



PLANNING 6-04-25

The Planning Commission meeting on June 4, 2025, focused on the proposal to amend the planning and zoning code to include pedestrian and bikeway improvements. The proposal, initiated on January 14, 2025, includes three phases: trail to Dean Memorial, trail to Heights Hill, and trail across Heights Hill. The cost of each phase was discussed, with phase one estimated at \$1.36 million. The commission debated whether to incorporate connectivity requirements into the zoning code, considering the potential benefits and practical challenges. Ultimately, the motion to include connectivity in the code was not seconded, suggesting a case-by-case approach instead. The meeting discussed the possibility of incorporating a 50-foot setback into the zoning code to support future connectivity and development. It was noted that existing roads, such as two-lane highways, already have a 60-foot right-of-way, with 30 feet on each side. The proposal aims to align setbacks for general business and retail areas with residential standards, which are currently 50 feet. The motion was seconded by Mayor Antal and passed unanimously. The meeting also touched on the need to revisit the building code regarding height restrictions.

Roll Call and Meeting Agenda

- T. Nemer initiates the meeting at 7:03 PM.
- Mayor Antal and T. Nemer conduct a roll call, confirming the presence of all members.
- The agenda includes the correction and adoption of previous meeting minutes and a continuation of a discussion on pedestrian and bikeway improvements.
- T. Nemer mentions receiving three parts of a proposal from Brian, but only one is present.

Discussion on Proposal Phases

- R. Dick clarifies that the trail ending is part of the proposal.
- Bill Hinkle and T. Nemer discuss the three phases of the proposal: trail to Dean Memorial, trail to Hines Hill, and trail across Hines Hill.
- Mayor Antal and T. Nemer express confusion about the missing parts of the proposal.
- Bill Hinkle and R. Dick provide details on the phases, including the trail's route and estimated costs.

Clarification on Connectivity Plan

- T. Nemer explains the purpose of the connectivity plan, emphasizing the need to understand what connectivity means in their area.



- Mayor Antal questions the necessity of requiring businesses to implement bike trails or sidewalks.
- T. Nemer argues that connectivity can benefit businesses and the community, citing examples from other cities.
- R. Dick and D. Maccarone express concerns about the practicality and cost of implementing the connectivity plan.

Debate on Implementation and Cost

- T. Nemer suggests incorporating connectivity requirements into the zoning code, allowing businesses to request exceptions if needed.
- Mayor Antal and R. Dick express skepticism about the feasibility and cost of the proposal.
- D. Maccarone suggests handling connectivity on a case-by-case basis rather than broadly incorporating it into the code.
- B. Hinkle and B. Goncy discuss the historical context and challenges of implementing similar projects in Hudson.

Exploration of Alternative Solutions

- S. Miller proposes using a tax incentive financing (TIF) approach to fund the connectivity plan.
- D. Maccarone and B. Hinkle explain the mechanics of TIFs and their potential benefits and limitations.
- T. Nemer and B. Goncy discuss the potential impact of requiring businesses to contribute to the connectivity fund.
- The group considers the possibility of setting aside land for future connectivity projects as an alternative to immediate implementation.

Final Recommendation and Vote

- T. Nemer makes a motion to recommend the inclusion of connectivity provisions in the zoning code to the Village Council.
- The motion is not seconded, leading to a discussion on the lack of enthusiasm for the proposal.
- D. Maccarone suggests handling connectivity on a case-by-case basis, which is supported by the group.
- The meeting concludes with a decision to recommend a case-by-case approach to the Village Council.



Discussion on Right of Way and Setback Requirements

- D. Maccarone questions if a recommendation can be made without it being a code requirement.
- T. Nemer suggests that a 45-foot setback should be built into the code to support sidewalks.
- B. Goncy confirms that the right of way for development is already approved and specified in the plans.
- B. Hinkle and B. Goncy discuss the specifics of the right of way for a two-lane highway, including the 60-foot right of way and the 30-foot distance on each side.

Clarification on Existing Right of Way Standards

- B. Goncy explains that every dedicated roadway has a built-in right of way, which is typically 60 feet.
- T. Nemer and B. Goncy discussed the right of way for older roads like Olde 8 Road, which has a 12-foot lane and a 60-foot right of way.
- B. Hinkle and B. Goncy discuss the adjustments made to older roads to meet modern standards.
- B. Goncy emphasizes that every roadway has a right of way specified in the plans.

Proposal for Updating Zoning Code

- B. Hinkle suggests that the zoning code should be updated to include a 50-foot setback for general business and retail areas.
- R. Dick mentions the existing packet for business applications, which includes various requirements like lighting plans and signage.
- B. Hinkle and B. Goncy discuss the current setback requirements, which are 20 feet in the general business district.
- T. Nemer proposes a motion to recommend a 50-foot setback to the village council.

Voting on the Motion

- T. Nemer makes a motion to recommend a 50-foot setback for general business and retail areas to the village council.
- B. Goncy and B. Hinkle discuss the specifics of the motion, including the applicability to different commercial areas.
- Mayor Antal calls for a vote, and all members present vote in favor of the motion.



Old and New Business Discussion

- D. Maccarone suggests bringing up the topic of building heights in the next meeting.
- T. Nemer confirms that the building height issue was previously discussed and approved.
- R. Dick mentions contacting a developer about the building height.
- Mayor Antal and D. Maccarone discuss ongoing communication with developers regarding building height and other issues.

Meeting Adjournment

- D. Maccarone makes a motion to adjourn the meeting.
- T. Nemer seconds the motion.
- Mayor Antal calls for a vote, and all members present vote in favor of adjourning the meeting.
- The meeting is officially adjourned.