may not be sufficient to buffer the view and that the rendering may or may not give an accurate display of what will be seen in perspective. 7) That other placements of the proposed structure may be better and have not been explored. 8) That the storm water issues, and fire department access requirements will need to be addressed. 9) Which side of the building most of the activity would take place.

Ms. Laurie Hass, HCC attorney, stated the ball washer will be moved to the opposite side of the property. Mr. Rose noted he has been manager since 2018 and was unaware of the neighbor's concerns. Mr. Sugar detailed why the staff review determined this a principal structure and noted PC has the authority to impose additional conditions.

Chair Stolle noted the role of the Commission is to interpret the LDC and his belief that since golf courses are permitted in the City and that since golf carts are part of a golf club, the proposed structure is a primary use.

Ms. Haas stated she believes this is a principal use because it is part of a golf club, that maintenance will not be done in the building, that the south side garage doors will be used in the morning and not in the afternoon, and that the club believes the electric golf carts would be an improvement for the neighbors. Ms. Haas also expressed that the past behavior of the club is not necessarily indicative of future behavior and stated she would like to receive the information provided by Ms. Emery.

The Commissioners discussed: 1) The neighbor's comments that they do not feel this is an improvement because of aesthetics and noise. 2) The possibility of relocating the proposed structure. 3) That the following conditions be considered: a) The three doors be relocated to the north side of the building. b) That the City of Hudson Solicitor making a determination regarding if this is a principal or accessory use. c) That the storm water management pond be relocated. d) That the lighting is in compliance with the LDC. e) That a compliant buffer be made. f) That the applicant has agreed to comply with the City Engineer's and Fire Marshal's recommendations. g) That the applicant is prepared to go before the AHBR for approval. h) That compliance with all conditions be met prior to any preconstruction meetings taking place. i) That the ball washing machine be moved as a condition. j) That landscape screening be required around the stormwater pond. k) The possibility of moving the ball washer inside.

The Commissioners decided to hear from the City Solicitor regarding the use type, and that the doors will need to be changed prior to approval if this is a primary use.

Mr. Romano made a motion, seconded by Mr. Vaughn, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission according to plans received July 17, 2023, the Planning

Commission finds the application is in compliance with the general conditional use standards of Section 1206.02(b) and the Special Conditions and Standards 1206.02(c)(1),(3),(5),(7) & (21) applicable to golf courses, private.

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

1. A determination shall be provided by the City Solicitor regarding the proposed building to be regulated as a “principal” structure. If the determination is made that the building is to be regulated as “principal” structure, the application may proceed to the issuance of a zoning certificate.
2. The orientation of the garage doors shall be revised so that they do not face the south. All hard surface shall be removed from the south side of the building so only plantings are located between the building and the property line to the south.
3. The proposed stormwater management basin shall be relocated to comply with the 50 ft setback to protect the riparian corridor and to minimize disturbance near the adjacent residential properties. Additional landscaping shall be provided to shield the basin from the properties to the east.
4. Lighting – The proposed lighting plan shall be revised per the following per Section 1207.14:
 - Lighting shall be reduced, activated by motion sensors devices, or turned off during non-operating hours to be compliant with Section 1207.14(d)(5).
 - Reduce lighting levels along the southeast corner of the building where two adjacent exterior lights are proposed, creating average footcandles greater than 5.0. Utilize one light fixture or a less intensive fixture.
 - Verify lighting levels would not exceed .1 footcandles at the property line per Section 1207.14(c)(3).
5. Landscaping:
 - No trees shall be removed along the adjacent property boundary to the south.
 - Revise the landscaping plan to include a minimum of eight Evergreens per 100 lineal feet, installed at a minimum height of 6 ft.
 - Revise the landscaping plan to extend the bufferyard to include the entirety of the proposed limits of disturbance along the southern property line.
6. The comments of Assistant City Engineer David Rapp shall be addressed per the August 22, 2023 correspondence.
7. The comments of Fire Marshal Shawn Kasson shall be addressed per the August 15, 2023 correspondence.
8. The design of the building shall be approved by the Architectural and Historic Board of Review
9. The ball washing equipment shall be located inside the proposed building.
10. The applicant shall install silt fencing and/or polypropylene fencing to mark and protect the approved clearing limits, which shall be maintained by the applicant.
11. Satisfaction of the above conditions prior to scheduling of a preconstruction meeting with City Officials and no clearing or construction of any kind shall commence prior to the issuance of a Zoning Certificate.

Aye: 4 - Mr. Stolle, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Furbee and Mr. Romano

Recused: 2 - Ms. Jones and Ms. Norman

IX. Other Business

X. Staff Update

Mr. Hannan and the Commissioners discussed an October 2, 2023, meeting regarding LDC updates if one of the proposed consultants is available. The Commissioners and staff discussed how the LDC updates and Comprehensive Plan update might be coordinated.

XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Furbee, seconded by Mr. Vaughan, 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.

* * *