

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

OCTOBER 29, 2020

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chairman Craig Pickerel. Commission members present were Greg Bade, Andy Lorenz, Mayor Mackin, Gilda Mitchell, Craig Pickerel, and John Wellstein (6). John Stout was absent (1). 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 September 24, 2020 meeting as written. Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: Bade, Lorenz, Mackin, Mitchell, and Pickerel (5). Nays: (0). Abstain: Wellstein (1).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

No report.

Final Plat

Horseshoe Bend Plat 10

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Mr. Brian Gruber
Fort Roach Developers, LLC
3102 Steeple Chase Lane
Perrysburg, OH 43551

REQUEST

Chapter 1295.07 – Final Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Horseshoe Bend is an R-3 residential subdivision originally proposed to consist of 192 lots. This subdivision is located east of Perrysburg High School and south of Roachton Road / Michael Owens Way.

Past activity in this subdivision is as follows:

Plat 1, 22 lots – finalized on December 30, 1999

Plat 2, 12 lots – finalized on July 3, 2001

Plat 3, 16 lots – finalized on July 24, 2002
Plat 4, 15 lots – finalized on June 12, 2003
Plat 5, 14 lots – finalized on October 27, 2003
Plat 6, 11 lots – finalized on August 26, 2004
Plat 7, 14 lots – finalized on June 2, 2005
Plat 8, 14 lots – finalized on October 5, 2005
Plat 9, 19 lots – finalized on September 6, 2006
Plat 11, 12 lots – finalized on January 5, 2018
Plat 12, 17 lots – finalized on December 12, 2018

Plat 10, 24 lots – Preliminary Plat last reapproved on February 27, 2020

BACKGROUND

This is the last remaining Plat for the Horseshoe Bend Subdivision.

ANALYSIS

- Provide Open Space Fee payment (in accordance with equation below)

Open Space Fee Requirement = 7.5% value of 11.9 acres + \$100 per lot.

Notes: Value per acre = \$11,500.00
 Value of 6.433 acres = \$136,850.00

Total Open Space Fee for Plat 10 (24 lots) = 11.9 acres x (\$11,500.00 x 7.5%) =
 \$10,263.75 + \$2,400 (\$100 x 24 lots) for a total of **\$12,663.75.**

Per Chapter 1295.07(d), the following payments or escrows shall be provided to the satisfaction of the City prior to signing the Final Plat of Plat 11:

Estimate of Construction Costs:

• Roadway and Pavement	\$TBD
• Drainage	\$TBD
• Erosion Control	\$TBD
• Waterline	\$TBD
• Sanitary Sewer	\$TBD
• Sidewalks (4'): (8,833.92 sq.ft. @ \$6.00/sq.ft.)	\$53,003.52
• Curb Ramps: (6 @ \$1,000 each)	<u>\$6,000.00</u>

Total Escrows (+ 20%)	\$TBD
------------------------------	--------------

Cash Payment Required:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| • Street Lights: (# @ TBD each) | \$TBD |
| • Street Signs: (# of signs x \$150) | \$TBD |
| • Open Space Fee | \$12,663.75 |

Total Cash Payment	\$TBD
---------------------------	--------------

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Final Plat for Horseshoe Bend Plat 10 with the condition that all escrows and payment items be paid to the City.

Mr. Easterling reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Final Plat for Horseshoe Bend Plat 10. Brian Gruber, Ridgestone Builders & Developers, and Bob Bailey, DGL were present. There were no comments or questions from the Commission nor the public.

Mr. Wellstein moved to approve the Final Plat for Horseshoe Bend Plat 10, subject to the conditions in the report. Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

Zoning Ordinance Review

Chapter 1250.42 – Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings

In June 2020, the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council fielded a complaint from a citizen regarding the enforcement of the fencing portion of the Zoning Code as it pertains to Plant Screenings. Council members then tasked our department with researching neighboring municipalities and how Planting Screens are enforced, as well as having the Planning Commission review the existing Code to see if there are any changes they would like to see made to the existing Code language. I have listed the Code sections below and have highlighted the sections that refer to Plant Screens, as well as the height limitations that would be applied in the chart below.

1250.42 FENCES, WALLS, STRUCTURAL SCREENS, HEDGES AND SCREEN PLANTINGS.

(a) The following regulations shall apply to fences, walls, hedges and screen plantings.

(1) A permit is required for the installation of any fence.

(2) The posts and all other supporting portions of fences shall be placed on the side of the fence facing the interior of the property owner installing the fence.

(3) The height and location of a fence, wall, structural screen, hedge or screen planting shall conform to the style/dimensional chart.

(4) Fences, walls, structural screens, hedges and screen plantings shall include all structures, shrubs, plantings or trees used to separate, enclose, screen or demarcate a boundary.

(5) For fencing purposes the side yard shall consist of the area between the front of the house to the midpoint of the side yard. Any portion of yard between the midpoint of the house and the rear facade of the home shall constitute a rear yard for fencing purposes only.

(6) Fence posts shall not exceed the maximum permitted height of the fence by more than four (4) inches.

(7) The measurement of the height of a fence shall be made from the ground surface at the bottom of the fence.

(8) All fences or screens within the Historic District shall require review and approval by the Historic Landmarks Commission.

(9) Fences or screens six (6) feet or less in height must be installed or maintained at least four (4) inches from property lines. If taller than six (6) feet, a twelve (12) inch setback from property lines shall apply.

(10) Chain-link fencing is prohibited in any front yard.

(11) Barbed wire is prohibited.

(12) Above ground electric fencing is permitted in A-1 districts only.

Location & Maximum Height									
Zoning District	Front Yard			Side Yard			Rear Yard		
	4'	6'	8'	4'	6'	8'	4'	6'	8'
R-1-R-5	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
RM	P	*	*	P	P	*	P	P	Z
A1	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C1	*	*	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C2	P	*	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C3	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C4	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
I1	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	Z
I2	P	Z	*	P	P	Z	P	P	Z
INS	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	Z
OS	P	*	*	P	*	*	P	P	*
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
PBP	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	Z
S1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

It is also important to note that although all sections do not mention Screenings, enforcement would apply to all sections of this Chapter in regard to Plantings and Plant Screens. If the Planning Commission could please review the above Code language to see if there should be changes in regards to Plant Screenings, or if the Code language should remain as written.

Mr. Easterling reviewed the above Staff Report for the Zoning Ordinance Review for Chapter 1250.42 Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings, and added that this review is for the Planning Commission to discuss and entertain the possibility of changes to the Code related to the highlighted portions. Mr. Pickerel asked about a review of other jurisdictions and those findings, and Mr. Easterling added that there was a mixture amongst other municipalities, and that the City of Maumee enforces the Code the same as we do. He added that there was nothing consistent across the board, and clarified that this review is related to growth of screenings beyond six (6) feet. There was a brief discussion about the requirements of highlighted portion #9, and Mr. Pickerel added that it needs to be clarified. Mr. Bade added that the City cannot continue to change the Code to accommodate residents. Mr. Lorenz asked if there have been a lot of complaints over the years, and Mr. Walters said that it's a unique complaint from an installer that has four or five customers that have been affected. There was a brief discussion about the intention of the screenings in terms of a "fence" and enforcement of the Code. Mr. Wellstein stated that there are a small number of complaints, and that the Code addresses this issue appropriately. Mr. Walters noted that this proposal is an examination of the current Code. There was a brief discussion about permitted fencing heights.

Mr. Wellstein made a recommendation to deny the proposed Zoning Ordinance Review for Chapter 1250.42 Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings. Seconded by Mr. Bade. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

Code Amendment

Chapter 1250.48(a)(2) – Exterior Wall Materials Standards by Zoning District

I have been approached by a building owner (Mr. David Kienzle) regarding the possibility of reexamining the use of metal panels on buildings in certain zoning districts within the city. Currently Ch. 1250.48 provides a chart that is used to determine the maximum amount/percentage of several common building materials that can be used on new or existing structures. Currently there are several categories including: Masonry/Stone, Metal, Glass, Wood and Finishes. Most of these categories feature subcategories which further categorize specific materials or methods. Although the current code identifies "metal" as a building material there is not currently a subsection that allows for the differentiation of different types of metal. In fact, the code uses the wording of "flat sheets, seamed or ribbed panels" and this description would seemingly encompass almost every type of known metal building material.

The request before you is to consider a more specific break down of metal building products and then to reexamine which zoning districts each specific material may be appropriately used. It is clear to me that since 2006/2009 when the code was written and subsequently amended there have been significant advancements in building materials. Products exist now that did not previously exist and some previously existing products have been noticeably improved. While I am not entirely sure how to best classify this type of building materials into smaller subcategories I would imagine that attributes such as gauge, finish, texture, reflectivity, durability and overall aesthetics would play an important role. I would also anticipate that the commission and myself would need to spend some time researching specific products and manufacturers to understand what differentiates high quality materials from low quality ones.

Generally speaking I am open to allowing high quality metal products to be used in appropriate percentages and in appropriate locations as I do believe they can add visual interest to structures by providing additional texture, color and patterns. Overall, it is recognized that this process may take some time to work through and may or may not work out for Mr. Kienzle's specific timeline but nevertheless it is a worthy consideration that would not only update the zoning code but could provide additional options for current and future structures. I have provided a copy of the current building material chart on the next page:

- (a) Architectural plans for buildings shall be submitted simultaneously with an application for site plan review. Documentation to be submitted shall include building elevations showing the building's design and exterior materials and any other information as deemed necessary to make a determination. Detailed information relating to any lighting or signage on the structure shall be provided, including backlit material or accent lighting. The architectural design shall be in accordance with the standards as contained in this Chapter.
- (1) The table below outlines maximum amount of exterior wall material types by zoning district. These standards do not supersede similar provisions referenced in specific zoning districts or overlay districts and do not supersede requirements imposed by an ARC or the Historic Landmarks Commission. (Ord. 152-2007. Passed 10-2-07.
- (2) Maximum allowable wall materials permitted by zoning district shall consist of:

Wall Materials	Commercial				Office	Industrial		Special		Institu- tional
	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	OS	I-1	I-2	PBP	P	INS
	Maximum % of Wall Coverage									
Masonry/Stone										
Face Brick	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Split Faced or Ribbed Block	50	50	75	75	25	100	100	75	75	75
Stone	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Precast Concrete	0	0	0	0	25	75	75	75	50	75
Concrete Formed In Place	25	25	25	25	25	75	75	50	50	50

Metal										
Flat Sheets, Seamed or Rib Panels	0	0	0	0	0	75	75	0	0	0
Glass										
Tinted or Reflective	25	25	75	75	75	75	75	75	50	75
Glass Block	25	25	25	25	75	75	75	50	50	50
Wood	50	50	50	50	75	75	75	50	100	100
Wood Siding										
Finishes										
EIFS System	25	25	50	50	50	75	75	75	50	50
Cement	25	25	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Plaster	25	25	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Stucco	25	25	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Vinyl/Cement Fiber Board	25	25	50	50	100	50	50	50	100	100

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the proposed Code Amendment to Chapter 1250.48(a)(2) Exterior Wall Materials Standards by Zoning District, and presented a brochure from a company that has completed many projects in the City. Mike Muse, The Collaborative, was present via AT Teleconference to speak on the proposed Code Amendment request, on behalf of Dave Kienzle, Shoppes at River Place. Mr. Muse added that this is an appropriate time to have the conversation around the finishes and broader context with expansion and growth, with regards to other materials that could be explored. Mr. Bade noted that these metal materials have been used along the way, and that he defers to the Administration for the allowable percentage. Mr. Lorenz confirmed that the Yark Dealership was approved for these materials and added that it makes sense to amend the Code. Mayor Mackin said that he has a concern with quality and percentage issues, and the effort to maintain consistency with high quality structures. Mr. Wellstein asked if there was a way to classify metals, and Mr. Walters said that a sub-category and a definition could be added to the Code. Mr. Wellstein agreed to allow certain percentages within the zoning classifications, and added that the City might want to research other municipalities Codes. Ms. Mitchell agreed with the discussion of the Commission, and agreed with Mayor Mackin with regards to the quality of the metal panels. Mr. Walters said that he will bring this Code Amendment back to the next meeting with a revised chart, definition, and proposed changes for the Commission to review. Mr. Wellstein stated that it would be helpful to go back to the existing structures of Yark, Costco, and Wendy's to determine the metal material percentages used. There was a brief discussion about the characteristics of SR 25 and the Corridor Overlay, and Mr. Bade noted that the chart may want to also evaluate different facades (rear vs. front). Mr. Pickerel said that there are a lot of benefits to utilizing the architectural metal panels, and confirmed that Mr. Walters will present ideas and follow-up with this Code Amendment at the December 10, 2020 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro