

PLANNING COMMISSION

SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Chris Carry. Commission members present were: Chris Carry, Byron Choka, Tom Forquer, Seth Hudson, Eric Nicely, Mayor Olmstead and Therese Witt (7). Also present was Brody Walters, Planning and Zoning Administrator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 27, 2015 MEETING

Ms. Witt noted that on page 2 of the minutes of the August 27, 2015 meeting it states she and Mr. Forquer voted Aye on the Preliminary Plat Extension for the Hawthorne Subdivision but they voted Nay. Mr. Forquer moved to approve the minutes of the August 27, 2015 meeting as amended. Mr. Hudson seconded and they were unanimously approved.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mr. Walters said that he will be providing a proposed Code Amendment related to the Definitions section of the Code to Commission members. He said that it will be sent separate from the packet for the meeting to allow extra time for review.

Preliminary Site Plan Perrysburg Schools Roachton and Hull Prairie Roads

Dave Serra of the Collaborative and Tom Hosler, Superintendent of Perrysburg Schools, were present. Mr. Serra stated that as they gathered more information regarding right-of-way and utilities for the site of the proposed 5th and 6th grade school, there were some items that need to be changed so they will resubmit the preliminary site plan for next month. Mr. Serra gave a general review of the site and the layout of the building including the access points. A resident of Saddlebrook subdivision expressed concern about traffic in the area and why the school has to be on the corner. Mr. Hosler stated that they looked for a corner lot so they could have two access points. He said that a traffic study is being done and the intersection of Roachton and Hull Prairie will not look the same when the school is built. Mr. Forquer asked if there are any deal breakers with this site because he would be hesitant to approve the rezoning without knowing what is going there. Mr. Hosler said that they have had multiple meetings, vetted through multiple sites, and they want to provide safe access for residents and students. Mr. Forquer stated that the traffic study could show a significant investment is required. Mr. Hosler said that they are aware of that and they have had meetings with Ray Huber, the Wood County Engineer about that subject.

Mr. Carry moved to table the Preliminary Site Plan for the proposed 5th and 6th grade school to be located at Roachton and Hull Prairie Roads. Mr. Hudson seconded. Ayes: Carry, Forquer, Hudson, Nicely, Olmstead, and Witt (6). Abstain: Choka (1).

***Rezoning Request R4-INS
Mark Rich/Perrysburg Schools
Roachton and Hull Prairie Roads***

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Mark Rich
23285 West State Route 51
Genoa, Ohio 43430

Perrysburg Board of Education
140 East Indiana Ave.
Perrysburg, Ohio 43551

REQUEST

Chapter 1225.08 – Use Regulations (R4 & INS)
Chapter 1285 – Changes and Amendments

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Roachton Road and Hull Prairie Road. The 18 acre rectangular split area is shown to feature 980' of frontage on Roachton Road and 800.60' on Hull Prairie Road. The Saddle Brook Subdivision is located immediately west of the subject property. The applicants desire to have the subject properties rezoned to INS (Institutional).

BACKGROUND

The subject property was purchased by Mark Rich (Held in the name of Louisville Title) for the purposes of constructing the northern portion of “The Villages at Canterbury”, a single-family subdivision. The Perrysburg School District currently has a contingent purchase offer on this property and the successful rezoning of this property is one of the contingencies.

ANALYSIS

Rezoning this property to INS could result in the following uses: (note: (S) = special approval use)

1. Plant Cultivation
2. Assisted Living Units (S)
3. Entertainment & Spectator Sport Facilities (S)
4. Medical Offices (S)
5. Medical Urgent Care Facilities (S)
6. Cemetery (S)
7. Child Day Care Center (S)
8. Club, Lodges, Fraternal and Civic Assembly (S)
9. Colleges and Universities (S)

10. Convalescent & Nursing Homes (S)
11. Essential Services
12. Hospital (S)
13. Institutional Use (S)
14. Part-Time Child Day Care Center (S)
15. Postal Service (S)
16. Public and Private School (S)
17. Public Service Facility (S)
18. Public/Private Utility (S)
19. Wireless Telecommunication Facility (S)
20. Oil & Gas Wells (S)
21. Outside Storage (S)
22. Wind Generator (S)

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council to approve the above mentioned 18 acres from R4 (Single Family Residential) to INS (Institutional). The current Conservation and Development map for the city designates this area as “controlled growth / traditional neighborhood development.” Not only is a school is believed to be appropriate for a neighborhood setting but its existence is justified by the nearby traditional neighborhoods that have become increasingly populated in recent years.

Further, it is recommended that a public hearing be set before City Council for November 3, 2015 at 6:20 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report. He added that at the request of Mr. Hosler he did a quick calculation of the surrounding area and identified approximately 750 residential lots in the queue. Mr. Walters stated that as part of his recommendation, he recommends that the rezoning be conditioned on the approval of a Final Site Plan for Perrysburg Schools.

Mr. Hosler was there on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Witt asked if they know when the traffic study will be done. Mr. Serra said that he is hoping it will be completed within two weeks.

Mr. Forquer made a motion recommending to City Council to approve the rezoning of 18 acres from R4 (Single Family Residential) to INS (Institutional) conditioned on the approval of a Final Site Plan for Perrysburg Schools and that a public hearing be set before City Council on November 3, 2015 at 6:20 p.m. Mr. Hudson seconded. Ayes: Carry, Forquer, Hudson, Nicely, Olmstead, and Witt (6). Abstain: Choka (1).

***Preliminary and Final Site Plan
Perrysburg Schools – Athletic Building
550 East South Boundary Street***

APPLICANT

Perrysburg Board of Education
140 E. Indiana Ave.
Perrysburg, OH 43551

Munger & Munger Architects
225 N. Michigan
Toledo, OH 43604

REQUEST

Chapter 1260.05 – Preliminary Site Plan Review
Chapter 1260.08 – Final Site Plan Review
Chapter 1250 – Site Design Standards

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject site is located at 550 E. South Boundary Street, to the rear of the existing Perrysburg Junior High School. The site is bordered on the south by I75 / I475 and is currently zoned INS (Institutional). The subject site is approximately 15 acres in size and currently contains tennis courts, a track facilities, a football field, a baseball field and other athletic accessories.

ANALYSIS

Land Use – The requested use has been reviewed and determined to be an “Accessory” Use to the existing school building and is therefore a permitted use in an INS zoned district.

Dimensional Standards - The proposed building shown on the Site Plan is consistent with the dimensional standards of Chapter 1230 with regard to minimum yard setbacks as the closest point of the proposed building to any property line is in excess of 140’. The height of the building is 39’ to the ridge line and the decorative tower on the top is an additional 13’ bringing the total height of the building to 52’ at its tallest point. Per Ch. 1230.03 the additional 13’ from the decorative tower is not required to be used in the height calculation of the building. The overall size of the building is approximately 165’ x 75’.

Building Materials – The applicants have provided two options for building materials through an alternate bid reference on the plans. As the elevation drawing shows, the building is proposed to be finished with fiber cement siding and the alternate bid is shown

to be a mixture of brick veneer and fiber cement finishes. Either of these two options would meet the code requirements of Ch. 1250.48 but the use of brick should be encouraged for visual continuity with other nearby structures. (*Notice: Elevation Sheet A5 has the directional elevation references labeled incorrectly*)

Access – The subject location can only be accessed from the public right-of-way through the Perrysburg Junior High School entrances that are to remain unchanged. Part of this proposed project does include the installation of a small access drive / parking lot to the north of the proposed building.

Parking – Due to the arrangement of uses on this site and the school site the applicants are proposing a shared parking arrangement along with the construction of a small parking lot to accommodate an additional 24 vehicles. It is not anticipated that the proposed building will create any higher demand for parking on-site because it is primarily intended to serve people already on-site for other purposes.

Parking Landscaping – The area of the parking lot was determined to be 10,110 SF in size. The PZ Code requires that not less than 6% of this area be landscaped. According to calculations provided by the landscape architect 12.2% of the parking lot has been landscaped with trees and other low growing vegetation (viburnum and sumac).

Site Landscaping – This site is unique in that it contains a large amount of open space but several large areas of open space cannot contain landscaping due to being used for athletic fields. For the purposes of the on-site landscaping calculation, the area of the site was determined by subtracting the area of the athletic fields and the parking lot. The area of the site after subtracting the parking lot area and the athletic fields is 335,819 SF which requires 33,582 SF of landscape. The applicants will get credit for 12,075 SF of existing landscape and have proposed to install an additional 21,750. The existing landscape in addition to the proposed landscape will result in the 10% requirement being met. It is recommended to require that on site landscaping be irrigated due to the site being larger than 1 acre in size.

Street Trees – A street tree plan is not required for this project because of its location to public streets.

Signage – A full review of signage will be conducted by the Planning and Zoning Division prior to the issuance of permits.

**Note: Relief for area, height and setback can be sought from the BZA. No relief can be provided for sign quantity.*

Lighting – No additional free-standing lighting is currently shown on-site plan but roof mounted spot lights are shown to illuminate the decorative tower on the top of the proposed building.

Sidewalks – N/A

Waste Receptacles – N/A

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary and final site plan for the Perrysburg Schools Athletic / Locker Room Facility as submitted recognizing the building may be finished with fiber cement siding but encouraging the use of brick where indicated as an alternate.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report. Rick Butera of the Edge Group, David Munger of Munger and Munger, and Tom Hosler were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Hosler stated that the need has been demonstrated for this building. He said that the high school teams are sharing locker rooms with the junior high students and when this building is constructed, that will no longer be the case. Mr. Munger stated that based on the fund raising, some items were included as alternates. The bids came in good and their intention is to do brick veneer on the outside as recommended in Mr. Walters' report. Mr. Butera requested relief on the irrigation requirement based on the fact that most of the area will be used for detention or multi-use fields. He added that the State has requirements for funding, and most schools are not irrigated. Ms. Witt expressed concern about the parking situation when there are football games. She asked if the outdoor stairways will be gated and about trash receptacles. Mr. Munger said that the intent is to gate the stairways and Mr. Hosler said that the trash will be transported to the Junior High dumpster. Mr. Choka asked about lighting for the 24 spot parking area. Mr. Munger said that the area will be used more for deliveries than for players parking there. Mayor Olmstead said that the plan is well thought out and he congratulated the school on their funding of the project. Mr. Forquer asked about the logo on the tower. Mr. Walters said that the signage is well done and creative and it is something his office will have to review later. Mr. Forquer asked if the field used to be irrigated. Mr. Hosler said that there is a manual system that they use that is not underground. There was a discussion regarding the detention area, the slope and when fencing is required. Robert Owens, Mallard Road, asked where the water off the building will go because the ditch in front of the school already gets pretty high. Mr. Butera said that the additional detention will also help the current situation.

Mr. Carry made a motion to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan for the Perrysburg Schools Athletic/Locker Room Facility minus the irrigation as noted recognizing the building may be finished with fiber cement siding but encouraging the use of brick where indicated as an alternate. Mr. Hudson seconded. Ayes: Carry, Forquer, Hudson, Nicely, and Olmstead (5). Nays: Witt (1). Abstain: Choka (1).

***Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Special Approval Use
Second Street Public Restrooms
East Second Street Parcel #Q61-000-901212008000***

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

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

REQUEST

Chapter 1260.05 – Preliminary Site Plan Review
Chapter 1260.08 – Final Site Plan Review
Chapter 1250 – Site Design Standards
Chapter 1235 – Special Approval Uses
Chapter 1235.04(hh) – Public Service Facility
Chapter 1235.04(jj) – Public/Private Utility

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Location: The subject property is located on the south side of E. Second Street across from the Perrysburg Messenger Journal building. This property is immediately west of the dental office and currently contains a public parking lot along with a portable restroom facility.

Property Size: approximately .24 acres

Parcels: Q61-000-901212008000

BACKGROUND

For many years the residents of Perrysburg have expressed a desire to have a public restroom facility located in downtown Perrysburg. Several years ago a plastic portable restroom was added to the northwest corner of the subject property and surrounded by wooden fencing and arborvitae. The city realizes that this is not a long term solution and now desires to install a more permanent facility that reflects a higher level of quality. On 9-14-2015 the Historic Landmarks Commission reviewed and conditionally approved the restroom design and materials.

ANALYSIS

A site plan and building elevations have been provided as part of this application.

Preliminary Site Plan

- **Zoning:** C2 (Central Business)

- **Setbacks:** No setback requirements in this district.
- **Adjacent Zoning/Uses:**
All adjacent parcels are currently zoned C2 (Central Business)
- **Land Use(s):** Parking Lot (Permitted)
Public Service Facility (SAU) / Public/Private Utility (SAU)
- **Site Layout:** The city proposes to construct a public restroom building in the northwest corner of the subject parcel. The remainder of the site, except for the building footprint and connection to the public sidewalk would remain unchanged. The existing access for the public parking lot would remain just to the east of the proposed building and the quantity of parking spaces is expected to be minimally impacted if at all. The proposed building would be setback from the public sidewalk along Second Street a similar distance as other buildings in the same block (approx. 9.8').

Final Site Plan

- **Parking:** C2 zoning does not require any onsite parking spaces be provided.
- **Landscape Islands:** The parking lot area is proposed to remain as it currently exists.
- **Parking Lot Landscape:** The parking lot area is proposed to remain as it currently exists.
- **Site Landscaping:** C2 zoning does not require any onsite landscaping.
- **Signage:** No signage is currently proposed for this building. Any future signage request will be reviewed once a sign concept is generated.
- **Lighting:** There is an existing street light pole in the northwest corner of this property that will provide the majority of the needed light for this proposed building. 4 additional wall sconce lights are proposed to be added to the building (3 facing north, 1 facing south beside the service door).
- **Building Materials:** The proposed restroom package is shown to be constructed entirely of brick veneer with a decorative rock faced sill. The roofing material is proposed to be standing seam metal.
- **Sidewalks:** Public sidewalks are present across the frontage of the property and an extension from the public sidewalk to the entrance doors is proposed.

- **General Notes:** The city will be required to work closely with the Department of Public Utilities to coordinate the extension of water and sanitary sewer lines to this project site.

Special Approval Use(s)

This particular special approval use has two sets of requirements that shall be met in order to be granted. The first of the requirements comes from Ch. 1235.02(d) and these are the general provisions for all special approval uses. The second/third set of requirements comes from Ch. 1235.04(hh) and Ch. 1235.04(jj).

Ch.1235.02(d) Standards

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the special approval use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare or the natural environment.
2. The special approval use 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 and impair property values within its neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special approval use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and necessary facilities have been or will be provided.
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.
6. The special approval use 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.

Ch.1235.04(hh) – Public Service Facility

1. No building or outdoor storage area shall be closer than fifty (50) feet to any property or street right-of-way line.
2. Facilities shall provide off-street parking and passenger loading areas at least 25' from residential lot lines.
3. All parking areas and storage yards shall be screened with a six (6) foot wall or fence from abutting residential districts and from view from public streets.
4. All buildings shall be harmonious in appearance with the surrounding area.
5. 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.

Ch.1235.04(jj) – Public Private Utility

1. Such facilities shall not provide outdoor storage yards.
2. It shall be shown that operating requirements necessitate locating said facilities within the district in order to serve the immediate vicinity.
3. Adequate screening of facilities shall be provided when such facilities abut residential property.
4. 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. City Council may require an agreement between the City and the applicant in order to guarantee specified improvements and City Council may impose fees and/ or require escrows related to the project.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator has reviewed all necessary information for the consideration of the preliminary and final site plan and recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council approval of the final site plan and the associated special approval use(s). The only noted deficiency of this request comes from Ch. 1235.04(hh)(1) which states that "No building or outdoor storage area shall be closer than 50 feet to any property or street right-of-way." It is the interpretation of the Planning and Zoning Administrator that this SAU section of the code generally refers to larger municipal complexes/functions such as salt domes, municipal garages, fire stations, etc. and that adherence to this strict application of the SAU criteria would result in a less desirable and less functional public restroom building. It is also important to note that Ch. 1235.04(jj) Public/Private Utilities can also be interpreted as a reasonable category for the proposed use and this section does not have the same dimensional requirements as "Public Service Facility" uses.

Further, it is recommended that a public hearing be set before City Council for November 3, 2015 at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report. Mr. Walters and Mayor Olmstead represented the City as the applicant. Mr. Nicely asked if the Historic Landmarks Commission has approved this. Mr. Walters said that they gave approval to the concept and needed some clarification regarding the windows, which are a type that have been approved elsewhere in the Historic District, and the orientation of the building. Mr. Nicely asked if we have heard from the property owner to the west of this location. Mr. Walters said that he received an email from Matt Skotynsky who owns the adjacent property and he expressed concerns about the placement/orientation of the building being relatively close to his. Mr. Walters explained that in C2 zoning districts there are no setback requirements. Mr. Skotynsky had concerns about safety with the buildings being so close and Mr. Walters explained that the City has to follow all building codes and will go through the approval process to obtain a permit from Wood County. Mr. Walters said that he has

not received a reply from Mr. Skotynsky. There was a lengthy discussion regarding the orientation of the building and concerns should there be a line outside of the restrooms that extends into the parking lot. Mr. Walters stated that the sidewalk area could be extended and bollards installed. Mr. Forquer asked why the parking lot does not need to be brought up to Code. Mr. Walters explained that this is C2 zoning and there are no offsite parking requirements. Mr. Choka asked about the Special Approval Use requirement that it not be detrimental and if any research has been done. Mr. Walters said that he feels that this project has been well done and overall it is a benefit to the area. Ms. Witt added that it would have to help property values as opposed to the current portable restrooms that are there. There was discussion regarding orientation of the building. Mr. Walters said that he would prefer orienting it to Second Street, but with the current curb cut and property line, the drive aisle would have to be reduced to 14'. Ms. Witt suggested putting the window on the Second Street side only to the wainscot line and then do a flower box. Mr. Walters said that the idea was to have the window on that side of the building go down all the way because it gives the appearance of a storefront door.

Mr. Hudson move to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan for the proposed Second Street Public Restrooms and to recommend to City Council approval of the Special Approval Use(s) and that a public hearing be set before City Council on November 3, 2015 at 6:10 p.m. Mr. Nicely seconded. Ayes: Carry, Forquer, Hudson, Nicely and Witt (5). Abstain: Choka and Olmstead (2).

Code Amendment

Ch. 1230 – Intensity & Dimensional Standards

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

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

REQUEST

Chapter 1285 – Changes and Amendments
Chapter 1230 – Intensity & Dimensional Standards

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The proposed code amendment to Chapter 1230 would affect all properties within the City of Perrysburg by modifying the criteria for the structure setbacks.

BACKGROUND

Chapter 1230 of the Planning and Zoning code is used to provide an explanation of lot setbacks and other dimensional standards such as coverage, height, and size. The bulk of this information is provided in chart format that has been very user friendly with the

following two exceptions; 1. There is a confusing distinction between lots with public and private utilities (shown as a footnote) and; 2. Side Yard setback totals. After utilizing the current chapter for many years as it currently exists, it is recommended to revisit and revise the current structure to increase the understanding and usability of this chapter. Overall, this chapter and its contents are achieving the desired development goals but it is believed a revision could make the information more easily understood.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report. He said the chart regarding setbacks has been condensed from two pages to half a page. He said that before there was a minimum side yard setback and a total side yard setback. The proposed change would make it only a minimum side yard setback. He said that he also proposes removing the distinction of public and private utilities and extend down the requirement for public utilities because it has not been an issue in at least the last eight years. Ms. Witt asked if he added any new text and Mr. Walters said he did not. Mr. Forquer said that this creates cookie cutter lots. Mr. Walters said that it maintains the same building envelope. Ms. Witt asked about additions to homes. Mr. Walters said that the Board of Zoning Appeals has been sympathetic in allowing the extension of the house line. Mark Rich was present and said that he has three scenarios where this would be detrimental. The first is with a side load garage. He said that in the Villages of Canterbury he requested R4 zoning only for the setbacks because with a 95' lot you have 5' for the driveway setback, a 25' driveway, 59' for the house and then a 6' side yard setback. The second scenario is if a fire hydrant, Edison box or transformer is in the front yard, you lose the ability to shift it over two feet. The third scenario is for corner lots where there are two front yards and you want to shift the house as far away from the next door neighbor. Mr. Walters said that he took the total side yard requirement and cut it in half. There was discussion regarding how the table could be simplified so it is easier to understand without reducing the setbacks or having cookie cutter lots.

Mr. Carry moved to table this issue to allow Mr. Walters time to revise the proposed change. Mr. Hudson seconded and it was unanimously approved.

Preliminary and Final Site Plan Kroger Fuel Center

Mr. Carry moved to untable discussion regarding the proposed changes to the Kroger Fuel Center. Mr. Hudson seconded and it was unanimously approved.

A representative from Kroger was in attendance along with Erica Randolph of SSOE. They asked for clarification on the issue regarding outside storage. Mr. Walters explained that our Code does not allow outside storage that zoning district. The Kroger representative stated that they will remove all items other than those located in the nesting cages. He said that studies show that people want these items. Ms. Randolph added that the current Kroger has it. It was explained that this is a non-conforming use. Mr. Nicely

asked about the financial impact to Kroger but they said they could not share sales figures because that was internal information. Ms. Randolph stated that if they lose the outside sales they may not update the facility. Mr. Forquer said that since the current outside sales violates the Code, they are asking the Commission to allow them to continue to violate the Code. Mayor Olmstead said that Kroger is an important project to the City, but we have to look at the practical application. There was discussion regarding the impact on similar businesses that are not allowed to have outside sales if Kroger were permitted to do so. Mr. Walters asked if there is a reason they can't increase the size of the kiosk given that they have the footprint to store these units outside of the kiosk. The Kroger representative said that it is due to the cost. Ms. Randolph asked that this issue be tabled again.

Mr. Carry moved to table the Preliminary and Final Site Plan for the Kroger Fuel Center on Carronade Drive. Mr. Hudson seconded. Ayes: Carry, Forquer, Hudson, Nicely, Olmstead and Witt (6). Abstain: Choka (1).

Preliminary and Final Site Plan
Chas. E. Phipps Co.
12450 Williams Road

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Poggemeyer Design Group, Inc.
935 Cleveland Ave.
Defiance, OH 43512

REQUEST

Chapter 1260.05 – Preliminary Site Plan Review
Chapter 1260.08 – Final Site Plan Review
Chapter 1250 – Site Design Standards

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Location: On the north side of Williams Road between Columbus Equipment and Penske Truck Rental. This property is located immediately south of Lock-it-Up Self Storage.

Property Size: 2.026 total acres

Parcels: Q61-400-180000042500

BACKGROUND

This property is currently occupied by the Charles Phipps Company.

ANALYSIS

The applicants have provided the necessary documents to conduct a preliminary site plan review only.

Preliminary Site Plan

- **Zoning:** I1 (Light Industrial)
- **Setbacks** (minimums): Front: 60 ft.
Side (each): 25 ft.
Rear: 40 ft.
- **Adjacent Zoning/Uses:**
All adjacent uses are currently zoned I1 (Light Industrial)
- **Land Use(s):** Warehousing (Permitted)
Wholesale Business (Permitted)
- **Site Layout:** The applicant proposes to concrete a remaining portion of a stone driveway and parking lot. A small portion of stone that is not proposed to be concreted is shown to be removed and replaced with topsoil and seeded.

Final Site Plan

- **Parking:** Parking spaces are shown to be 10' x 20' in size and the total parking count is 15 spaces.
 - 5 spaces + (13,209 SF / 1,700 SF) = 13 spaces required.
- **Landscape Islands:** 15 parking spaces requires 2 landscape islands within the parking area. The large grass area with the 4 existing trees can be counted as 1 of these two islands. It is recommended to install an additional landscape island between the entrance drive and the first parking space on the left (approximately where the number "15" is circled on the plans). This island would fulfill a code requirement and would also provide separation between parked vehicles and vehicles using the entrance/exit drive off of Williams Rd.
- **Parking Lot Landscape:** Parking lot landscaping is calculated to be 2,366 SF in area. This calculation improperly includes lawn area in the calculation. If properly calculated it is anticipated the parking lot landscape percentage falls significantly below the requirement of 6%.
- **Site Landscaping:** No information has been provided for onsite landscaping. Street trees have been identified as existing along Williams Road but there is no calculation shown to determine the percent of landscape provided on-site. A visual inspection suggested the 10% requirement for site landscaping is also deficient.
- **Signage:** Any request for signage will be reviewed in accordance with Ch. 1250.29 prior to the issuance of any sign permits.

- **Lighting:** No additional lighting is being requested at this time.
- **Sidewalks:** Public sidewalks are present across Williams Road frontage.
- **General Engineering:** The applicant shall submit and obtain City of Perrysburg engineering approvals for drainage calculations prior to a zoning permit being issued.
- **Miscellaneous:** The plans indicate there is to be 751 SF of stone remaining after the installation of the newly proposed concrete. The Planning and Zoning code requires that all stone be replaced with an impervious surface or removed if used within an area of parking surface or driveway.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator has reviewed all provided information and recommends approving only a preliminary site plan with the condition that an additional landscape island be provided as described in this report and the remaining stone on site be removed or replaced with an approved surface.

Mr. Hudson moved to untable the Preliminary and Final Site Plan Review for Chas. E. Phipps Co. Mr. Forquer seconded and it was unanimously approved.

Mr. Walters said that he received a revised site plan and landscape plan. Lee Rausch of Poggemeyer Design was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Rausch said that they would be happy to remove the stone area at the east end of the parking lot. He said that it benefits them to remove it because it helps with the drainage calculations. He said that they have four new landscape areas and they believe that the landscape plan meets the spirit and intent of the zoning ordinance with the amount and percentage of landscaping on site. He said the only outstanding issue is the removal of a parking space for a landscape island. He said that although parking is plentiful, they need the parking space for the maneuverability of delivery trucks.

Mr. Forquer moved to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan for Chas. E. Phipps Co. on Williams Road with the revised landscape plan as submitted. Mr. Hudson seconded and it was unanimously approved.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Sutton