

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 28, 2023

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman Andy Lorenz. Commission members present were Greg Bade, Andy Lorenz, Mayor Mackin, Rob Vela, John Wellstein, Becky Williams, and Megan Wolfinger (7). Also present were Brody Walters, Planning & Zoning Administrator, and Mark Easterling, Planning & Zoning Deputy Administrator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Lorenz moved to approve the minutes of the June 29, 2023 meeting as written. Seconded by Ms. Williams. Ayes: Bade, Lorenz, Mackin, Vela, Williams, and Wolfinger (6). Nays: (0). Abstain: Wellstein (1).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

None.

Preliminary Plat Extension Summerfield Subdivision

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Steve Mitchell & Mike White
MB Investments, LLC.

Feller Finch and Associates, Inc.
1683 Woodlands Drive, P.O. Box 68
Maumee, Ohio 43537

REQUEST

Chapter 1295.01 – Preliminary Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Summerfield is a proposed subdivision consisting of 145 lots, and is located just north of Bay Shore Village Plat 1, on the north side of Five Point Road between SR25 and Fort Meigs Road. This subdivision (54.3 AC) is an R-4 (Single Family) residential subdivision with an area (separate from this request) outside of but adjacent to the eastern side of this plat proposed as R-5 (Two Family) residential.

BACKGROUND

Previously, the original Bayshore Village Preliminary Plat was first approved in 2005, but Subdivision Plats 2-8 expired in 2015 and were not approved for a Plat Extension in 2016. The Preliminary Plat for Summerfield Subdivision was approved on March 30, 2017 and upon approval was purchased by Steve Mitchell. The Preliminary Plat for Summerfield is now set to expire on August 30, 2023. If approved, this request would allow for the Summerfield Preliminary Plat to be active until August 24, 2025.

Plat 1 consists of 21 residential lots on approximately 11.6 acres and was approved in October 2018.

Plat 2 consists of 21 residential lots on approximately 6.645 acres and was approved in September 2019.

Plat 3 consists of 33 residential lots and one “common lot” on approximately 13.351 acres and was approved in September 2020.

Plat 4 consists of 35 residential lots on approximately 10.939 acres and was approved in June 2021.

ANALYSIS

The City of Perrysburg’s current Comprehensive Plan indicates “Encouraged Growth/Economic Development Area” for the subdivision. The land proposed for the subdivision was once agricultural land but now sits as an empty parcel.

The Code provides for a minimum lot area of 9,500 SF for R-4 Zoning. All proposed lots currently meet or exceed the minimum lot size.

The applicant shall provide an Open Space Fee to the City of Perrysburg (prior to final plat approval) for the improvement of open space or recreational areas within the city per the following formula: Open Space requirement = 7.5% of appraised value of 54.3 acres + \$100.00 per lot. An official appraisal of the property has not been submitted to calculate the Open Space Fee.

The subject property shall be subject to Chapter 1295 – Subdivision Regulations.

- Per Ch. 1295.05(a)(6)(G) lots shall not have an average depth which is more than three times its average width, nor shall it have a depth of less than one hundred twenty feet unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission. There is one lot that does not meet a maximum 3:1 ratio (please see lot 12 which has a ratio of 3.015).

- Each of the lots on the chart below, has a frontage less than 65'. This would require the approval of the Planning Commission according to Ch. 1295.05(a)(6)(E).

Lot	Frontage (FT)
3	57
5	57
12	65
40	65
41	44
42	44
43	44
44	44
45	63
113	53
114	53
115	53

Of the lots listed above, the only remaining un-platted lots that do not meet the ratio are lots 40-45 in Plat 5.

There are 34 lots in the subdivision that remain un-platted in the Final Plat 5.

Preliminary Plat approval shall be effective for a maximum period of twenty-four (24) months unless, upon application of the developer, the Planning Commission grants an extension. If the Final Plat has not been recorded within this time limit, the Preliminary Plat must again be submitted to the Planning Commission for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the extension of the Preliminary Plat drawing for the Summerfield subdivision until September 28, 2025.

Mr. Easterling reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary Plat Extension for Summerfield subdivision. Greg Feller, Feller Finch, was present.

Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the Preliminary Plat Extension for Summerfield subdivision until September 28, 2025. Seconded by Mr. Lorenz, and it was unanimously approved (7-0).

Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Coventry Pointe North

Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road)

Parcel J37-100-240000020000 (o Fort Meigs Road)

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Steve Mitchell
Five Point Investments LLC
3150 Republic Blvd., Suite 3
Toledo, OH 43615

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

REQUEST

Chapter 1240.01 – Planned Unit Development
Chapter 1240.07 – Submittal and Approval of PUD Plan

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property is comprised of two separate parcels; Q61-100-240000008000, and J37-100-240000020000 (recently annexed). These parcels are located on the west side of Fort Meigs Road, south of Roachton Road and north of Five Point Road. For additional reference purposes this property is immediately north of Coventry Pointe subdivision. Collectively this site is approximately 78.801 acres in size and all properties are zoned R-3 (Single Family Residential).

ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting PUD Plan Approval per Ch. 1240.07. The applicant has provided an engineered site plan, building location plan, Open Space/Circulation Plan, Landscape Plan and a bird's-eye view rendering. The code typically requires a topographic survey but due to the relatively flat nature of the property it is recommended not to require this information. The following items on the submission list are currently deficient with this proposal:

Ch.1240.07(a)(3)(D) requires that estimated floor areas, building coverage and the number of stories and heights be noted on the plans. This information is not present.

Ch. 1240.07(a)(3)(K) requires that a written statement explaining in detail the full intent of the applicant, indicating the type of dwelling units or uses contemplated and resultant population, floor area, parking and supporting documentation, including the intended schedule of development. This information is not present.

Based on the procedures outlined in the code the Planning Commission shall hold a hearing (regularly scheduled meeting) and review the proposed PUD plan and make a determination as to the proposal's qualifications for the PUD option and for adherence to the following objectives and requirements:

1. The proposed PUD adheres to the conditions for qualification of the PUD option and promotes the land use goals of the City.
2. All applicable provisions of this Chapter shall be met. Insofar as any provision of this Chapter shall be in conflict with the provisions of this Chapter shall apply to the lands embraced within the PUD area.
3. There is or will be, at the time of development, an adequate means of disposing of sanitary sewage and of supplying the development with water and that the road system and storm water drainage system are adequate.

The applicant desires to develop this property for residential purposes in a way that will provide a mixture of residential uses (single family, two family, and multiple family units. The overall plan for this property includes both single story villas and apartments mixed with traditional single-family homes. The total number of residential units is listed as 314 units at a density of 3.98 units per acre.

Per Ch 1240.03, in order to qualify for the Planned Unit Development option all of the following must be met:

- a) The PUD option may be effectuated only in the R, RM, C, OS and I Districts.
- b) The use of this option shall not be for the sole purpose of avoiding the applicable zoning requirements. Any permission given for any activity or building or use not normally permitted shall result in an improvement to the public health, safety and welfare in the area affected.
- c) The PUD shall not be utilized in situations where the same land use objectives can be accomplished by the application of conventional zoning provisions or standards. Problems or constraints presented by applicable zoning provisions shall be identified in the PUD application.
- d) The Planned Unit Development option may be effectuated only when the proposed land use will not materially add service and facility loads beyond those contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan unless the proponent can demonstrate to the sole satisfaction of the City that such added loads will be accommodated or mitigated by the proponent as part of the Planned Unit Development.

- e) The PUD shall not be allowed solely as a means of increasing density or as a substitute for a variance request; such objectives should be pursued through the normal zoning process by requesting a zoning change or variance.

Additionally, at least two of the following must be met:

- 1) To permanently preserve open space or natural features because of their exceptional characteristics or because it can provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses.
- 2) To permanently establish land use patterns which are compatible or which will protect existing or planned uses.
- 3) To accept dedication or set aside open space areas in perpetuity.
- 4) To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.
- 5) To guarantee the provision of a public improvement which could not otherwise be required that would further the public health, safety, or welfare, protect existing or future uses from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.
- 6) To promote the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.
- 7) To foster the aesthetic appearance of the City through quality building design and site development; the provision of trees and landscaping beyond minimum requirements; the preservation of unique and/or historic sites or structures; and the provision of open space or other desirable features of a site beyond minimum requirements.
- 8) To bring about redevelopment of sites where an orderly change of use or requirements is determined to be desirable.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission recommend disapproval of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) request as submitted. A detailed review of the plan details indicates missing information from Chapters Ch.1240.07(a)(3)(D) and Ch.1240.07(a)(3)(K). Additionally, the code calls for the Planning Commission to review whether this specific plan as proposed adheres to Ch.1240.03(a) through Ch. 1240.03(f)(1-8) which are the conditions for qualification. Ch. 1240.15 would generally determine that 3.1 units is the baseline density for R-3 zoned properties which this proposed plan would exceed. Based on this it could be said that Ch.1240.03(d) would not be met due to the increase in units above that contemplated by the underlying zoning (not including the land use plans suggestion of larger lots).

A general rule of thumb is to take the gross area of the land (3,432,833 SF) subtract 20% for roads and right-of-way (686,567 SF) which gives you 2,746,266 SF. Dividing that number by the minimum lot size of R3 which is 11,600 SF would provide theoretical yield of 237 building sites (vs. the 314 proposed). This calculation would suggest that the plan as proposed would increase service and facility loads by significantly increasing the density. In summary, the number of units and their density are of primary concern. While the nature of the project does have its merits the true intent of the PUD has not been recognized in this application. Any recommendation for approval should be accompanied by other requests to improve the attributes and attractiveness of this overall project in a mitigating manner.

Further, it is recommended to schedule a Public Hearing before City Council on November 7, 2023 at 6:15 PM.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Coventry Pointe North, located within Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road) and Parcel J37-100-240000020000 (0 Fort Meigs Road), and explained the Planned Unit Development process. Greg Feller, Feller Finch, and Tim Bockbrader, EDGE, and Mike White, Buckeye Real Estate Group, were present on behalf of the PUD request. Mr. Feller passed out an additional summary to the Planning Commission, and stated that their main issue is density and the impact to the surrounding area and municipality. He briefly discussed three main factors (number of units, traffic, and students in the schools) of this proposed development. Mr. Feller referenced a development study that was conducted from Sylvania, Ohio that noted a four (4) percent decrease of students in schools, noting the impact to the community is less or equal to an average neighborhood. Mr. Bockbrader briefly discussed the open space buffer around the perimeter of the neighborhood, and added that twenty-seven (27) percent or 21.9 acres of open space is preserved. He stated that a mitigating factor is also the 1.5 miles of dedicated bike path throughout the development. Mr. Bockbrader referenced the land use plan recommendation with regards to grouping tighter areas of residential development and preserving open space, and added that they are proposing a central green space with a pavilion shelter and playground in conjunction with building community. The Commission briefly discussed the density of the lots as proposed compared to single-family residential, cluster housing, and open space. Mr. Bade noted that he appreciates the proposed open space, and added that ponds are not to be included in those calculations. There was a brief discussion about the timeline for development, and Mr. Feller said that it could be a five (5) year build out and added that this PUD is intended for flexibility. Mr. Bockbrader added that there is a development trend moving to homes with smaller lots, and Mr. Bade said that he is concerned with the quantity of two-story townhomes proposed. Ms. Williams confirmed that there will be a PUD contract with the city for this development once approved, and added that she has a few concerns: the pond cannot be used in the open space calculation, empty nester housing as referenced at the June 29, 2023 Planning Commission meeting, the impact on the schools, the playground component, and an overall concern with PUD developments going forward.

Mr. Bockbrader noted that there is more control over the PUD development. Ms. Wolfinger said that she appreciates the need for smaller units, and asked if the R-3 (Single Family Residential) zoning calculations were compared to a local census, as their additional research seemed like a gross over calculation. Mr. White noted that similar developments are located within the Columbus, Ohio and Texas markets, that feature hidden garages, a craftsmen finish, and a great look. Mayor Mackin added that that this proposal is a continuation and ongoing process, and noted the balance of concerns previously discussed and the density. Mr. Vela agreed with the density concern, said that he understands three-fourths of the plan, and that he has an issue with the townhomes being proposed as the first area for construction which will in turn create a super high density for the first five years of development. He added that he is not a fan of the townhomes, and while he understands diversifying the portfolio of the development, the cluster of units will equate to a lot of traffic. Mr. Wellstein stated that the development is too dense, and noticed that some of the side yards are five (5) feet off of one another which seems tight. Mr. Lorenz said that he realizes that this is an ongoing process for development, and referenced the density issue that Mr. Bade recognized with three-fourths of the units at the June 29, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Feller asked the Planning Commission for clarification and direction related to density, and what is not too dense, and Mr. Bade suggested that they start with twenty (20) percent. Mr. Lorenz said that they are pushing the limits of the property as proposed, and Mayor Mackin said that he is not discounting the value of the proposed mitigation, but added that this proposal is not "it". The Commission offered a few suggestions for this development: bigger lots, a clubhouse or pool, proportionately off-set number of units, an open space value that is high enough to off-set the density, and to take a look at concrete comparisons; for example, the parking concern on Monclova Road for the McCarthy Builders development. Mr. Walters noted that previous PUD developments showcased specifics down to paint color, street signs, and architectural features. He informed the Planning Commission of their scope of authority with this request, and said that he envisions at least two more meetings and time to be invested to polish up this proposal. There was a brief discussion about next steps for this proposal, and Mr. Feller said that they would prefer to table this and bring it back to the Planning Commission at a future date.

Eric Coger, 8945 Five Point Road, addressed the Planning Commission, and asked them if they know what they want.

Mr. Bade made a motion to table the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Coventry Pointe North, located within Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road) and Parcel J37-100-240000020000 (0 Fort Meigs Road). Seconded by Ms. Williams, and it was unanimously approved (7-0).

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro
Zoning Clerk

