

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JUNE 25, 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, Craig Pickerel, John Stout, and John Wellstein (6). Gilda Mitchell was absent (1). Also present was Brody Walters, Planning and Zoning Administrator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Lorenz moved to approve the minutes of the February 27, 2020 meeting as written. Seconded by Mayor Mackin. Ayes: Lorenz, Mackin, Pickerel, and Wellstein (4). Nays: (0). Abstain: Bade and Stout (2).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

No report.

Final Site Plan

***Schuetz Container – Drum & IBC Building Addition
(South of Spafford Drive)***

APPLICANT

Schuetz Container
2105 S. Wilkinson Way
Perrysburg, OH 43551

Poggemeyer Design Group
1168 N. Main Street
Bowling Green, OH 43402

Lathrop
28 N. St. Clair St., Suite 200
Toledo, OH 43604

REQUEST

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

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct two additions (98,402 SF total), one on each of two existing buildings located south of Spafford Drive. The subject property is located immediately north of Roachton Road and east of Ft. Meigs Road. It is located within an I2 – General Industrial zoning category on a 19.48 acre parcel.

BACKGROUND

Schuetz Container last appeared before the Planning Commission on February 14, 2016 to present the plans for the aerial bridge (over top of Spafford Drive) and the new warehouse facility north of Spafford Drive.

ANALYSIS

Land Use – The requested use has been reviewed and determined to be “Manufacturing – General” which is a permitted use in this zoning district.

Dimensional Standards – Both buildings shown on the site plan are consistent with the dimensional standards of Chapter 1230 with regard to building setbacks. I2 zoned properties are required to maintain the following setbacks:

Front Yard: 60' (along Wilkinson Way and Spafford Drive)

Rear Yard: 40' (along Roachton Road)

Side Yard: 25' (between the subject parcel and the adjacent property owned by OI Levis Park STS Inc. to the west)

Max Height: 45' (Building 1 = 44' 3", Building 2 = 36' 7")

Building Materials – Elevation sheets are as follows:

Building 1 is on sheet A201

Building 2 is on sheet A211

Building 1 (67,370SF) (IBC Building) - The building materials for the proposed building are shown to be CMU (wainscot) with metal panels on the upper portion of the main building. The plans do not indicate the building material percentages and due to the irregular shape of the building it is difficult to estimate those percentages. The applicant has not proposed the existing portion of each building be brought up to current building material code compliance. It would appear from the drawings that only the additions are attempting to comply with the material percentages. Additionally, there are roofline areas of building addition 1 that have rooflines in excess of 100' that do not provide the required elevation changes. Other aspects of Ch. 1250.481 have not been addressed specifically on the south facing elevation and the north facing elevation. The south facing elevation is considerably more important due to the limited visibility of the north elevation from public view. The east and west elevations appear to be well done and have tried to coordinate with the recent warehouse addition that was constructed north of Spafford Drive several years ago. These elevations have parapet walls, horizontal windows and

plant on awnings to achieve code compliance and visual interest to the large building. It is recommended that building material percentage calculations be provided along with a revision to the south elevation be requested with specific attention paid to Ch. 1250.481(b), (d) and (e).

Building 2 (31,032 SF) (Drum Building) - The building materials for the proposed building are shown to be CMU (wainscot) with metal panels on the upper portion of the main building. The plans do not indicate the building material percentages on this building either and as with the first building it is difficult to estimate those percentages. Overall the comments from Building 1 are the same for building 2. Building 2 has a north, east and south elevation with the two primary facades being the north and east sides. Due to the change in plane and recessed design of the north elevation it would appear to comply with the applicable code sections. The east facing façade has failed to meet the specific requirements of Ch. 1250.481 and also appears to lack the architectural elements that have become prominent features of the warehouse and the East and West elevations of the Building 1 addition. It is recommended that building material percentage calculations be provided along with a revision to the east elevation be requested with specific attention paid to Ch. 1250.481(b), (d) and (e).

The Planning Commission will need to consider what if any changes to the existing buildings that are being added on to will be required. The existing buildings are legal non-conforming and these additions may require that the existing building as well as the proposed additions be brought up to code. Building material percentage calculations could be beneficial to this discussion.

Access – The current access in and out of the site is not proposed to change. All existing access points come from Wilkinson Way and are shown to remain.

Parking

Sheet C401 indicates 97 existing parking spaces with 43 additional being added for a new total of 140 spaces. However, this calculation does not appear to be accurate due to the loss of parking that will occur with these building additions. The existing parking lot located between the two proposed building additions is shown to increase in size. This expansion is easiest seen on Sheet C102 in light gray. **Further explanation should be provided by the design engineer as to the compliance and operational logistics of this site with regard to parking.**

Building 1 - The proposed site plan shows that approximately 53 semi-trailer parking spaces would be lost as a result of this addition.

Building 2 – The semi-trailer parking along the parking area to the east of the building will likely become unusable after this building addition (approximately 26 spaces).

Per Ch. 1250.03(e)(b) the required parking count is determined from the following formula:

5 parking spaces plus 1 for every employee in the largest working shift or 5 plus 1 for every 1,700 SF of usable floor space, whichever is the greater.

Space on site shall also be provided for all construction workers during periods of construction.

Landscaping – Sheet L103 contains a planting schedule and a landscape requirement matrix. The matrix identifies that the parking lot landscaping requirement has been met by providing 872 SF of landscape. As for the overall site landscape requirement of 10%, there is not a calculation provided, rather the landscape architect has simply indicated that the landscape has been “provided” to achieve this percentage. Per Ch. 1250.02(t) if more than 65% of the total off-street parking spaces for the entire site are located between the front façade of the principal building and the primary street abutting the site, additional landscaping, buffering and raised pedestrian walkway connections are required. The code also requires irrigation on sites that are 1 acre in size or larger.

Street Trees – A single sheet will need to be provided that shows all current and proposed landscape. The plan should also inventory the existing street trees along Spafford, Wilkinson Way and Jennison Drive. This plan will then be submitted to and reviewed by the city’s street tree commission to determine if any additional street trees are required to be provided. If additional trees are required tree permits will be added to the necessary zoning permits which are to be paid by the applicant and planted by the city.

Signage – A full review of signage will be conducted by the Planning and Zoning Division prior to the issuance of permits. Wall signs are permitted per the following dimensions:

Allowable S.F. = 10% of the façade on which it’s placed.

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

Lighting – It is required that any lighting meet the requirements of Ch. 1250.43. The lighting schedule does not indicate the height of the proposed light fixtures. The photometric plan does indicate that the light intensity does not unnecessarily spill out of the property lines.

Sidewalks – Sidewalks are shown along the entire frontage of the property but not through the existing driveways. It is not recommended to require modification at this time but when the driveways are replaced in the future it will be required that this requirement be met. It is a requirement that all sidewalks through driveways be poured through the driveway and physically separated from the driveway with expansion joint.

Waste Receptacles – No external waste receptacles are shown to be part of this site plan request.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning Commission request additional information regarding parking quantity and discuss the compliance of both the existing buildings on site. Upon these items being addressed to the satisfaction of the Commission would then be recommended to provide Conditional Approval for the Final Site Plan approval subject to the following conditions and to permit the Planning and Zoning Administrator to review the recommended plan revisions below for compliance, approval and permitting.

1. Provide building material percentage calculations for building 1 that show compliance with maximum percentages.
2. Provide building material percentage calculations for building 2 that show compliance with maximum percentages.
3. Revise the south elevation of Building 1 to comply with Ch. 1250.481.
4. Revise the north and east elevation of Building 2 to comply with Ch. 1250.481.
5. Indicate the lighting height of all fixtures used.
6. Submit a single sheet landscape plan indicating current and proposed landscaping as well as existing street trees along street frontages of Spafford, Wilkinson and Jennison.
7. Add required irrigation to new areas that will not be served by any current irrigation system.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Final Site Plan for Schuetz Container at 2105 S. Wilkinson Way. Joe Cleveland, Lathrop, and Thomas Neil, Schuetz Container were present. Mr. Bade asked if there were any issues with the Zoning Administrator's recommendation, and Mr. Neil added that they have some concerns with the building elevation recommendations (#3 and #4). He added that they tried to design the buildings to be as aesthetically pleasing as possible, and asked for clarification about the recommendations. Mr. Bade noted the additions to the buildings are reducing the amount of semi-trailer parking spaces behind the existing landscaping hills, and asked how this reduction will be functional. Mr. Neil stated that is a concern of theirs as well, and he added that the addition to building 1 is for additional drum production and storage, and therefore they will not have to hold as much stock as they previously had been doing. Mr. Lorenz asked Mr. Walters if the elevation concerns would be able to be handled administratively, and Mr. Walters noted that recommendations #3 and #4 are based off of code requirements from Chapter 1250.481, and that those concerns are for the facades facing public streets. Mr. Walters added that he will need clarification on the compliance from the Planning Commission regarding the elevation recommendations. Mr. Stout asked Mr. Neil about the portion that isn't aesthetically pleasing, and there was a brief discussion about the variation in elevations. Mr. Pickerel clarified that the Planning Commission will need to discuss the modifications to the existing buildings, and any relief that could be granted. Mayor Mackin clarified that the new additions will add a difference in height to the visual appearance of the buildings. Mr. Wellstein asked for clarification about the building materials for the new buildings, and Mr. Cleveland added that building 1 will use the same materials as building 3. Mr. Wellstein confirmed that the expansion to building 2 is

to mimic the existing building. Mr. Cleveland noted that the south elevations to building 1 are matching those of the south side of building 3. Mr. Wellstein added that the tree foliage will fall in the winter and the buildings will be visible from the street. Mr. Neil confirmed that the total cost of the project is about eleven (11) million dollars. Mr. Wellstein asked if there's been any interest for Schuetz to change the exterior on the remaining portions of the buildings that face Ft. Meigs Road, and Mr. Neil added that it's very difficult to renovate on the outside while operating the business on the inside. There was a brief discussion about the overall exterior colors of the buildings, and creating conformity that's aesthetically pleasing as the area is also becoming more residential. Mr. Pickerel added that he agrees with Mr. Wellstein's comments regarding uniformity and consistency to the buildings within the neighborhood. There was a brief discussion about the parking requirements, and Mr. Cleveland added that he will be able to work with providing Mr. Walters with further information. Mr. Pickerel recommended that each façade of all the structures be painted in lieu of bringing the entire building into compliance. Mr. Neil added that this new standard will depend upon cost and the approval from the board within Schuetz. Mr. Walters added that there could be a suggestion to phase these changes in over time for continuity, like over the next five years. Mr. Neil added that he has sent the recommendations to Mr. Schuetz, and that there will be further discussion within Schuetz as this facility is one of the largest factories. Mr. Bade noted that this recommendation is an atypical option to phase in the changes over time. Mayor Mackin confirmed that Ft. Meigs Road is now a highly trafficked road, compared to twenty years ago, and that there would be a lot of value added to the company to make those aesthetic changes as discussed. Mr. Walters proposed repainting the north façade of building 2 along Ft. Meigs Road, and Mr. Bade and Mr. Lorenz agreed that it's a reasonable request. There were no further comments nor questions from the Commission or public.

Mr. Bade moved to grant conditional approval with the amended painting as proposed by Mr. Walters, along with recommendations #1, #2, #5, #6, and #7 as provided in this report for the Final Site Plan for Schuetz Container at 2105 S. Wilkinson Way. Seconded by Mayor Mackin. Ayes: Bade, Lorenz, Mackin, and Stout (4). Nays: Pickerel and Wellstein (2). Mr. Walters clarified and confirmed the conditional approval:

1. Building 1 be built as proposed.
2. Building 2 be built as proposed with the color scheme of the addition and the building behind it consistent with the greys/blacks/whites in a consistent arrangement.
3. North façade of Building 1 along Spafford Drive be painted with the color scheme to match Building 2.

Mr. Bade suggested that Schuetz create a small sign to be displayed on the exterior of the property to explain what Schuetz does, as the community often asks.

***Preliminary & Final Site Plan
Nicole Bloomer Office
13015 Roachton Road***

APPLICANT

Nicole Bloomer
13015 Roachton Road
Perrysburg, OH 43551

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 property is located at 13015 Roachton Road. The property is on the south side of Roachton Road at the intersection of Steeplechase Lane, on the southeast corner of the intersection. This property is immediately south of the Mayle Law Office and just west of the current State Farm Insurance offices. The property was rezoned from RM (Multiple Family Residential) to OS (Office and Service) in July of 2019.

ANALYSIS

Land Use – The current use of the property has been reviewed and determined to be “Office and Banks” and is therefore an approved use in the OS zoning district.

Dimensional Standards – The setbacks that will apply to this project site are as follows:

Front Yard – 50’
Rear Yard – 30’
Side Yard (min) – 10’
Side Yard (total) – 25’
Max Height – 35’

The proposed Site Plan shows an existing primary structure meeting all of the current setbacks set forth for (OS) Office and Service.

Building Materials – The applicant’s building is composed of majority face brick, with a small section of vinyl on the south and eastern facades. Each material is approved up to 100% on each facade.

Access – The subject location is accessible from two approaches, both of which are located on Roachton Road. Currently, both access points are approximately 35’ wide, and are shown to be in compliance with the required spacing distance streets and drives (100’ minimum distance from intersections and 80’ from existing driveways). The drive

aisles are both shown at 10.55' and 10', the minimum width permissible in Chapter 1250.06(b) would be 12'.

Parking – Business offices are required to have a minimum of 1 space for each three hundred square feet of usable floor area. The site would be required to have at least 7 spaces and there are 7 spaces shown in the correct sizes. The layout of the lot creates a maneuverability concern in the two spaces closest to the accessory structure.

Parking Landscaping – The current quantity of parking spaces (7) would suffice for at least 1 shade tree but no landscape islands are required. There were no landscape calculations provided as to determine if a portion of the wooded area could compensate for the 6% required for parking lot landscaping.

Site Landscaping – Although no landscaping plan was provided, a large portion of the site is heavily wooded (majority of the western and southern sides of the property). The minimum required for OS zoned parcels is 10%. No calculations have been provided at this time.

Street Trees – A Street Tree Plan will be created for this property by the Street Tree Commission. The quantity of trees is determined by taking the frontage of the parcel, subtracting 24' (allowable driveway width) and dividing that length by 40' (the average spacing of street trees) as well as along the entrance of each unit.

Site = frontage – 24' driveway (# of driveways) = remaining frontage divided by 40' =
of street trees (\$475 each)

The Street Tree Commission will select the species and placement of these trees. Fees for required Street Trees will be collected at the time the zoning permit is obtained. All trees will be planted by the City

Signage – A full review of signage will be conducted by the Planning and Zoning Division prior to the issuance of permits. The current sign code allows for variances to address height restrictions as well as size restrictions but no allowance for increasing the quantity of signs is available.

Lighting – No new light fixtures are shown.

Sidewalks – Sidewalks are shown across the frontage of the property.

Waste Receptacles – No exterior trash receptacle on-site.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the Preliminary Site Plan with the following conditions:

1. Provide details of Parking Lot Landscape Calculations to include all impervious surfaces with the visual representation shown on the landscaping plan that shows the parking lot landscaping separate from the site landscaping.
2. Provide additional landscaping details as to the total amount of landscaping on the site signed and stamped by a landscape architect.
3. Add additional spacing between the parking spaces in the corner of the lot closest to the accessory structure to allow for the maneuverability of larger vehicles.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for the Nicole Bloomer Office at 13015 Roachton Road. Mr. Walters clarified that the setbacks indicated on the site plans are incorrect, and that the actual setbacks cause a conflict with the site plan with regards to parking that could require conditional approval with contingency from an approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). Mr. Walters noted that Roachton Road has a raised median that will present access challenges, and creates an awkwardness of the turns in and out of the site. Mr. Walters added that the required parking in the front yard will need approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), so any approvals from the Planning Commission will need to be conditional upon BZA relief. Ron Guiliani, DGL was present on the phone over the AT Conference System, and Nicole Bloomer was present in person. Mr. Guiliani added that he discussed the horseshoe driveway with Doug Dariano, City Engineer, and it was understood that the infrequent traffic of the business itself would not pose an issue with maneuverability and access. Mr. Guiliani added that a revised site plan was provided with updated landscaping requirements. Mayor Mackin clarified the practicality of the horseshoe driveway and parking lot. Mr. Bade added that he agrees with Mr. Walters recommendation that the entrance traffic be reversed as the speed limit on Roachton Road is forty-five (45) miles per hour. Mr. Bade noted there are not any trash receptacles show on the site plan, and it was stated that the trash is still being picked up despite the zoning change from residential to office and services. Mr. Walters clarified that because this site is now commercial that those services will cease. Ms. Bloomer confirmed that the pool is staying on the property. Mr. Pickerel questioned whether the entry/exit causes a hazard, and if there is a way to simplify the driveway. There was further discussion regarding the drive aisles between the Commission, Mr. Guiliani and Ms. Bloomer. Mr. Wellstein recommended that the Commission refer to the new drawing for clarification. Ms. Bloomer added that traffic flow will be low at this location, and that it hasn't been causing a traffic problem as the drives are currently. Mr. Pickerel confirmed that there is an ADA accessible route into the building. Ms. Bloomer added that the parking lot is being removed and replaced, and Mr. Walters noted that adding parking to this site plan is a "trigger" for compliance. Mr. Walters suggested that the driveways be constructed at ninety (90) degrees in a hard "u" shape instead of currently as is, and Mr. Bade agreed. Mr. Walters added that he is willing to work administratively with Ms. Bloomer and Mr. Guiliani with the parking and driveway plans. There were no further comments nor questions from the Commission or public.

Mr. Wellstein moved to grant conditional approval based upon the recommendations of this report, and subject to relief granted for the additional parking spots from the Board of

Zoning Appeals (BZA) for the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for the Nicole Bloomer Office at 13015 Roachton Road. Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

Project Name: Otterbein Perrysburg– Building Additions

Location: 3529 Rivers Edge Drive

Zoning: Multiple Family (RM)

Applicant(s): Jeff Kmet – Vice President Properties & Construction

Land Use: Residential

Parcel(s): Q61-100-240000040005

Request: Preliminary & Final Site Plan Review

Preliminary & Final Site Plan Checklist

Land Use		Permitted	Special Approval	Not Permitted
1225.08	Land Use Type (Multiple Family)	x		
Dimensional		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1230	Front Setback (25')	x		
1230	Side Setback (30')		x	
1230	Rear Setback (30')	x		
1230	Lot Coverage (max 60%)			x
1230	Height (max 45')	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 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. The applicant is proposing the construction of building additions to each of the five primary structures. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved two exceptions, for buildings E and D, on March 9, 2020 to allow for the side yard setback to be reduced by five (5) feet.
2. Sidewalks do not connect from the right-of-way to door of the main building, but do connect to 2 of the 4 residential buildings.
3. The landscape plan does not show where the landscaping being removed, for additional parking spaces, is being relocated. In addition, if landscaping is being removed are these numbers being reflected in the percentages?
4. The additional five (5) parking spaces create a total of fifteen (15) consecutive spaces in a row with no landscape island. The addition of the five (5) spaces would also require an additional landscape island.

Recommendation:

The Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission conditionally approve the Final Site Plan for Otterbein Perrysburg subject to the following conditions being completed and updated site/landscape plans be submitted to the Planning and Zoning administration for compliance review.

1. Connect the sidewalk that exists in front of the buildings to the public sidewalk along Rivers Edge Drive.
2. Clarify where the relocated landscaping is being moved with Planning Commission members.
3. Add a landscape island between the fifteen (15) consecutive spaces (with shade tree removed for additional parking).

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for the Otterbein Senior Life - Perrysburg at 3529 Rivers Edge Drive. Jeff Kmet, Otterbein Senior Life was present, and asked for clarification about recommendation #1. Mr. Kmet added that with Otterbein being a skilled nursing facility, that accessibility by public sidewalks would create a safety concern for the residents, and would create a liability too. He added that there is an outdoor space in the rear for the residents, and asked the Commission for sidewalk relief from a safety standpoint. Mr. Kmet also confirmed that any of the landscaping that is disturbed during construction, will then be directly replaced as was after construction is complete. Mr. Kmet confirmed that ten (10) in a row is code regarding parking spaces. He added that parallel parking has been working well within the site, and he added that they would like to propose parallel parking instead of perpendicular. Mr. Kmet asked for relief for parking and island requirement with recommendation #3. Mr. Bade and Mr. Wellstein added that they are both okay with the relief request. Mr. Pickerel asked for clarification with the sidewalk safety concern and walking visitors, and Mr. Kmet added that this is a high twenty-four (24) hour care facility. There were no further comments nor questions from the Commission or public.

Mayor Mackin moved to grant approval with relief on recommendations #1 and #3 for the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for Otterbein Senior Life – Perrysburg at 3529 Rivers Edge Drive. Seconded by Mr. Wellstein. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Bade noted the discussion about the resurgence of hens as was stated in the Messenger Journal recently, and Mr. Walters added that the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council recently discussed hens at their last meeting. Mr. Walters confirmed that any proposed code change will first come back to the Planning Commission for the process of a change.

Mr. Walters provided a brief update of a comprehensive land use plan that is being updated going forward, and that there will ultimately be a series of code changes that will start with the Planning Commission for the process of a change.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro