

CITY OF HUDSON
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2011
7:30 P.M., TOWN HALL

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Mrs. Barone, called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Hudson at 7:30 p.m. in Town Hall, 27 East Main Street, Hudson, Ohio.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hanink, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan, Mr. O'Keefe,
Mrs. Barone
Absent: None

Officials Present: Thomas E. King, Director, Mark Richardson, City Planner, R. Todd Hunt, Assistant City Solicitor

Minutes were taken by Ms. La Lomia, Planning Commission clerk.

OATH OF TRUTHFULNESS

Mrs. Barone, the Chair, placed everyone under oath who would be giving any testimony during the meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mrs. Barone submitted a letter from Christopher Bednar, P. E., Osborn Engineering, dated February 9, 2011 with regard to the High School matter, and a memorandum from Thomas Sheridan, City Engineer, also with regard to the High School case, and they are attached to the minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

CASE NO. 2010-015, SETON CATHOLIC SCHOOL TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Mr. Richardson said last August the Commission approved additional classrooms at Seton Catholic School and the traffic impact study was a condition of that approval. He reviewed the staff report and said all the material had been reviewed and staff agreed with the finding of the study.

Mike Ritenour, Secretary and Fiscal Chair for Seton Catholic School, hoped the Commission would accept their traffic study.

Mr. Drew asked whether there were other items that needed to be completed. Mr. Richardson replied landscaping was still an open item. He said there was an active

bond in place that would ensure the applicant installs the planting or the City would go against the bond.

Mr. Kagler asked whether the traffic consultant was present. Mr. Ritenour replied no.

Mr. Kagler agreed with the recommendation but questioned whether the school would have to do something if the enrollment exceeded 450 students. He questioned whether there was language that could be added to a decision on this matter which would provide the school more predictability. Mr. King asked whether he would suggest the number of students be increased. Mr. Kagler said if the school was close to the maximum now, a higher number could be assigned rather than 450. Mr. King thought the school was looking for closure without more expense from a consultant or the City and he suggested 480 students. Mr. Ritenour said 450 students was what the school believed their maximum enrollment would be with this amount of square footage. He said he did not ask the traffic consultant what the maximum enrollment could be without an impact on Stow Road. He thought maybe the school should spend some money to see what that maximum number would be. Mr. Kagler said maybe with a recommendation from the consultant and agreement of the City Engineer it could be a higher number. Mr. King said any number would only be valid for a period of five years.

Mr. O'Keefe asked what kind of assurance was in place to measure enrollment to be sure it had not increased over that 450 number. Mr. King said staff would check with the applicant and have public sources available.

Mr. Hanink agreed with Mr. Kagler to use whatever language that would give the applicant closure now.

Mr. Cox said agreeing now would make it more economical for the applicant.

Mrs. Barone asked the current growth rate. Mr. Ritenour replied it was a larger number before the last two years. He said the school felt 450 was their maximum for space and they would need to have a major capital improvement to move beyond the 450.

Mr. Mulligan asked what was the school's threshold with regard to directing traffic. Mr. Ritenour said based on the traffic study they did not need to have anyone directing traffic. He said internally they have not had any accidents and the school felt good about their procedures for dismissal so they did not have a plan to put a person out there.

Mr. Kagler moved to accept the information and conclusions of the Traffic Impact Study dated November 16, 2010 and Mr. Michael Schweickart's letter dated January 4, 2010, and finds that no traffic control measures are needed at Seton Catholic School at this time. This finding is made with the condition that if enrollment exceeds 450 students, or if improvements to the school campus are proposed that could increase enrollment to more than 450 students, then the school shall be responsible for providing a traffic impact study for the roads and signals adjacent to the school. The number of students may exceed 450 for a fixed period of time not to exceed five (5) years, as proposed by

the applicant based on its traffic consultant recommendation and reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and staff. Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hanink, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan,
Mr. O'Keefe, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion unanimously carried.

CASE NO. 2011-07, ZONING CERTIFICATE FOR BUILDING ALTERATION FOR JOANN STORES, 5555 DARROW ROAD

Mr. Richardson reviewed the staff report. He said it was a simple door and window replacement project along with a sidewalk replacement with a smaller pad near the door. He explained all projects in District 8 needed to be approved by the Commission.

Debbie Mansfield, Director of Energy and Facilities, JoAnn Stores, 5555 Darrow Road, Hudson was present for the applicant.

Mr. Drew asked whether the Commission was acting as the Architectural and Historic Board of Review ("AHBR"). Mr. Hunt replied that was correct. Mr. Drew referred to Section 1207.18(h) of the Code and asked whether this remodeling would meet the Code requirements. Mr. Richardson responded the proposed design would match the existing materials around it so it would comply. Mr. Drew asked when these windows were removed would it be a challenge trying to match the brick. Ms. Mansfield replied, "yes", but it could be done. Mr. Drew asked whether there was any landscaping requirements with this small change. Mr. Richardson replied, no.

Mrs. Barone explained that the Design Subcommittee consisting of herself and two other people who sit on that board reviewed this project. She said this Commission is to review their recommendation and take final action.

Mr. Mulligan moved to accept the recommendation of the Design Subcommittee for Development in Districts 6 and 8, and approves the design for Case No. 2011-07 for a building alteration at JoAnn Stores, located at 5555 Darrow Road, according to plans and details dated as received February 1, 2011. Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hanink, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan,
Mr. O'Keefe, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion unanimously carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

CASE NO. 2011-03, SITE PLAN FOR WENTZ FINANCIAL GROUP, 5790 HUDSON DRIVE

Mr. Richardson reviewed the staff report. He explained that some of the landscaping has failed in the immediate area around the storage building and what was lost in the

last few years should be put back. He suggested removing the July deadline to do so in the conditions.

Bud Wentz, Wentz Financial Group, the applicant, said he was addressing the landscaping issue. He said they planned to be in the space by June or July and hoped to have the landscaping done in May. He said they would probably replace a few of the plants and for the new building would add the same size bed as was along the existing building now.

Mr. Cox asked whether having trucks was typical for their business. Mr. Wentz replied their firm sponsored a truck and trailer in races around the country. He said the other part of the building would be for document storage since they needed to keep items for seven years. He said they currently have four rental units and wanted to consolidate their storage needs into one place.

Mr. Kagler questioned whether there was a potential visibility issue regarding location of the doors on the south side of the building and suggested moving the building to another part of the lot. Mr. Wentz thought it was better to make the building as invisible as possible and having the garage doors facing south of the building. He said this plan makes the most use of as many parking spaces as possible.

Mr. Kagler asked whether the truck would be taken out at odd hours. Mr. Wentz replied, yes occasionally, on weekends.

Mr. Kagler thought maybe a big mirror would help visibility. He understood the number of parking spaces left would be enough for office use but questioned whether it would prohibit this building from being used by another user at a future date. Mr. Richardson said the parking was in excess of what is required for office use.

Mr. Drew questioned why the original building had parking in front of the building. Mr. Richardson explained the property was in District 8 and District 8 permits a certain amount of parking in the front. He said a certain percentage in District 7 was also permitted, about 10%.

Mr. Drew said the change was modest with this building and the goal of not having parking in front of the building would improve the situation. He understood that when it was the American Legion building they had some handicap spaces, but thought maybe there could be less front row parking on Hudson Drive.

Mr. King said this was a matter of interpretation. He said staff considered it a nonconforming situation which was built fairly recently to District 8 standards. The City rezoned that lot to District 7, therefore that parking became nonconforming.

Mr. Drew questioned whether the location chosen was a wise choice with the pine trees. He did not think ingress or egress to the new building would be a significant issue.

Mr. Wentz said he wanted to have parking on the left side of the building since they were applying for a sign. He thought parking in the front would probably be used for

handicap use only and envisioned staff parking on the north and clients' parking on the south side or back. He said the main entrance would be on the east.

Mr. Mulligan asked whether they were proposing a different deadline to install the landscaping. Mr. Wentz thought the deadline was fine.

Mr. Mulligan liked the siting of the building and thought it was the best place to locate it.

Mr. Cox did not think it was appropriate to discuss the parking issue in the front of the building. He said the object of this review was the proposed garage. He said if the requirements for parking changed they should have been addressed when the zoning changed.

Mrs. Barone opened the public hearing. There being no comments, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kagler asked whether this was considered a building or accessory structure. Mr. Richardson replied it was an accessory structure. Mr. Kagler asked if there was a maximum floor area for accessory structures. Mr. Richardson said there for residential accessory structures but not for commercial uses. Mr. King explained the maximum building lot coverage ratios could permit a small office with a large warehouse in the back. He did not see any objective that would be achieved by limiting the size of an accessory structure for a commercial building like this. Mr. Kagler asked about the regulations in District 7. Mr. King said there was no limit on an accessory size for any nonresidential use.

Mr. Hanink suggesting maybe altering or expanding the landscaping to provide some low shrubs to provide a little bit of a buffer without losing parking.

Mr. Mulligan moved to approve the Site Plan for Case No. 2011-003 for a storage building for Wentz Financial Group to be located at 5790 Hudson Drive according to plans dated January 11, 2011 with the following conditions.

1. Landscaping that no longer remains as shown on an as-built landscaping plan from 2005 must be replaced by July 1, 2011.
2. No clearing, grading or construction of any kind shall commence prior to the issuance of a Zoning Certificate.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hanink, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan,
Mr. O'Keefe, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion unanimously carried.

**CASE NO. 2011-05, HUDSON HIGH SCHOOL, SITE PLAN, ATHLETIC FIELDS
STORM WATER IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Richardson said this project was for the replacement of track and field surfaces to the high school. He said this project and the addition of storm water management facilities was part of a multi-phase improvement to the campus. He said it was a big engineering project and calculations had not yet been submitted. He said the City Engineer has been in contact with the design engineer and distributed a letter from the design engineer. Exterior lighting was not proposed at this time. Staff was not prepared to recommend approval when it was writing the staff report but after the applicant's presentation the Commission may want to approve the project.

Chris Wynn, OSports Architecture, and Chuck Schilling, Hudson City Schools, were representing the project.

Mr. Wynn said this project was a field replacement and upgrade to the infrastructure of the storm water system for the new field and track. He said all the engineering and all background information was done and only calculations were left to do. He said the City Engineer widened the area that storm water should be managed. He said all the concerns have been addressed so he believed the project was ready for approval.

Mrs. Barone asked whether storm water management was for the whole site. Mr. Wynn replied, yes, the playing fields and whole zone behind the high school on the south side of the building. Mr. King said there was an existing pond that was being expanded.

Mr. Mulligan asked whether future parking areas have been contemplated.

Chuck Schilling, Supervisor of Facilities Services, said this project basically addressed the east side of the property. He said some additional parking could be added to the west at some point in time. He said the water runs in two directions, and they were working with the EPA with 100 year storm projections behind the houses on the property and that is handled on the west side.

Mr. Cox asked whether there was storm water concern for the same footprint of the track and football field. Mr. Wynn said some water on the field percolates through the multiple level artificial turf.

Mr. King asked the applicant to clarify whether the storm water basin would accommodate the addition of spectator stands and two or three buildings that are there. Mr. Wynn said everything other than the stadium zone would be accommodated.

Mr. Hanink said the letter just received indicated a future roadway entrance from the site and he questioned whether that was also part of the proposal. Mr. Wynn replied, no. Mr. Richardson said the road was described to make sure the City Engineer knew what impervious coverage would be handled by the new storm water facility.

Mr. Hanink asked whether the detention ponds would be wet most of the time. Mr. Wynn said it was not intended to be a swamp, they were bioswales. He said when the rest of the other projects were done then they would landscape that area.

Mr. Hanink asked whether there would be any impact on the west side program. Mr. Schilling replied, no.

Mr. O'Keefe asked whether it was an existing detention basin. Mr. Wynn replied, yes. Mr. O'Keefe said it appeared it could grow in size if there was more runoff. Mr. Wynn said the calculations had been modified a little more to handle the flow.

Mr. Kagler asked about the school's master plan. He did not necessarily have a problem with what was being proposed but thought maybe the Commission should be considering all the other things being proposed since it could transform the site. Mr. Wynn said the master plan was presented to the AHBR and they had no comment.

Mr. Kagler asked whether the development of the site with additional roads could impact the site and whether there was any lighting.

Mr. Schilling said the last plan was done over ten years ago; however, the school was not able to finance the proposed improvements. He said this project was going to be privately funded, a \$20 million dollar master plan in phases. He said the first piece that needed to go in was addressing as much of the infrastructure upfront as possible and receive input regarding electric and engineering to make sure they were not putting something in place which may have to be removed in the future. He said they have been trying to replace the track for about 7 years, and the base of the track was replaced about 4 years ago.

Mr. Kagler said it sounded like there was a plan and a vision and an idea moving forward according to that plan. He said he would like to see it now to see how it relates. Mr. Schilling apologized for not having that with them.

Mr. Drew asked whether they were considering starting some landscaping around the retention basin. Mr. Wynn said the detention area was likely going to have substantive planting. He thought it could be addressed in this phase. Mr. King said landscaping was not required for this facility but comments would be helpful to the applicant.

Mrs. Barone asked whether in the original plans for the high school the stadium was always planned to be around this track. Mr. Schilling replied, yes.

Mrs. Barone asked how old was the high school. Mr. Schilling replied about 20 years.

Mr. Wynn said this project may get some additional funding soon and they would know fairly soon whether the grandstands, the lighting and the concession/rest room complex were going forward.

Mrs. Barone opened the public hearing. There being no comments, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hanink said he was sensitive to Mr. Kagler's comments about the master plan. He said the master plan blocked the City from building a bike/hike trail on the north instead of the south of the turnpike. He was glad to see the school and City collaborating on

walkways to save some money. He thought it was good to be pro-active with respect to these detention ponds.

Mr. Schilling said the east side was going to be similar to the west side. He believed Mrs. Thaxton, a high school science teacher, could design a plan for that area and get her environmental group involved.

Mr. Kagler had some concerns giving this a blessing without any concept of the other improvements. Mr. Wynn said they would come back to the next meeting with the master plan. Mrs. Barone did not have that concern since it is replacing something that is there.

Mr. Mulligan moved to approve the Site Plan for Case No. 2011-05 for replacement of the track and field and a new storm water management facility to be located at Hudson High School, 2500 Hudson-Aurora Road according to plans dated as received January 20, 2011 provided the following conditions are met.

1. The comments of the City Engineer must be addressed.
2. Summit Soil and Water Conservation District must approve the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.
3. No clearing, grading or construction of any kind shall commence prior to the issuance of a Zoning Certificate.
4. Before a zoning certificate may be issued the applicant shall install silt fencing, polypropylene fencing, and/or other means acceptable to the City to mark and protect approved clearing limits, which shall be maintained by the applicant.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hanink, Mr. Mulligan, Mr. O'Keefe, Mrs. Barone

Nay: Mr. Kagler

Motion carried.

CASE NO. 2011-06, ORDINANCE 11-23, AMENDING OFFICIAL ZONING MAP REGARDING 78 RAVENNA STREET TO DISTRICT 5

Mr. Richardson reviewed the staff report reintroducing this project to rezone 78 Ravenna Street from District 3 to District 5 as requested by a private party in order to allow a dental practice at that location. He said some of the landscaping requirements have been reduced since the last time this project was presented. He was confident a solution to the grade of the drive could be worked out.

Dr. Anthony Fratantonio, a dentist, the applicant, said it has been over a year ago that he approached the Commission to remove the existing building and he has now reevaluated that approach. He said Cleveland Restoration has reviewed the building and he thought it could be renovated to make it work for his practice.

Mr. Drew was glad he would be able to renovate the house and thought it was a good use for the site.

Mrs. Barone stated this was a zoning change.

Mr. Kagler echoed Mr. Drew's comments. He appreciated the property owner's steadfastness and thought efforts like this made Hudson what it is. He said it should be recognized in the highest regard and found merit in what was proposed. He thought that the two properties to the east should also be contemplated for rezoning in conjunction with this property as he stated last time. He understood it was a private-party initiated rezoning and could not be added to that request but thought it was an issue that was important. He thought the adjacent properties to the east would be left in a state of limbo regarding their potential use and value. He did not know if those properties were opposed to this rezoning. He asked whether the building proposed was about 3,000 square feet. Dr. Fratantonio replied that was correct.

Mr. Kagler questioned whether buffers should be required for the proposed driveway if the driveway could be around the west side and come out to Ravenna Street. Mr. Richardson said a buffer yard was required on the east side. He said the curb cut location should have as much distance as possible between the post office and this owner and predicted the curb cut would be as far east as possible. Mr. Kagler suggested the driveway come around the other side of the building. He thought this site was a good location for this project.

Mr. O'Keefe commended the applicant for re-using that building. He said last time a landscape buffer was included. He said another part of the motion incorporated permeable surface and wanted to make sure that was part of this proposal when it comes back for site plan approval.

Mr. Hanink was sympathetic with other properties and understood it was outside the scope of this request. He asked whether staff could propose a rezoning of those properties. Mr. King did not think it was within the scope of this review. He said if the Commission thought the boundary line should be further east they should recommend that. He explained that was why the rezoning was separate from site plan approval.

Mr. Hanink wished the applicant well and looked forward to the detailed plan. He thought the extension of the zoning should be considered.

Mr. Cox was in favor of the matter. He would limit trying to rezone any other house until someone asks for it to be rezoned.

Mr. Mulligan commended the applicant for doing the project. He was surprised there were concerns of restoring this building as opposed to the previous project of having a new building. He thought the renovation has a more residential character and would be more of a benefit to the neighbors up the street. He discussed the idea of moving the zoning district line to Oviatt Street. He encouraged those other owners to speak up on this matter as the project has changed from a year ago. He encouraged staff to contact those owners to try to take advantage of this applicant's initiative.

Mrs. Barone asked whether the pond holds water all the time. Mr. Curt Van Blarcum, an owner of the subject property, replied, "yes".

Mrs. Barone said if Oviatt Street ever gets extended, that may be the right time to consider rezoning the properties to the east to the new street.

Mr. Mulligan was concerned whether relocating the driveway and adding a curb cut would be adding a lot of impervious surface.

Mrs. Barone opened the public hearing.

Larry Watson, 84 Ravenna Street, said he spoke regarding this rezoning in 2009 and again stated any structure would be better than what was currently there. He asked whether any time limits could be put in place to restore the building.

Curt Van Blarcum, 422 North Main Street, an owner of the subject property, said when he started the project he was interested in historical preservation work as a restoration and conservation project. He said it was a challenged property and had been used as a rental for a long time. He said there was definitely a unique, historical component of the house and he had lengthy discussions with the former City Engineer, David McCallops, about the Oviatt Street/Veterans Way extension. He said everything he had done to that point would be changed so he could not put any more time or money into that project knowing there was going to be a big bridge built. He weighed out proceeding with the job and where would be the logical place for the district line. He respected the residential flavor of that block and thought the residential use should be retained if that was the true desire of whomever owned the house. He said this was a wonderful plan retaining more of this significant structure of Hudson from its past and he encouraged the rezoning of the property.

Mrs. Barone closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Barone was concerned that if this proposed business did not stay there, whether the rezoning would permit other types of businesses such as an automotive repair store. She was not sure the other types of permitted uses would be good for that neighborhood.

Mr. Kagler said the two properties to the east were both homes and while similar zoning may be appropriate, he thought the Comprehensive Plan should specify these three properties all together and make a global recommendation for all three of them. He thought the City's role was to look at the Comprehensive Plan and recommend this. He thought when the other properties on Ravenna Street were looked at with the Comprehensive Plan Council could recommend to rezone those other two properties without any involvement from those adjacent property owners.

Mr. King responded to the question of a timetable by stating that staff has met with the applicant, architect and engineer and the applicant must commence construction within one year from the effective date of the approval and complete the project within two years. He said if that construction did not occur the rezoning would lapse.

Mr. Kagler moved to recommend City Council adopt Ordinance No. 11-23, "An Ordinance Amending Part Twelve of the Ordinances of Hudson to Amend the Official Zoning District Map to Rezone Property at 78 Ravenna Street from District 3, Outer Village Residential Neighborhood Zone, to District 5, Village Core District Zone". Mr. Drew seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hanink, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan,
Mr. O'Keefe, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion unanimously carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cox moved to approve the minutes of the January 10, 2011 Regular Meeting, as amended. Mr. O'Keefe seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Hanink, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan, Mr. O'Keefe,
Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Abstain: Mr. Drew

Motion carried.

PROJECT INTRODUCTION

Mr. Wynn said the Hudson Middle School was going to install an artificial turf field on the football field, install fencing, renovate the entry, and keep the grandstands and restrooms. He said they were having a pre-application meeting shortly and would want the project to be completed in August. He said there would be new lighting, four poles about the same height as the existing eight poles.

The Chair, Mrs. Barone, adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Jennifer Barone, Chair

Nora La Lomia, PC Clerk