

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

DECEMBER 10, 2020

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Craig Pickerel. Commission members present were Greg Bade, Andy Lorenz, Mayor Mackin, Gilda Mitchell, Craig Pickerel, and John Wellstein (6). Also present were Brody Walters, Planning and Zoning Administrator, and Mark Easterling, Deputy Planning and Zoning Administrator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pickerel moved to approve the minutes of the October 29, 2020 meeting as written. Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

No report.

Final Plat Summerfield Townhomes (R-5)

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Mr. Steve Mitchell
MB Investments, Inc.
3150 Republic Blvd. Suite 3
Toledo, OH 43615

Feller Finch and Associates, Inc.
1683 Woodlands Drive
P.O. Box 68
Maumee, OH

REQUEST

Chapter 1295.07 – Final Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Summerfield Townhomes is an R-5 (Two-Family) residential subdivision proposed to consist of 39 lots total. This subdivision is east of the Summerfield (Single Family) Subdivision located on the north side of Five Point Road between SR 25 and Fort Meigs Road. The entire subdivision is approximately 17.157 acres.

BACKGROUND

The current version of the Preliminary Plat of Summerfield Townhomes was approved by the Planning Commission on January 21, 2019 and is still active until January 21, 2021.

ANALYSIS

The plat layout for Summerfield Townhomes is compliant with the Preliminary Plat that is currently active for this area. The number of lots, street layout and arrangement of lots is the same as originally proposed within the subdivision Preliminary Plat. All lots shown meet the minimum depth to width ratio with the exception of Lots 2, 3 and 22 (due to being on the outside of a curve). In addition, lots 1-4 and 22-24 each have frontages less than the minimum 90' requirement, but according to the Preliminary Plat, lots will meet the minimum at the building line. All other lots conform to all necessary dimensional requirements.

Open Space Requirement = There are three ways to satisfy the Open Space Requirement for subdivision development. The first option is to provide 5% of the area of the subdivision as Open Space (cannot include detention/retention areas). The second option is to provide a cash in-lieu payment in an amount equal to 7.5% of the value of the undeveloped land, and the third option is to dedicate an equivalent amount of land (5%) elsewhere in the City. Per the layout of this Plat the developers will be required to provide a payment for 7.5% of the value of the undeveloped land. A recent appraisal (within the last 5 years) will be required to determine the value of this property.

Per Chapter 1295.07(d), the following escrows and fees attached to this report shall be provided to the satisfaction of the city prior to releasing the signed copy of the final plat:

ESCROWS

Roadway & Pavement
Drainage
Erosion Control
Waterline
Sanitary Sewer
Sidewalks
Curb Ramps

PAYMENT ITEMS

Street Signs
Street Lights
Open Space Fee

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Final Plat for Summerfield Townhomes subject to the comments and recommendations in this report including the deposit of escrows, and payment of other fees as required.

Mr. Easterling reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Final Plat for Summerfield Townhomes. Austin McDonald, FellerFinch, was present on behalf of the application and added that they agree with the recommendations in this report. There were no comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Mr. Lorenz moved to approve the Final Plat for Summerfield Townhomes, subject to the conditions in the report. Seconded by Mr. Wellstein. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

Final Site Plan Amendment & Special Approval Use Rotary Community Park Masterplan – Inclusive Playground

In an effort to efficiently provide you information for the proposed Site Plan Amendment to the Rotary Community Park Masterplan I have compiled the attached documents for your review. Included with this memo you will find:

1. The original Staff Report for the current Masterplan submitted and reviewed at the September 25, 2008 meeting of the Perrysburg Planning Commission.
2. The original Masterplan/Site Plan for the Park (2008).
3. A recently updated Masterplan showing the current arrangement of features on site as well as a proposed park pavilion featuring restroom facilities (dated 5-19-19) that was submitted as part of the Rotary's proposal for the recently constructed pavilion.
4. A new 2020 revision showing an Inclusive Playground.

Rotary Community Park has been in design since at least 2008. Over time and as the needs of the community have changed different features and amenities have been added or changed inside the park. Due to the somewhat open-ended and undocumented changes to the park since this time Rotary Community Park looks and functions slightly different today than was envisioned at its inception. This newest request for a Masterplan/Site Plan Amendment reflects the changes that have been made since 2008 (including the recent 2020 pavilion construction) and also provides a revised plan for how the remainder of the park will develop into the future. This most recent amendment is being sought to update the current park by providing an Inclusive Playground. This project previously received a Special Approval Use (SAU) in early 2009 and again in 2019 and due to the proposed changes the new plan must be reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the relevant Special Approval Use criteria per Ch. 1235.04(cc) – Parks, Parkways and Non-Commercial Recreational Facilities.

Due to the extent of development that has already occurred within this park it is not necessary to conduct a full review of the site features at this time. The only two aspects of both the current and proposed Site Plan is that the parking lot is non-compliant (landscape island spacing & quantity) and the sidewalk does not currently run through the apron of the driveway. Aside from these two deficiencies the site is otherwise in compliance. In order to facilitate the new request for Special Approval Use, I have provided the requirements below:

(cc) Parks, Parkways and Non-Commercial Recreational Facilities:

1. Parks, parkways and recreation facilities shall be subject to Site Plan Review to assure compatibility with residential areas.
2. Any such use shall be so located and developed so as not to create a nuisance to abutting property, and so as to be neither injurious to the surrounding neighborhood nor contrary to the spirit and purpose of this Zoning Code.
3. The development of parks, parkways or recreational facilities on waterfront sites shall be so developed as not to create visual barriers to other residential waterfront property or in any way restrict the use of residential waterfront property.
4. Any use of land created by filling of water areas for parks and/or recreational use shall only be allowed upon the issuance of a permit by the City. Such permit shall be issued only if it can be shown that such

filling of water areas will not in any way obstruct the view or hinder access to open water or which could in any way create any hazard to health or in any other way diminish the amenity enjoyed by land abutting the water area.

5. No building or outdoor storage area should be closer than fifty (50) feet to any property or street right-of-way line.
6. Facilities shall provide off-street parking and passenger loading areas at least twenty-five (25) feet from residential lot lines.
7. All sports fields shall be a minimum of one hundred (100) feet from any lot line and two hundred (200) feet from any dwelling.
8. All buildings shall be harmonious in appearance with the surrounding area and shall be similar in design and appearance to other buildings on the same development site.
9. Lighting of outdoor activities shall be shielded from adjacent residential areas.
10. After review, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation to the City Council. City Council shall hold a Public Hearing with respect to the proposed use, in accordance with the same procedures as provided for in Chapter 1285, shall review and decide whether or not the use will be permitted in accordance with the criteria of this Zoning Code and the procedures of Chapter 1285.

After reviewing all the details of this proposed amendment it is my recommendation to approve the proposed Masterplan/Site Plan Amendment with the following conditions:

1. The Masterplan be updated to reflect the athletic fields that were part of the Rotary's 2019 submission (with the exception of the proposed athletic field located north of the tennis courts due to not meeting the minimum setback requirement from houses and property lines.)
2. A sidewalk be installed through the driveway at the time the next major asphalt work is done to this driveway and parking lot.
3. Parking lot landscaping be increased to meet the landscape requirements of the code, namely quantity and spacing (1 island per each 10 spaces to create a parking lot with at least 6% of landscape coverage), unless the Planning Commission modifies this requirement.

Additionally, it is recommended that a public hearing be set before City Council on January 19, 2021 at 6:15 p.m.

Anticipated Timeline:

December 10, 2020 – Planning Commission Recommendation

January 19, 2021 – Public Hearing

February 10, 2021 – PZ Committee Recommendation

February 16, 2021 – City Council Final Vote

***Preliminary Master Plan
Preliminary & Final Site Plan Review and Special Approval Use
Fort Meigs Road***

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Rotary Club of Perrysburg:

Jeff Normand, President

Rick Thielen, Director-Community Service

Greg Archambeau and Jim Euting, Rotary Park Co-Chairs

Normand Associates, Inc.

Architects / Planners

885 Commerce Drive

Perrysburg, Ohio

REQUEST

Chapter 1210.02 – Area of Jurisdiction

Chapter 1210.11 – Regulations Applicable to Municipal Property

Chapter 1260 – Site Plan Review

Chapter 1235.04(cc) – Special Approval Use - Parks, Parkways and Recreational Facilities

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located off Fort Meigs Road, south of Eckel Junction Road, across from the existing Rivercrest Park and south of the existing YMCA. To the rear of the property is the CSX Railroad right-of-way. Adjacent to the proposed entrance to the park from Fort Meigs Road is currently residential property zoned R1 Perrysburg Township (annexation required per approved Perrysburg Municipal Utility Overlay). To the northwest of the subject property is residential properties zoned R3 (Residential City of Perrysburg). To the south of the subject site is the I-475/US 23 overpass /expressway.

The subject property is zoned P (Park) consisting of approximately 20.453 acres.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is vacant with the exception of an existing telecommunications facility consisting of an existing 135' monopole structure located in the southeast corner of the subject property, adjacent to the CSX railroad right-of-way (location is not included on plans as submitted).

The Rotary Club of Perrysburg has included the proposed Rotary Park project in its Community Service agenda for a number of years and has raised significant funds for the project.

The overall project includes two ball diamond facilities, six foot wide walking paths, restroom and maintenance buildings, roller hockey and basketball courts, five tennis courts, six smaller soccer fields that could be converted into three full-size soccer fields, new outdoor water park and off-street parking for 185 spaces.

Phase 1 will include the entry drive and 108 off-street parking spaces, walking paths and five tennis courts.

ANALYSIS

- **Zoning:** The current zoning for the subject property is P (Park), consistent with the proposed use as a park.

Per Chapter 1210.11, a Special Approval Use is required. Chapter 1235.04(cc) - Parks, Parkways and Recreational Facilities requires review and consideration including the following criteria and review and approval by City Council per a required public hearing.

1235.04 (cc)

(cc) Parks, Parkways and Recreational Facilities:

(1) Parks, parkways and recreation facilities shall be subject to site plan review to assure compatibility with residential areas.

(2) Any such use shall be so located and developed so as not to create a nuisance to abutting property, and so as to be neither injurious to the surrounding neighborhood nor contrary to the spirit and purpose of this Zoning Code.

(3) The development of parks, parkways or recreational facilities on waterfront sites shall be so developed as not to create visual barriers to other residential waterfront property or in any way restrict the use of residential waterfront property.

(4) Any use of land created by filling of water areas for parks and/or recreational use shall only be allowed upon the issuance of a permit by the City. Such permit shall be issued only if it can be shown that such filling of water areas will not in any way obstruct the view or hinder access to open water or which could in any way create any hazard to health or in any other way diminish the amenity enjoyed by land abutting the water area.

(Ord. 186-2006. Passed 8-1-06.)

(5) No building or outdoor storage area should be closer than fifty (50) feet to any property or street right-of-way line.

(6) Facilities shall provide off-street parking and passenger loading areas at least twenty- five (25) feet from residential lot lines.

(7) All sports fields shall be a minimum of one hundred (100) feet from any lot line and two hundred (200) feet from any dwelling.

(8) All buildings shall be harmonious in appearance with the surrounding area and shall be similar in design and appearance to other buildings on the same development site.

(9) Lighting of outdoor activities shall be shielded from adjacent residential areas.

(10) After review, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation to the City Council. City Council shall hold a public hearing with respect to the proposed use, in accordance with the same procedures as provided for in Chapter [1285](#), shall review and decide whether or not the use will be permitted in accordance with the criteria of this Zoning Code and the procedures of Chapter [1285](#).

The above items #1 - #10 shall be addressed individually throughout this review.

- **Site Layout:** The applicant proposes the following:
 1. Approximate 20' x 30' maintenance building (Phase 1).
 2. Two, 200' outfield ball diamonds (Phase 2).
 3. A number of 6' wide walking paths that connects through the YMCA "grass area" to the north, ultimately to Eckel Junction Road existing sidewalk. Also, there is a proposed connection through ODOT right-of-way to the south, also ultimately connecting to Fort Meigs Road existing sidewalk (Phase 1).
 4. Approximate 50' x 100' restroom building facilities (Phase 2).
 5. Three roller hockey / basketball courts (Phase 2).
 6. Six, 130' x 185' smaller soccer fields that can be converted to three full size soccer fields for tournament play (Phase 2).
 7. Five, 36' x 80' tennis courts (Phase 1).
 8. 185 off-street parking spaces (108 spaces in Phase 1).
 9. Entrance drive (Phase 1).
 10. New outdoor waterpark (Phase 2).

Per Code, no building or outdoor storage area shall be closer than fifty (50) feet to any property or street right-of-way line.

Per Code, off-street parking spaces shall be 10' x 20' each and be located at least twenty-five (25) feet from residential lot lines.

Per Code, all sports fields shall be a minimum of one hundred (100) feet from any lot line and two hundred (200) feet from any dwelling.

As shown, the proposed off-street parking area is to be connected to the existing parking lot of the YMCA. Also, as shown, there appears to be "additional" parking and a second entrance/exit from the east side of the YMCA onto Eckel Junction Road.

This review does not support a second ingress/egress from the YMCA to Eckel Junction Road. One concern is that an additional ingress/egress would potentially provide an “easier” access to Eckel Junction Road, from Fort Meigs Road – avoiding the intersection.

As not shown, there is no reference on the Master Plan or Phase 1 Site Plan of the existing telecommunications facility consisting of any existing 135’ monopole structure.

Vehicle access will be required to service the existing telecommunication facility.

All existing and proposed utility lines such as electric, telephone, CATV or other similar lines shall be installed underground. This requirement shall apply to lines serving the subject site as well as to utility lines necessary within the project.

The proposed entrance shall be coordinated with the City’s continued plans to upgrade / improve Fort Meigs Road as currently under construction south of Coe Court.

The applicant in coordination with the City, shall coordinate development/improvement within the existing Gas Easement.

- **Storm Water, Water and Sanitary Sewer:** The subject site is served by City of Perrysburg water and sanitary sewer. **Storm water, water and sanitary sewer connections will be required to be coordinated with the City of Perrysburg.**
- **General Engineering:** The applicant shall submit and obtain City of Perrysburg engineering approvals for site civil construction plans including pavement and drainage, water, storm and sanitary sewer prior to a zoning permit being issued. A zoning permit is required prior to Wood County issuing a building permit.
- **Building Design:** Building elevations are required to satisfy the requirements of the Final Site Plan review. Elevations have not been provided.

Per Code, mechanical equipment, whether ground level or rooftop shall be shielded and screened from public view and designed to be perceived as an integral part of each building.

Per Code, All buildings shall be harmonious in appearance with the surrounding area and shall be similar in design and appearance to other buildings on the same development site.

- **Landscaping:** As shown, there appears to be mounding along Fort Meigs Road property line separating the outdoor water park area and Fort Meigs Road and the adjacent residential property.

As shown, there are “tree plantings” proposed throughout the development site. **A detailed landscape plan is required to satisfy the requirements of the Final Site Plan review.** A detailed landscape plan was not submitted.

Street trees, 2 ½” minimum caliper, planted 30 feet on center shall be planted along Fort Meigs Road. A street tree plan shall be submitted to the City Street Tree Commission for review and approval.

Parking lot landscaping shall be in conformance with Chapter 1250.16 – Parking Lot Landscaping.

As shown, the applicant proposes landscaping outside the subject property, on YMCA property to the east of the existing YMCA facility. Additional explanation shall be required.

- **Signage:** Signage should be designed as a coordinated and complementary architectural element of the development. **A detailed signage plan shall be required as part of the Final Site Plan review.** Signage was not submitted.

- **Sidewalks:** There is an existing sidewalk along Fort Meigs Road on the east side. **The concrete sidewalk shall continue through the proposed entrance driveway.** As shown, there is a six (6) foot wide walking path that circles the perimeter of the subject site. It also appropriately connects various interior uses as well as, Fort Meigs Road and Eckel Junction Road. **ODOT will need to review and approve the proposed walking path in ODOT right-of-way.**

- **Lighting:** **All exterior lighting of outdoor activities shall not cause interference with the abutting residential properties.**

- **Impact Assessment:** The subject property is without any natural or man-made features. The property is located within Flood Zone X Area. Zone X is defined as “areas determined to be outside 500-year flood plan.” The development will be served by City of Perrysburg police, fire and emergency services. The subject development will use City water and sanitary services. By the nature of the proposed development, there will be no affect on Perrysburg Schools. The site plan has been submitted for review and recommendation to the consulting engineer currently contracted for the design and development of the Fort Meigs Road construction / improvement. The purpose is to advise the City as to the potential level of service for traffic flow in this location with regard peak hour and daily directional trips.

Approval of the Preliminary Site Plan is valid for a period of six (6) months. If a Final Site Plan for the proposed development or any phase of the

development has not been submitted during that period, the approval of the Preliminary Site Plan shall be null and void.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning, Zoning and Economic Development Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Site Plan / Phase 1 and the Special Approval Use for Perrysburg Rotary Community Park, subject to the comments and recommendations set forth in this report including modifications proposed by the Planning Commission.

Further, it is recommended that a public hearing for the Special Approval Use be set before City Council for November 18, 2008 at 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Final Site Plan Amendment and Special Approval Use for Rotary Community Park Masterplan – Inclusive Playground. Mr. Walters noted that this application is a revision to the Masterplan from 2019 and a consideration of a new Special Approval Use. Ryan Wichman, Wood County Plays, was present on behalf of the application. Mayor Mackin asked about the requirement regarding the trees in the parking lot based on the recommendation, and Mr. Walters stated that in 2019 Rotary Club felt that the donation of the Pavilion to the Park did not warrant an update to the parking lot landscaping. Mr. Wichman stated that they are continuing fundraising efforts, and that their goal is \$760,000.00 and that they are about ninety-one (91) percent of the way there. There was a brief discussion about setbacks with regards to the athletic fields on the revised site plan. Mr. Wellstein and Mr. Bade shared their concerns with regards to the landscaping in the parking lot, and Mayor Makin stated that the landscaping shouldn't impede the Inclusive Playground project, as the City has a vested interest in the Park. Jeff Hagedorn, 13301 Eckel Junction Road, stated that he lives nearby and asked if there is a plan for lighting, as the tennis court lights are very bright. Mr. Wichman confirmed that there is not a plan for lighting, and there was a brief discussion about the "fall height" and how thick the rubber needs to be for safety. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Mr. Wellstein moved to approve the Final Site Plan Amendment and Special Approval Use for Rotary Community Park Masterplan – Inclusive Playground with the condition that City Administration commit to bringing the parking lot up to Code, and that a Public Hearing be set for January 19, 2021. Seconded by Ms. Mitchell. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

***Preliminary & Final Site Plan
Lakeside Interior Contractors
26970 Eckel Road***

Project Name: Lakeside Interior Contractors - Final Site Plan

Location: 26970 Eckel Rd.

Zoning: I-2 (General Industrial)

Applicant(s): Shane Huntley, Poggemeyer Design Group (Bowling Green, OH)

Land Use: Sale & Storage of Building Materials

Parcel(s): Q61-400-070301009000

Request: Preliminary and Final Site Plan Review

Land Use		Permitted	Special Approval	Not Permitted
1225.08	Land Use Type	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			
1230.03(b)	Features above max height (exemptions)			
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)			
1250.11(a)(3)	Planting Schedule	x		
1250.13(g)	Tree size (8' height, 2 1/2" 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)			
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 impeded 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:

1. Sheet L1.01 provides a calculation for the amount/percentage of landscape shown on the site, however, while the parking lot meets the minimum percentages, the overall site does not meet the minimum 10%. The plan shows approximately 11,151 SF in overall site landscaping. The amount of landscaping shown on the plan accounts for only 60% of the required on-site landscaping.
2. The overall length of the rear of the building is just under 150'. The Code requires that buildings that exceed 100' in length must utilize recesses and projections to help reduce the perceived size and scale of larger buildings. Both the length of the building and roofline remain constant throughout the rear, but has low impact on the overall visual of the building as every façade visible from the street meets or exceeds the minimum requirement.
3. The site plan does not indicate any trash receptacle on site. If no exterior trash facilities are provided this requirement would be met but in the event that an exterior trash facility is planned further information would be required regarding the location and construction methods of the enclosure.

Recommendation:

The Planning & Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends conditional approval based on the re-submittal of an updated Landscape Plan and Site Plan showing the following two changes:

1. Satisfy the minimum overall Site Landscaping percentage (18,295 SF).
2. Show sidewalk connecting the public walk to the front door.

Mr. Easterling reviewed the above Staff Report for Lakeside Interior Contractors at 26970 Eckel Road, and added that this review is essentially an upgrade to the parking lots. Shane Huntley, Poggemeyer Design Group, and Matt Homier, Lakeside Interior Contractors, were present on behalf of the application. Mr. Homier stated that the additional landscaping requirement seems a bit excessive, and added that they are asking for relief with regards to the landscape percentage and public sidewalk. Mr. Easterling noted that the parking lot landscape requirement and overall site landscape requirement are two different calculations. Mr. Bade asked for clarification of both of the landscape calculations, and Mr. Huntley stated that the six (6) percent parking lot requirement is 3,028 SF and that they have proposed to exceed that requirement with 4,330 SF. Mr. Huntley added that the overall site landscaping requirement provided on the site plan is 11,151 SF. Mr. Easterling clarified that the overall site landscaping requirement for Lakeside Interior Contractors is 18,295 SF. There was a brief discussion about existing and new landscaping, and Mr. Huntley added that they are adding 3 trees near the rear detention pond. Mr. Bade added that he can be flexible with calculations, but 7,000 SF is deficient as Lakeside is updating the building to the new Code. There

was a brief discussion about the required public sidewalk compared to other recent and nearby site plans in the area, like Wimsatt, Mayle Law, and Yark Chevy, and Mr. Bade stated that the Commission has not been very lenient with relief of the public sidewalks in the past. Mr. Walters noted that the Commission can evaluate when pedestrian access is expected. Mr. Wellstein and Ms. Mitchell agreed that they are in favor of the public sidewalk requirement. Mayor Mackin stated that more landscaping is better, as it improves the property and it's not an unreasonable difference. Mr. Wellstein confirmed that the trash is outdoors, and there was a brief discussion about the dumpster enclosure requirement to be screened with fencing around the perimeter of the enclosure. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Mr. Bade moved to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan for Lakeside Interior Contractors at 26970 Eckel Road, subject to the meeting the following conditions:

1. Show sidewalk connecting the public walk to the front door.
2. Provide 3,500 SF additional Overall Site Landscaping in an effort to provide relief to the applicant.
3. Provide a dumpster screen as discussed in this meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: Bade, Lorenz, Mackin, Pickerel, and Wellstein (5).
Nays: Mitchell (1).

Code Amendment – Wall Materials – Metal Panels
Chapter 1215.02(111.01)
Chapter 1215.02(111.02)
Chapter 1250.48(2)

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Planning & Zoning Division
City of Perrysburg
201 W. Indiana Ave.
Perrysburg, OH 43551

REQUEST

Chapter 1285 – Changes and Amendments
Chapter 1215.02(111.01) – Metal Panels
Chapter 1215.02(111.02) – Metal Panels (Architectural)
Chapter 1250.48(2) – Exterior Wall Materials Standards by Zoning District

DESCRIPTION

This Code Amendment seeks to define/classify metal building panels into one of two categories. The current code language defines metal panels as simply “flat sheets, seamed or ribbed panels” and the case has been made that there are defining characteristics of metal building products that may be more appropriate to acknowledge that these relatively simple attributes. The end purpose of this proposed Amendment would be to create a hierarchy of metal products so that the higher quality forms of metal panels may be used in a larger percentage than the lower quality versions of metal panels. For the purposes of this Code Amendment the two categories of metal will be referred to as “architectural metal panels” and “metal panels”.

BACKGROUND

The categories of building materials found in Ch. 1250.48 was originally adopted in 2006 and has not gone through any significant update since that time. Since 2006 there have been some significant advancements in building materials. Products exist now that did not previously exist and some previously existing products have been noticeably improved. Additionally, the energy portion of the building code, including LEED certification has continued to demand more efficiency. Some forms of metal panels are very important to meeting some of these energy demands. Metal wall panels are an increasingly popular choice for exterior wall skins due to their versatility and range of profiles, colors, and design possibilities.

ANALYSIS

Existing Code Language

1250.48 Exterior Wall Materials Standards by Zoning District

Maximum % of Wall Cover

	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	OS	I-1	I-2	PBP	P	INS
METAL										
Metal Panels	0	0	0	0	0	75	75	0	0	0

Proposed Code Language

1215.02(111.01) Metal Panels

Standard metal panels are typically constructed from powder coated steel or aluminum. Typically featuring a thin, single-skin design with limited material profiles, and/or exposed fasteners. These panels are generally considered a more economical and lower quality option to architectural metal panels.

1215.02(111.02) Metal Panels (Architectural)

Architectural metal panels are similar to standard metal panels but have design characteristics that make them higher quality, more durable and more visually interesting. These architectural panels are categorized by features such as: higher R-values due to insulation, hidden fastener systems, material thickness (gauge), the panel profile, engineered interlocking design and the inherent composition of the metal (such as copper, aluminum, stainless steel or composite based materials).

1250.48(2) Exterior Wall Materials Standards by Zoning District

Maximum % of Wall Cover

	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	OS	I-1	I-2	PBP	P	INS
METAL										
Metal Panels	0	0	0	0	0	75	75	0	0	0
Metal Panels (Architectural)	10	10	30	30	25	75	75	50	0	30

RECOMMENDATION

No recommendation provided.

Further, it is recommended that a Public Hearing be set before City Council for January 19, 2021 at 6:25 p.m.

Anticipated Timeline:

December 10, 2020 – Planning Commission Recommendation

January 19, 2021 – Public Hearing

February 10, 2021 – PZ Committee Recommendation

February 16, 2021 – City Council Final Vote

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the proposed Code Amendment – Wall Materials – Metal Panels to Chapter 1215.02(111.01), Chapter 1215.02(111.02), and Chapter 1250.48(2). Mr. Walters added that this proposal was brought forth by Dave Kienzle, The Shoppes at River Place, and Mr. Walters read an email from Mr. Kienzle to the Commission. Mr. Walters added that this proposed Code Amendment doesn't guarantee future project approval for Mr. Kienzle. Mr. Walters clarified that Mr. Kienzle was asking if the City would consider thirty (30) percent of a storefront material change. There was a brief discussion on out-lots and parcels within the Corridor Overlay. Mr. Lorenz asked Mr. Walters if he had looked at other communities regarding this proposal, and Mayor Mackin added that it would be beneficial to find out the percentage of this proposal in other municipalities. There was a brief discussion about Planned Business Parks (PBP) and Mr. Walters clarified that PBP's have their own development standards, and that he's looking to provide as much flexibility with exterior wall materials as possible. Mr. Pickerel asked about the primary façade of a building compared to the wall coverage of the entire building, and Mr. Walters added that this material change would

allow for one (1) front loading façade to be comprised of metal panels within the Corridor Overlay. Mr. Bade agreed that he would prefer another review of this Code Amendment with a look at other municipalities, and that the primary façade be defined. There was a brief discussion amongst the Commission about parameters regarding this proposal. Mr. Walters agreed to bring forth a fresh application to the Commission for the January 28, 2021 meeting, and the Commission agreed to hold off on a decision until that meeting.

Zoning Ordinance Review

Chapter 1250.58(c)

Swimming Pools, Detention Ponds and Water Gardens

Swimming Pool Setback Requirements

At the November meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council there was discussion regarding the current setback requirements for swimming pools. The discussion was initiated by two situations involving residents that are currently on notice about violating the required pool setback requirements for their newly installed pools. One resident self-performed their own pool installation which resulted in the above ground pool (which is partially buried) being only 12' from the side property line. The second resident hired a pool company to install an in-ground pool and that company did not install the pool consistent with the permit that was issued, resulting in a setback of 11' from the side property line. In both of these scenarios a permit was requested and issued but not complied with.

Several years ago a Code Amendment was initiated by the Planning and Zoning office to reduce the required setback for pools from 20' with the possibility of a variance (water's edge to the property line) to 15' without the possibility of a variance. The Amendment was supported due to a high volume of cases coming before the BZA for 1' - 3' setback relief. It was determined that this additional 5' was reasonable and would have accommodated nearly all previous setback issues that were presented to the BZA. Furthermore, the Planning Commission and City Council took the position that the additional 5' flexibility was in essence the equivalent of the BZA relief and felt justified not to allow additional relief beyond the newly established 15' requirement.

The current applicable code section reads as follows:

(c) Location of Swimming Pools: Swimming pools, whirlpools, hot tubs or similar features shall be permitted in the rear yard or within the side yard if a variance is approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals (refer to definition of "lot, a corner" and "yards" in Section 1215.02). In all cases, swimming pools shall maintain a minimum setback of five (5) feet from a property line to any deck or patio and of fifteen (15) feet to the water's edge. In all cases, whirlpools, hot tubs or similar features shall maintain a minimum setback of five (5) feet from any property line. The allowable distance from a residence to the above features is subject to any applicable building codes. No such structures may be placed within recorded easements for any purpose.

(Ord. 7-2017. Passed 1-17-17.)

The task of the Planning Commission is to review the current (above) code requirement to see if any changes are warranted. While this request was prompted by two specific examples it is important to understand that any recommended changes would apply to all swimming pool issues going forward.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Zoning Ordinance Review of Chapter 1250.58(c) – Swimming Pool Setback Requirements, and added that he will report back to the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council at their January 2021 meeting with the Commission’s decision tonight. Mr. Wellstein asked when the last Code Amendment came through with this Chapter, and Mayor Mackin said that it’s been within the last ten years. There was a brief discussion about how many pools are affected per year, and Mr. Wellstein asked how the two current pool issues arose. Mr. Walters stated that one pool was installed incorrectly by the contractor, and the other pool was installed incorrectly by the homeowners. Mr. Wellstein said that he’s not sure that the Code needs to be adjusted, and Mr. Walters noted that Planning and Zoning staff are willing to complete a pre-inspection at the property before a permit is issued and work begins to aide in the correct placement of pools within the City. Mayor Mackin added that in the practical sense the appeal process is hard to turn down, and that he is concerned with a ten (10) foot leniency, and Mr. Wellstein agreed. Mr. Pickerel noted the current Code language with regards to a hot tub, and Mr. Bade said that neighboring drainage complaints are real, and that the Code is already lenient with plenty of chances to remedy the installation of a pool. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Mr. Wellstein moved to recommend to Planning and Zoning Committee of Council that no changes be made to the existing Code regarding the Zoning Ordinance Review of Chapter 1250.58(c) – Swimming Pool Setback Requirements. Seconded by Mr. Bade. Ayes: Bade, Mackin, Mitchell, Pickerel, and Wellstein (5). Nays: (0).

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro