

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 26, 2026

Rob Vela called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. Commission members present were Greg Bade, Stephen Dane, Chris Kaspar, Rob Vela, and Mayor Weber (6). Mathew Beredo and Lindsey Tacket were absent (2). Brody Walters, Planning & Zoning Administrator, and Mark Easterling, Deputy Planning & Zoning Administrator, were also present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Dane moved to approve the February 26, 2026, meeting minutes as written, and Mayor Weber seconded the motion. Ayes: Dane, Kaspar, Vela, and Weber (4). Nays: (0). Abstain: Bade (1).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mr. Walters stated that the April 30, 2026, meeting is canceled due to a lack of agenda items.

Assignment of Permanent Zoning Krise Property Group LLC 25851 Fort Meigs Road

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

City of Perrysburg
201 W. Indiana Ave.
Perrysburg, OH 43551

Krise Property Group LLC
1005 Wilderness Ct.
Perrysburg, OH 43551

REQUEST

Chapter 1285 – Changes and Amendments
Chapter 1285.11 – Zoning of Newly Annexed Areas

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located on the west side of Fort Meigs Road, directly west of Spafford Drive, the road that splits the Schuetz Container property. The assignment of

zoning request pertains to this parcel that was recently annexed to the City of Perrysburg from Perrysburg Township. This parcel is currently identified as: P60-100-130000024000 and currently contains several structures. The current zoning in the township is I-2 General Industry.

This parcel includes approximately 4.00 acres of land.

BACKGROUND

The City of Perrysburg has acquired this land from Perrysburg Township as a result of a water/sewer agreement and subsequent voluntary annexation. This annexation will be effective on April 2, 2026, which is 30 days after the ordinance was passed.

ANALYSIS

The current use of the property is commercial/industrial, with several storage buildings on site. The city's Land Use Plan has placed this property within the "Innovation District." The Innovation District suggests industrial, office, retail, public, and semi-public uses would generally be appropriate and preferred.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council approval of the assignment of permanent zoning of I1 (Light Industrial) for the parcel identified in this report, which contains approximately 4.00 acres.

Further, it is recommended that a Public Hearing be set before City Council for May 5, 2026, at 6:25 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Assignment of Permanent Zoning for Krise Property Group LLC at 25851 Fort Meigs Road. Mr. Kaspar asked if any of the existing structures on site are non-conforming, and Mr. Walters confirmed that it's highly likely, but that he hasn't seen a site plan. Mr. Walters noted that there is a water agreement on file for utilities, but he is unsure whether those resources are being utilized.

Mr. Bade made a motion to recommend approval of the Assignment of Permanent Zoning for Krise Property Group LLC at 25851 Fort Meigs Road, and that a Public Hearing be scheduled for May 5, 2026, at 6:25 pm. Seconded by Mr. Dane. Ayes: (5). Nays: (0).

***Preliminary & Final Site Plan
Perrysburg Lincoln Properties LLC
25818 N. Dixie Highway***

Project Name: Perrysburg Square – Perrysburg Lincoln Properties LLC
Location: 25818 Dixie Hwy (former Social restaurant)
Zoning: C4 Highway Commercial – City
C2 Community Business District - Township
Applicant(s): Perrysburg Lincoln Properties LLC, The JDI Group, Inc.
Land Use: Restaurant and Shopping Center
Parcels: 20 parcels in the City of Perrysburg, 3 parcels in the process of annexation from Perrysburg Township
Request: Preliminary & Final Site Plan Approval

PRELIMINARY & FINAL SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

Land Use		Permitted	Special Approval	Not Permitted
1225.08	Land Use Type	X		
Dimensional		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1230	Front Setback	X (BZA)		
1230	Side Setback			X
1230	Rear Setback	X (BZA)		
1230	Lot Coverage	X		
1230	Height	X		
1230.03(a)	Height Variance from BZA			X
1230.03(b)	Features above max height (exemptions)			X
Parking		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.02(t)	Parking Lot Location	X (BZA)		
1250.02(r)	Parking Relief			X
1250.03	Parking Quantity	X		
1250.05(b)	Parking lot design/layout	X		
1250.05(c)	Wheel Stops			X
1250.05(f)	Location of Driveways	X		
1250.06(a)(5)	Parking Lot Screening (near residential)	X		
1250.06(a)(7)	Parking Lot Surface Material	X		
1250.06(b)	Parking Space Sizes	X		
Landscape		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.11	Planting Plan	X		
1250.11(a)(1)	Landscape Architect (stamp/sign)	X		
1250.11(a)(3)	Planting Schedule	X		
1250.13(g)	Tree size (8' height, 2 ½" caliper min)	X		
1230	Minimum Landscape Percentage of parcel	X		
1250.18(a)	Min. Landscape Percentage of Parking Lot (6%)	X		
1250.17(b)	Parking Lot landscape primarily shade trees	X		
1250.17(c)	Planting areas dispersed through parking lot	X		
1250.19(b)	5' landscape strip between parking lot and P/L	X		
1250.19(c)	1 tree for each 8 parking spaces	X		
1250.19(d)	Landscape island = 1 per ea. 10 parking spaces	X		
1250.19(d)	Shade trees located in islands	X		
1250.20	10' landscape strip between R/W and parking	X		

1250.20(d)	Hedge within 10' landscape (min 1.5' height)	X		
1250.27	Berms/Earth Mounds (if required)			X
1250.42	Fence/Screen Requirement (height & location)	X		
1250.43	Lighting (height & direction)	X		
Building Design		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.44	Screening of Rooftop Mechanicals	X		
1250.48	Building Material (allowable percentages)	X		
1250.481(a)	Customer entrance facing each street frontage		X	
1250.481(b)	Recesses/projections if > 100' in length	X		
1250.481(d)	Façade to have color/texture/material change	X		
1250.481(e)	Rooflines to change at least every 100'	X		
1250.481(f)	Façade colors – low reflectance and neutral	X		
1250.481(g)	Building trim to be non-illuminated	X		
Drives & Access		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.51(a)	Driveway access onto public or private street	X		
1250.51(a)(2)	Drives enter perpendicular	X		
1250.51(a)(3)	Driveway grade less than 10%	X		
1250.51(a)(6)	Driveway – at least 100' from an intersection	X		
1250.51(a)(6)	Driveway – at least 80' from other driveways	X		
1250.51(c)	Driveway – alignment with existing drives	X		
1250.53	Deceleration Lanes if use > 1,000 trips per day			X
Sidewalks		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.56(a)	Sidewalks across all frontages	X		
1250.56(a)	Sidewalks from R/W to entrance	X		
1250.56(a)	Sidewalk material through drive aisles	X		
Dumpster		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.57	Waste Receptacle - Location	X		
1250.57	Waste Receptacles to be consolidated	X		
1250.57	Waste Receptacle – design/materials	X		
Acc. Buildings		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.61(a)	Accessory Building – Location (rear yard)			X
1250.61(b)	Accessory Building – ≥ 5' from side or rear P/L			X
1250.61(b)	Accessory Building – ≥ 10' from main structure			X
1250.61(d)	Acc. Building – Height (20' or main structure)			X
1250.61(f)	Accessory Building – Size Limit (5% of lot size)			X
Traffic Study		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1255.04	Traffic Study – if more than 100 trips/peak Hr.			X
1255.04	Traffic Study – if more than 750 trips per day			X
Miscellaneous		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1260.15(a)(1)	Plan doesn't impede normal development	X		
1260.15(a)(2)	Existing landscape preserved (as possible)	X		
1260.15(a)(5)	Emergency vehicle access to structures	X		
1250.26	Wall Location (if required)	X		

NOTES

This site plan relies on 3 parcels that are currently in Perrysburg Township. Annexation is currently in process. Any approval should be conditional upon successful completion of the annexation and the subsequent combination of parcels.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission conditionally approve the request for Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval, subject to annexation of the entirety of the project site and the subsequent parcel combination to combine 23 parcels into 1.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for Perrysburg Square (Perrysburg Lincoln Properties LLC) at 25818 N. Dixie Highway, which includes 20 parcels in the City of Perrysburg and 3 parcels in the process of annexation from Perrysburg Township. Steve Best (of Perrysburg Lincoln Properties LLC) and Sarah Penner (of The JDI Group) were present on behalf of the application. There was a brief discussion about the jurisdiction of the properties to the north and south, and Mr. Walter confirmed they are within city limits and added that this request is consistent with the development along SR-25. Ms. Penner noted that they have not yet heard back from Wood County regarding approval of the annexation of the three parcels currently located in Perrysburg Township. Mr. Bade asked whether the detention is adequate for the site, and Ms. Penner noted that there will also be some detention in the parking lot, as well as the two swales indicated on the site plan.

Mr. Vela made a motion to grant conditional approval of the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for Perrysburg Square (Perrysburg Lincoln Properties LLC) at 25818 N. Dixie Highway, which includes 20 parcels in the City of Perrysburg and 3 parcels in the process of annexation from Perrysburg Township, with the following conditions:

1. Annexation of 3 Parcels from Perrysburg Township: P60-400-180302021000, P60-400-180302022000, and P60-400-180302023000.
2. Lot combination of the total site of 23 parcels to 1 parcel.
3. Fencing modification along the eastern rear property line by pulling the fencing back about 8-10 feet to preserve the roadway line of sight along the residential area.

Seconded by Mr. Bade. Ayes: (5). Nays: (0).

Ms. Penner confirmed that this development will be an 11,000 SF retail building with 5,000 SF for a restaurant.

***Preliminary & Final Site Plan, and Special Approval Use
(Outdoor Storage)
Michels Corporation Expansion
26933 Eckel Road***

Project Name: Michels Corporation – Special Approval Use, Preliminary and Final Site Plan

Location: 26933 Eckel Road (32.47 acres)

Zoning: I2 – General Industrial

Applicant(s): Troy Halbach (Michels Corporation)

Land Use: Agriculture, Construction, Semi-Truck Sales, Lease and Service, Outside Storage

Parcel(s): Q61-100-654406003001, Q61-100-654406001002, Q61-100-654406001002, Q61-100-654406003001, Q61-100-654103048000, Q61-100-654103049000

Request: The applicant is requesting a Special Approval Use, Preliminary, and Final Site plan review to expand their storage yard.

PRELIMINARY & FINAL SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

Land Use		Permitted	Special Approval	Not Permitted
1225.08	Land Use Type	x	x	
Dimensional		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1230	Front Setback		x	
1230	Side Setback	x		
1230	Rear Setback	x		
1230	Lot Coverage	x		
1230	Height	x		
1230.03(a)	Height Variance from BZA			x
1230.03(b)	Features above max height (exemptions)			x
Parking		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.02(t)	Parking Lot Location	x		
1250.02(r)	Parking Relief			x
1250.03	Parking Quantity	x		
1250.05(b)	Parking lot design/layout	x		
1250.05(c)	Wheel Stops			x
1250.05(f)	Location of Driveways	x		
1250.06(a)(5)	Parking Lot Screening (near residential)	x		
1250.06(a)(7)	Parking Lot Surface Material	x		
1250.06(b)	Parking Space Sizes	x		
Landscape		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.11	Planting Plan	x		
1250.11(a)(1)	Landscape Architect (stamp/sign)	x		
1250.11(a)(3)	Planting Schedule	x		
1250.13(g)	Tree size (8' height, 2 ½" caliper min)			x
1230	Minimum Landscape Percentage of parcel	x		
1250.18(a)	Min. Landscape Percentage of Parking Lot (6%)	x		

1250.17(b)	Parking Lot landscape primarily shade trees		x	
1250.17(c)	Planting areas dispersed through parking lot		x	
1250.19(b)	5' landscape strip between parking lot and P/L		x	
1250.19(c)	1 tree for each 8 parking spaces	x		
1250.19(d)	Landscape island = 1 per ea. 10 parking spaces		x	
1250.19(d)	Shade trees located in islands		x	
1250.20	10' landscape strip between R/W and parking		x	
1250.20(d)	Hedge within 10' landscape (min 1.5' height)		x	
1250.27	Berms/Earth Mounds (if required)	x		
1250.42	Fence/Screen Requirement (height & location)	x		
1250.43	Lighting (height & direction)	x		
Building Design		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.44	Screening of Rooftop Mechanicals			x
1250.48	Building Material (allowable percentages)		x	
1250.481(a)	Customer entrance facing each street frontage	x		
1250.481(b)	Recesses/projections if > 100' in length		x	
1250.481(d)	Façade to have color/texture/material change		x	
1250.481(e)	Rooflines to change at least every 100'		x	
1250.481(f)	Façade colors – low reflectance and neutral	x		
1250.481(g)	Building trim to be non-illuminated	x		
Drives & Access		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.51(a)	Driveway access onto public or private street	x		
1250.51(a)(2)	Drives enter perpendicular	x		
1250.51(a)(3)	Driveway grade less than 10%	x		
1250.51(a)(6)	Driveway – at least 100' from an intersection	x		
1250.51(a)(6)	Driveway – at least 80' from other driveways	x		
1250.51(c)	Driveway – alignment with existing drives	x		
1250.53	Deceleration Lanes if use > 1,000 trips per day			x
Sidewalks		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.56(a)	Sidewalks across all frontages	x		
1250.56(a)	Sidewalks from R/W to entrance	x		
1250.56(a)	Sidewalk material through drive aisles		x	
Dumpster		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.57	Waste Receptacle - Location	x		
1250.57	Waste Receptacles to be consolidated	x		
1250.57	Waste Receptacle – design/materials		x	
Acc. Buildings		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.61(a)	Accessory Building – Location (rear yard)		x	
1250.61(b)	Accessory Building – ≥ 5' from side or rear P/L	x		
1250.61(b)	Accessory Building – ≥ 10' from main structure	x		
1250.61(d)	Acc. Building – Height (20' or main structure)		x	
1250.61(f)	Accessory Building – Size Limit (5% of lot size)		x	
Traffic Study		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1255.04	Traffic Study – if more than 100 trips/peak Hr.			x
1255.04	Traffic Study – if more than 750 trips per day			x
Miscellaneous		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1260.15(a)(1)	Plan doesn't impede normal development	x		
1260.15(a)(2)	Existing landscape preserved (as possible)	x		
1260.15(a)(5)	Emergency vehicle access to structures	x		
1250.26	Wall Location (if required)			x

General Requirements		No special approval use shall be approved by the Planning Commission unless it shall find the following:	
Section	Requirement	Compliant	Non-Compliant
1235.02(d)(1)	The establishment, maintenance or operation of the SAU will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, general welfare or the natural environment.	x	
1235.02(d)(2)	The SAU will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted nor shall it substantially diminish or impair property values within its neighborhood.	x	
1235.02(d)(3)	The establishment of the SAU will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.	x	
1235.02(d)(4)	Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and necessary facilities have been or will be provided.	x	
1235.02(d)(5)	Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.	x	
1235.02(d)(6)	The SAU shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and to any additional conditions or procedures as specified in this Chapter.	x	
Specific Requirements		Additional "use specific" requirements:	
Section	Requirement	Compliant	Non-Compliant
1235.04(bb)(1)	A solid wall, earthen berm at least eight (8) feet in height shall be provided around all sides of the area abutting residential, office or commercial zoning district and shall be provided on all sides visible from public streets. Such wall or berm shall be of sound construction, painted or otherwise finished neatly and inconspicuously. Such fence, wall or berm shall be of permanent finish and construction.	x	
1235.04(bb)(2)	Ingress and egress to the facility shall be only from an arterial street. The City may approve access to a collector street if the City finds that such access point will further minimize impacts on other properties.	x	
1235.04(bb)(3)	The minimum lot or parcel size shall be five (5) acres.	x	
1235.04(bb)(4)	Adequate parking and unloading facilities shall be provided at the site so that no loaded vehicles at any time stand on a public right-of-way awaiting entrance to the site.	x	

BACKGROUND

This property was formerly Welded Construction, which closed and sold the buildings and properties to the Michels Corporation in 2019. The applicant has since stored equipment and materials throughout the property and was notified by the Planning and

Zoning Division (special approval use for outside storage granted in 2021). The applicant would like to expand this use to one of their vacant parcels.

ANALYSIS

The site exhibits multiple existing deficiencies, most of which are considered legal nonconforming. These include the front yard setback of the principal building, the exterior building materials, the location of the accessory structure within the side yard, and the height of the accessory structure, all of which have remained unchanged for at least fifteen (15) years. The applicant has not indicated any intent to alter these existing conditions.

The new and existing parking areas do not show landscaping spread throughout the parking areas. Although the new parking spaces are shown at the correct size (10x20), the existing spaces are shown at 9.5x18. The additional storage yard and associated drive are also shown as gravel surfaces; however, the zoning code requires parking lots and drive aisles to be constructed of impervious material.

The site plan does not show a sidewalk through the southern driveway approach. Dumpsters are shown on site, although they are fully enclosed within the site and are not visible to the public; they are not shown to be enclosed by code.

RECOMMENDATION

The Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Special Approval Use, Preliminary and Final Site Plan application for Michels at 26933 Eckel Road, with the condition that the following outstanding items are addressed with the Planning Commission:

1. Parking lot landscaping details are addressed, as the applicant greatly exceeds the amount of landscaping on site.
2. The zoning code requires all parking lots and drive aisles to be constructed of impervious surface material, which the current site does not provide. (Planning Commission must decide what is considered a storage area and what is considered a parking lot)
3. The site plan does not show the required sidewalk through the southern driveway approach.
4. No dumpster enclosure is provided on site as required by the zoning code.

Mr. Easterling reviewed the above Staff Report regarding Preliminary & Final Site Plan, and Special Approval Use (Outdoor Storage) for Michels Corporation at 26933 Eckel Road. Troy Halbach (of Michels Corporation) and Nick Elmais (of Woolpert) were

present on behalf of the application. Mr. Bade said that he has no issue with the dumpster enclosure, and asked about the gravel drive to the layard. Mr. Halbach added that the main opportunities on site are tooling, casing, offloading, and loading of heavy equipment, and Mr. Bade added that concrete may not add quality to the site for this use. Mr. Bade said that he would like to see more landscaping, and he asked about the berm and drainage on the other side of the berm. Mr. Elmaisan said that they analyzed the drainage on the west side of the site, and Mr. Easterling confirmed that drainage issues will be addressed through the Construction Review process with Stormwater following Ohio EPA standards. Mr. Elmaisan noted that the berm is proposed at five (5) feet from the property line with a six (6) foot fence.

Mayor Weber referenced a list of questions that he received from neighboring residents dated March 24, 2026 (a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes). Mr. Halbach confirmed that this site is a laydown yard and noted that there is a range of time for the impact of activity on the site. He noted that an open burn will not be used on the site. Mayor Weber confirmed that this site has always been an industrial use before the neighboring homes were constructed and that appraised values of the properties have always been known.

Mr. Halbach said that he would rather put a hedge on site, that he is willing to concede on a few items previously discussed, and noted that they are losing a significant amount of space with the berm.

Mr. Dane asked about the parking lot south of Eckel Road and the southern entrance, and Mr. Halbach said that it is used as a secondary entrance in case the main gate goes down. Mr. Elmaisan noted that the front parking lot is partially encroaching on the city right-of-way and added that they are required to have two ADA parking spaces (one in the public lot and one on private property).

Mr. Halbach confirmed that there is no plan to make changes to the current nonconforming structures on site.

Karen Friend, of 535 Rutledge, was present and said that she has lived here since 1989. She read a prepared statement in opposition to the application. Mr. Elmaisan said that he is unaware of existing EPA violations, and Mr. Easterling confirmed that the EPA concerns will be addressed in the Construction Review process and has no bearing here. Mr. Halbach confirmed that they do not have hazardous materials on site, as Michels has service shops to fix their equipment elsewhere.

Richard Koehler, of 562 South Ridge Drive, was present and requested a sound barrier wall due to the consistent noise in the warmer weather months. He noted that 30 neighboring properties signed a petition in opposition to this application.

Mary Beth Radeck, of 688 South Ridge Drive, was present and addressed concerns regarding intensity, noise, and vibration, and referenced her FOIA request. Mr. Easterling confirmed that the FOIA was received late last week and is actively being

worked on to fulfill. Mr. Walters noted that the Police Division would have equipment to address the noise and vibration concerns.

Jerry McAvoy, of 688 South Ridge Drive, was present and said that he understands the antiquated zoning and that he is concerned with the noise as noted in the Site Plan Checklist.

Kevin Ruffing, of 681 Little Creek Drive, was present and asked who the neighbors should complain to. Ms. Friend said that she contacted the police in 2020, and the noise was not evaluated. Mr. Easterling confirmed that the police enforce noise complaints from 6:00 am to 10:00 pm across the city. Mayor Weber asked the neighbors to contact his office or the City Administrator with further concerns. Mr. Bade said that he understands the concerns and noted that this property was zoned Industrial dating back to 1989. He added that it's Michels' right to utilize their property.

Phil Zinsmaster, of 587 Rutledge Court, was present and referenced city values and the mission statement. He added that the proposal from Michels is fair in a lot of the areas, and added that he is concerned with the tall proposed chain link fence. Mr. Zinsmaster said that neighbors have been maintaining ten (10) feet behind their properties.

Mr. Radeck referenced the Site Plan Checklist and asked how items are determined as compliant when they are detrimental or injurious.

Ms. Radeck asked when the use of the property intensifies and is moving closer to residential, does that change the use?

There was a brief discussion about the variance request from Michels Corporation on February 9, 2026, and Mr. Elmaisan said that they had originally proposed trees instead of a mound. Mayor Weber asked if there is data that shows how an eight-foot (8) mound with plantings on top will help with sound, and Mr. Walters said there would be, but that he doesn't have that data.

There was further discussion about the Special Approval Use, and Mr. Elmaisan said that it is intended that there could be an intensified use.

Mr. Easterling noted that with the previous application, neighbors requested a fence, and he encouraged Michels to construct a berm instead. He said that the zoning code cannot make everyone happy.

Mr. Easterling read into the record a letter (a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes) from Kristen Lucas, of 543 Rutledge Court, noting the concerns with the impact of the Special Approval Use.

Mayor Weber referenced an email received (a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes) from Jim & Karen Friend, of 535 Rutledge Court. Mr. Weber said that he responded to the email and confirmed that, according to research, ODNR never declared this area a wetland.

Mr Zinsmaster read an email from Randy Zinsmaster related to concerns with the continuation of noise, EPA concerns with material seepage, lighting, and working hours.

Mr. Vela asked if concessions could be made related to the concerns from the neighbors, and the steps that could be taken by the city to address the concerns. Mayor Weber noted that the police division may need to get equipment and training to help evaluate the noise concerns. He said that he lived on Pauly Drive for 29 years and that he understands the concerns of the neighbors. Mr. Halbach asked if they are being held to a different standard, and Mr. Vela confirmed that other businesses are held to the same degree.

Mr. Dane made a motion to grant conditional approval of the Preliminary & Final Site Plan, and Special Approval Use (Outdoor Storage) for Michels Corporation at 26933 Eckel Road, with the following conditions:

1. Install a sidewalk through the southern driveway approach.
2. Install one ADA parking spot in the public parking lot and one ADA parking spot in the employee parking lot.

Seconded by Mr. Kaspar. Ayes: (5). Nays: (0).

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro
Recording Secretary

March 24, 2026

Mayor Mark Weber
City of Perrysburg
Planning Committee

Good afternoon Mark,

When we met on February 27th, in regard to the Michels Special Use permit, you stated that since we would not be able to attend the meeting that you would be more than willing to ask a few questions on our behalf. The following are the questions I would like you to ask:

1. Please explain, in a transparent way, how the Michels expansion will impact activity at this site. Expected number of incoming and outgoing semi vehicles per day? Provide an overview of the operations at this site and how this will change as a result of your expansion.
2. Mention was made of an open burn to clear the field. Is this still the plan? Given the Open burn ban in Ohio, what is your backup plan?
3. Have you had any communications with the Ohio EPA in regard to your expansion and if yes, what was the outcome? Making a decision on this Special Use permit without resolution of an EPA issue may be premature and unsupported by evidence. A stay could be requested if a decision is made prematurely.
4. Have you had a study performed in regard to the surrounding neighborhood to determine the impact of your expansion?
5. Please explain why it is necessary to install your 6 foot chain link fence so close to our split rail fences? The entire west side of the field, save one home, has split rail fences at their property lines, with a gate, to facilitate maintenance of the field adjacent to our property. We have all maintained this area(in our case since 1991)without question by your organization. We would ask that as a courtesy you install your fence farther back from our property line so that we have the ability to open our gates and maintain our property. When you walk the field, you will see that we have maintained 14 feet back from our property line as have our neighbors.
6. The check list review for this Special Use application requires that there is not a negative financial impact on the adjacent properties. We will all most certainly loose Value as a result of your expansion. Explain how this expansion will not impact our property values. Our homes are currently valued between \$400 to \$500,000. Any potential new home owner would most likely walk away from our homes once they see Our back yard. We have already had one home owner sell and another is on the market To get ahead of the anticipated drop in value.

Fw: Regarding Michel Property Proposal

From Perrysburg Mayor <mayor@perrysburgoh.gov>

Date Mon 3/16/2026 7:58 AM

To Mark Weber <mweber@perrysburgoh.gov>

Cc Brody Walters <bwalters@perrysburgoh.gov>

 1 attachment (14 MB)

Video.mov;

Dana Bombrys

Executive Assistant

[City of Perrysburg](#)

Administration

201 W. Indiana Ave.

Perrysburg, OH 43551

P: 419.872.8076



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the addressee shown above. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure subject to Ohio public records law. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy, or use it, and do not disclose it to others. Please notify the sender of the delivery error by replying to this message and then delete from your system.

From: Kristen Lucas <kristen.rn.2001@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2026 5:09 PM

To: Perrysburg Mayor <mayor@perrysburgoh.gov>

Subject: Regarding Michel Property Proposal

You don't often get email from kristen.rn.2001@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon Mayor,

My name is Kristen Lucas. My spouse, Michael Aughinbaugh, and I reside at 543 Rutledge Court in Perrysburg with our three children. We purchased our home in 2017 with the intention of remaining in this neighborhood for many years.

I am writing regarding the undeveloped field owned by Michels directly behind my property. We have major concerns about the impact that granting a Special Use approval would have on our family and our surrounding neighbors. There are approximately 30 directly impacted tax-paying neighbors, along with several others who would be indirectly affected by this proposal.

Our neighbor, Jim Friend, attended the meeting during which the original owner provided assurances that the field would remain undeveloped. The subsequent owners, Welded, upheld

those assurances as well. Concerns only began to arise after the property was purchased by Michels, a company headquartered out of state in Wisconsin.

As you are likely aware, the homes surrounding this property are currently valued in the \$400,000–\$500,000 range. Any change that introduces industrial use immediately adjacent to our properties will certainly negatively impact property values and cause financial harm to the families who live here.

The City of Perrysburg Special Use Code 1250.04 clearly states that a special use should not be detrimental to public health, safety, or general welfare, and that approval “shall not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity, nor substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.” Based on the current proposal, we do not believe these standards are being met.

We have a two-story home with windows covering the back of our house. We did not purchase this home to have our privacy taken away or to look out onto a gravel lot filled with stored items, with trucks and tractors constantly going in and out. It is already quite loud even at the current distance when Michels operates their tractors early in the morning and throughout the day, often with bright lights. If Perrysburg does not currently have noise ordinances, they need to institute them. I have attached a video with the current noise level. Imagine if they moved their equipment closer.

This message was sent from an external email address. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

We are requesting that an elevated privacy fence of at least 10 feet in height be installed. The fence should be visually appropriate for a residential neighborhood, not a chain-link fence that would allow residents to look directly into what would essentially become a junk or storage yard. The majority of the homes affected are two-story homes, which increases the impact of visibility into the property.

At a minimum, we are requesting a 60-foot setback from the future fence to be installed by Michels. This would help reduce the financial impact on surrounding homeowners and preserve the privacy and livability that residents of this neighborhood reasonably expect.

There are also environmental concerns that need to be looked into before any moves are made.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael Aughinbaugh and Kristen Lucas

Maughinbaugh78@gmail.com

Kristen.rn.2001@gmail.com

543 Rutledge Court

Perrysburg, Ohio

Thank You,

Kristen Lucas

Fw: Michels Corp.

From Perrysburg Mayor <mayor@perrysburgoh.gov>
Date Wed 3/11/2026 10:49 AM
To Brody Walters <bwalters@perrysburgoh.gov>
Cc Mark Weber <mweber@perrysburgoh.gov>

Please see below.

Dana Bombrys
Executive Assistant

[City of Perrysburg](#)
Administration
201 W. Indiana Ave.
Perrysburg, OH 43551
P: 419.872.8076



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the addressee shown above. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure subject to Ohio public records law. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy, or use it, and do not disclose it to others. Please notify the sender of the delivery error by replying to this message and then delete from your system.

From: Karen Friend <karensfriend@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 10:10 AM
To: Perrysburg Mayor <mayor@perrysburgoh.gov>
Subject: Michels Corp.

[You don't often get email from karensfriend@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Mayor Weber,

We are Jim and Karen Friend and have resided at 535 Rutledge Court since December of 1989.

Our concern about the Special Use approval is due to the impact it would have on our quality of life and the value of our property and that of our neighbors who live on Rutledge Court and South Ridge Drive.

The business owner who preceded Michels had a picnic for the people on our street in the early 1990's as a gesture of good faith and, at that time, stated that he would give us the opportunity to purchase the field if he decided to sell.

That, obviously, was not passed along to Michels.

The rezoning of that parcel of land in 1996 was guided by the assurances that the field and wooded parcel, which was a dedicated wet land in 1989, would be protected.

Possibly, you recall these discussions.

The suggested changes would certainly impact our property values and quality of life.

We are awakened each morning at 6:30 by the Michels's activities. Fortunately, we are early risers, but many of our neighbors have young families.

The wording of Perrysburg Special use code 1250.04 indicates an opposition to the changes being requested by Michels.

We are seeking your support in not allowing the present proposal, knowing the impact it will have on old and new

residents.

We have been Perrysburg residents since 1976 and have never regretted or questioned our move here, until now.

Sincerely,

Karen and Jim Friend

karensfriend@icloud.com

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

This message was sent from an external email address. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.