



# City of Hudson, Ohio

## Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

*David Nystrom, Chair*  
*Sarah Norman, Vice Chair*  
*Fred Innamarato*  
*Matt Romano*  
*Angela Smith*  
*Ronald Stolle*  
*Erik Vaughan*

---

Monday, January 13, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall  
27 East Main Street

---

### I. Industrial Design Subcommittee (6:45 PM)

Present:

**Architectural Historical Board of Review:**

Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley

**Planning Commission:**

Mr. Innamarato

A. [PC 2024-1339](#) [IDS](#) **The Industrial Design Subcommittee will review Case 24-1339 prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.**

**Attachments:** [Staff review memo](#)

[Elevations](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the agenda item by displaying and explaining the project, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Jeff Certo, DCS Architects, noted this is the next phase of the building and stated the landscaping is in accordance with the LDC.

The Subcommittee, applicant, and staff, discussed the landscaping plan, window fenestration, landscaping to soften the building, the proposed building materials and their compatibility with the existing building, rooftop screening, and the loop gravel drive for emergency access.

**Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to recommend approval with the following conditions: That on the north and west elevations, windows be added between every third bay and trees be added between the windows. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye: Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Mr. Innamarato**

### II. Call To Order

Chair Nystrom 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. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato, Ms. Smith and Stolle

**IV. Swearing In**

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

**V. Election of Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Industrial Design Subcommittee and Alternate)**

**Ms. Norman nominated Mr. Nystrom to the position of Chair, Mr. Nystrom declined.**

**Mr. Nystrom nominated Ms. Norman to the position of Chair, Mr. Innamorato seconded the motion. The nomination was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

**Abstain:** 1 - Mr. Stolle

**V. Election of Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Industrial Design Subcommittee and Alternate)**

**Mr. Stolle nominated Ms. Smith to the position of Vice Chair, Mr. Romano seconded the motion. The nomination was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

**Election of Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Industrial Design Subcommittee and Alternate)**

**Mr. Nystrom nominated Mr. Innamaroto to be the representative to the Industrial Design Subcommittee, Mr. Stolle seconded the motion. The nomination was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

**Election of Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Industrial Design Subcommittee and Alternate)**

**Mr. Stolle nominated Mr. Romano as the alternate to the Industrial Design Subcommittee, Mr. Innamarato seconded the motion. The nomination was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

**VI. Approval of Minutes****A. [PC 12-9-24](#) Minutes of Previous Planning Commission Meeting: December 9, 2024**

Attachments: [PC Meeting Minutes 12.9.24](#)

**A motion was made by Mr. Stolle, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the December 9, 2024, Minutes be approved as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

**Abstain:** 2 - Mr. Romano and Mr. Nystrom

## **VII. Public Discussion**

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comments on any topic not on the agenda. There were no Public Comments.

## **VIII. Correspondence**

Chair Norman requested the Commissioners and staff disclose any outside correspondence which was not included in the staff report.

Mr. Sugar noted two items received after the staff report was published. These have been printed and distributed to the Commissioners and will be updated online.

## **IX. Old Business (including continuation of public hearings)**

There was no Old Business.

## **X. New Business (including public hearings)**

### **A. [PC 2024-1339](#) A proposed Major Site Plan request for CEI USA to construct a 179,888 square foot building addition.**

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)  
[Site Plans](#)  
[Elevations](#)  
[Wetland Report](#)  
[Trip Generation Report](#)  
[Stormwater Report](#)  
[Engineering Dept. Review 1.6.25](#)  
[Construction Schedule](#)  
[Current Deed and Legal Description](#)  
[Engineer's Estimate](#)  
[Landscape Estimate](#)  
[Owner Affidavit](#)  
[PC 2018-3913 Record](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting this is a site plan review and is not a Public Hearing. He then described the request as an addition to the rear of the existing building, displayed an aerial view of the location of the building on the property, noted this building planned for phased additions over time, and reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Sugar then reviewed the recommendation by the Industrial Design Subcommittee to approve the application with two conditions: On the north and west sides a window be added between every third bay, and trees be planted between those windows.

Mr. Innamarato, representing the Industrial Design Subcommittee, noted there were no other comments from the Subcommittee.

Mr. Jeff Certo, architect, noted agreement with the Industrial Design Subcommittee recommendations and requested clarification regarding the setbacks and limits of disturbance stipulations.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff, discussed: The species of trees to be used, the missing numberings for the manholes on Plan Sheet C4.1, and that the product of the light industrial company involves no hazardous materials. Also discussed was: The staff analysis regarding LDC 1207.13.3 - ecological issues, that the applicant submitted a wetland delineation verifying the onsite wetlands would not be affected, that a concrete sidewalk connects the parking lot to the building, that the storm water management plan was developed during the first phase of the building, and that this is not a well-head protection area.

There were no Public Comments.

The Commissioners, staff, and applicant, discussed the 20-foot perimeter road which was accepted by the Fire Marshal.

The Commissioners reviewed the staff recommendation.

**Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stolle, based on the evidence and representations to the Commission on January 13, 2025, that the Planning Commission approve the Major Site Plan Request for a building addition, in Case 24-1339 for CEIA USA, 6336 Hudson Crossing Parkway (Parcel #3010245) according to plans received December 18, 2024 as the Planning Commission finds the application is in compliance with the Zoning District Standards of 1205.09 and the Site Standards of 1207.18.**

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

- 1. Revise the proposed limits of disturbance to be outside of the 100 ft wetland setback in the area depicted in Figure 1 of the attached staff report dated January 8, 2025.**
- 2. Revise the landscaping plan to depict a row of staggered evergreen trees on a mounded surface, each a minimum of 6 ft in height as depicted in Figure 3 of the attached staff report dated January 8, 2025.**
- 3. The exterior lighting plan shall be revised to meet the following requirements:**
  - a) Full cutoff, cutoff, or semi-cutoff light fixtures shall direct light toward the ground. The light source shall not be visible from the property line.**
  - b) Light fixtures shall be mounted on concrete or painted metal poles no higher than forty-five feet.**
- 4. The Planning Commission accepts the following recommendation of the Industrial Design Subcommittee.**
  - a) The elevations shall be revised to depict a window every third bay along the north and west building elevations. Trees shall be depicted between each window to help break up the overall mass.**
- 5. The comments of Assistant City Engineer David Rapp review shall be addressed per the attached January 6, 2025 correspondence.**
- 6. 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.**
- 7. 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.**

**8. Plan sheet C4.1 shall be revised to include rim elevations and numbering for the storm and sanitary manholes.**

**The motion was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Stolle, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

- B. [PC 2022-822](#) [HCL FENCE](#) A request for a modification to the previously approved Planning Commission case for Hudson Community Living, Case No. 2022-822 approved December 12, 2022, to consider revising the proposed perimeter fence material from wood to vinyl.**

**Attachments:**     [Staff Report](#)  
[Letter from applicant](#)  
[Proposed fence information](#)  
[Product samples](#)  
[Approved Site-Landscaping Plan](#)  
[Public Comments](#)  
[Site Photos 1.8.25](#)  
[PC Signed Decision 22-822 Decision](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting this is a previously approved application and that the applicant is now requesting a modification of the fence materials from wood to vinyl and displayed samples of the proposed material.

Mr. George Roth, Augere Construction, described the proposed vinyl fence design and material, and noted the conversations he had with surrounding property owners.

Mr. Joe Matava, Peninsula Architects, further described the fence design and materials, noted the landscaping that would be installed for the site in relation to the fence. Mr. Matava then distributed the landscaping plan to the board.

Mr. Sam Maj, Augere Construction, noted the proposed fencing would cost between \$60,000 and \$70,000, as compared to \$40,000 for a wood fence and stated that it would be safer for the residents.

The Commissioners, applicant, and staff, noted the siding on the villas is Hardi-Plank with Azek trim, the applicant's preference to the proposed material vs. wood, and the visibility of the fence in relation to the adjacent historic district.

Mr. Majeed Makhlof, legal council for the applicant, stated the applicant's intent of the project from the beginning was to have vinyl fence and he believes aside from color, the proposed fence resembles a wood fence.

Mr. Roth stated wood fencing will deteriorate quicker than vinyl and the vinyl will be safer.

Mr. Makhlof, stated any product will deteriorate, that this facility will maintain the fence, vinyl would have cost savings over time, and that a wood fence could be painted white.

The Commissioners discussed the AHBR guidelines regarding permitted fences types, that the fence will be six-feet high, and that letters of concern were submitted from other neighbors.

The Commissioners and staff discussed: Appendix D, and the need to satisfy the zoning requirements prior review of the AHBR, that the fence and development must be compatible to the adjacent neighborhood, that the 2022 submittal noted a wood fence, and that PC has the final authority regarding opaque screening.

The applicant submitted a sample of the proposed vinyl fence product which was passed to all PC members for their inspection.

Staff could not recall instances of approval for a wood fence being changed to vinyl in or near the historic district

The Commissioners and applicant discussed: The current state of project funding, that the property owner is proposing a more expensive solution with this upgrade, that the applicant does not know of examples of vinyl fences adjacent to the Historic District, and how the Historic District homes will be impacted by allowing a vinyl fence in this area.

Chair Norman opened the meeting for Public Comment.

Mr. John Wortendyke, 25 Edward Drive, noted some plastic fences around town do look bad, however, those are not installed correctly. Mr. Wortendyke also stated he is in favor of the proposed fence being installed.

Seeing no one else wishing to make Public Comment, Chair Norman closed Public Comments.

The Commissioners questioned why the vinyl fence was not proposed originally. Mr. Mahklouf stated it was an error that the fence type was not specified in the original plan,

Mr. Maj and Mr. Matava described the timeline of the proposed fencing through the approval process and how it was depicted and noted on the submitted site plans.

The Commission and staff discussed the rezoning of properties in order to support this project and had a vinyl fence been proposed originally - the Commission would not support.

Mr. Mahklouf thanked the Commission for its consideration of this request and support throughout the project, and noted that the fence was not considered because of the very large scope of this project. Mr Mahklouf also stated his belief that it would have a minimum impact on the neighborhood and community.

The Commissioners comments included: That it is understandable when considering the total scope of the project that the type of fence was not a discussion item, that 1400 feet of fencing is significant and that vinyl is not compatible adjacent to the Historic District and Barlow Community Center, that if the fence would have been designated as vinyl in the beginning it would not have been supported, that the arguments presented are not compatible with the LDC, that the fence does not resemble wood, that public correspondence was submitted in opposition to the vinyl fence, that those involved in creating this project were familiar with the rules of building in Hudson, that the Historic District deserves a compatible fence.

**Mr. Nystrom made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith, based on the evidence and representations to the Commissioners on January 13, 2025, that the Planning Commission DENY the request to modify the previous Planning Commission Major Site Plan and Conditional Use Case 22-822 for Hudson Community Living, Parcel #3204196 according to plans received December 16, 2024.**

**The motion to DENY was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

**Nay:** 1 - Mr. Stolle

**XI. Other Business**

- A. [COUNCIL CHECK-IN JAN 2025](#) The Planning Commission will finalize the memo to Council for the January 28, 2025 Check-In.

Attachments:     [Draft Memo to Council](#)

Mr. Sugar noted PC will Present at the Council Check-In on January 28, 2025.

Ms. Smith and Ms. Norman agreed to jointly represent PC at the Council Check-In.

Mr. Stolle announced his resignation from PC effective January 14, 2025. Mr. Stolle read a statement reflecting on his time with the Planning Commission. The Commissioners expressed their gratitude to Mr. Stolle for his years of service.

**XII. Staff Update**

Chair Norman requested PC meet in February even if there are no applications. The purpose of the meeting will be to consider revisions to Appendix A - submittal requirements. It was also requested that the Commissioners review Appendix A, and submit their recommendations to staff by January 31st.

**XIII. Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Mr. Stolle, seconded by Mr. Innamorato, that the meeting be adjourned at 9:38 P.M. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ms. Norman, Mr. Romano, Mr. Nystrom, Mr. Innamorato and Ms. Smith

\_\_\_\_\_  
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.*

\*       \*       \*