

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2024

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Rob Vela. Commission members present were Greg Bade, Mathew Beredo, Mayor Mackin, Rob Vela, and Becky Williams (5). Andy Lorenz and Megan Wolfinger were absent (2). Also present were Brody Walters, Planning & Zoning Administrator, and Tim Effler, Law Director.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Williams moved to approve the February 29, 2024 meeting minutes as written. Seconded by Mr. Vela, and the minutes were unanimously approved (5-0).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

None.

Final Plat *Canterbury Plat 4*

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Mr. Mark Rich
23285 West State Route 51
Genoa, Ohio 43430

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

REQUEST

Chapter 1295.07 – Final Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Canterbury is an R-4 residential subdivision proposed to consist of 410 lots in total. This subdivision is located south of Roachton Rd., and east of Hull Prairie Rd. The subdivision is approximately 204.3 acres and borders Perrysburg Intermediate School on the south and east sides.

Plat 1 consists of 37 non-contiguous residential lots and a common space lots A - F on approximately 25.401 acres and was finalized on May 25, 2017.

Plat 2 consists of 29 non-contiguous residential lots on approximately 13.984 acres and was finalized on July 25, 2019

Plat 3 consists of 37 residential lots on approximately 21.288 acres and was finalized on April 15, 2021.

BACKGROUND

The current version of the Preliminary Plat of Canterbury was approved by the Planning Commission on February 4, 2016. Since this time the overall Preliminary Plat has been renewed and is currently active/valid until January 26, 2025.

ANALYSIS

The plat layout for Plat 4 is compliant with the Preliminary Plat that is currently active for this area. The number of lots, street layout, and arrangement of lots are the same as originally proposed within the subdivision Preliminary Plat. All lots shown conform to all necessary dimensional requirements. The staff has reviewed the Final Plat for Plat 4 and approved it with the following comments:

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

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

ESCROWS

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

PAYMENT ITEMS

Street Signs
Street Lights
Open Space Fee

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Final Plat for Canterbury Plat 4 subject to the comments and recommendations in this report including the deposit of escrows, payment of open space fees, and other fees as required.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Final Plat for Canterbury Plat 4 and noted that the Open Space fee for this subdivision has already been fulfilled. Mark Rich, Developer of Canterbury, was present on behalf of the request. There were no comments or concerns from the Commission.

Ms. Williams made a motion to approve the Final Plat for Canterbury Plat 4 subject to the comments and recommendations in the above report including the deposit of escrows and other fees as required. Seconded by Mr. Bade, and it was unanimously approved (5-0).

Site Plan Amendment (Pavilion Addition) Saint John XXIII 24250 N. Dixie Highway

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Ridge Stone General Contractors
7015 Lighthouse Way, Suite #500
Perrysburg, OH 43551

Saint John XXIII
24250 N. Dixie Hwy
Perrysburg, OH 43551

REQUEST

Chapter 1260.05 – Preliminary Site Plan Review
Chapter 1260.08 – Final Site Plan Review
Chapter 1250 – Site Design Standards
Chapter 1245.33 – Corridor Overlay Development Standards

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located at 24250 N. Dixie Highway, just south of Five Point Road on the east side of the road. The closest neighboring uses include Southview Estates mobile home park and the St. Clare Commons nursing home campus. The current property zoning is Institutional (INS) and the site size is approximately 26 acres. The current property contains an existing church. The applicant would like to add an open pavilion to the south of the parking lot. There have been no other changes since the

parking lot and property were previously reviewed by the Planning Commission in July 2019.

ANALYSIS

Land Use – The current and requested use of the property has been reviewed and determined to be an “Institutional Use.” This existing facility has previously obtained a Special Approval Use for the property/use which did anticipate future expansion so it is not recommended to require additional review of the SAU at this time.

Dimensional Standards - The proposed parking lot addition is located to the east of the existing parking lot area and is sufficiently far enough away from nearby property lines to meet the required setback.

Building Materials – There are no proposed changes to the primary structure. The pavilion consists of wood posts and a vinyl board wall on the western elevation. Chapter 1250.48 allows for up to the usage of 100% vinyl in institutionally zoned districts.

Access – The subject location does have direct access (right-in, right-out) to SR25 from an existing curb cut which would remain in place to serve the existing development as well as the parking addition.

Parking – The current number of parking spaces for this site is 398. Per the zoning code, the required use and square footage would typically require 421 parking spaces. On March 13, 2017, the applicant applied to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) and was granted a variance to reduce the required parking by 30%. This variance was found to meet the requirements of Ch. 1250.02(r) 1-5 largely due to the repurposing of the existing church area and the fact that most traffic would not be overlapping due to the programming schedules of the different areas of the building.

Parking Landscaping – The area of the new parking lot is 40,498 SF of which 2,430 SF is required to be landscaped to satisfy the 6% requirement. Per sheet L-100, 6,015 SF is proposed to be landscaped which equates to about 14.8% of the parking area.

Site Landscaping – Ch. 1230 requires that not less than 10% of the overall site be landscaped. The landscape architect did not provide the calculation to verify that this requirement is being met. It is recommended to request verification that this requirement is being met. Additional landscape requirements such as on-site trees and street trees are being met in terms of quantity and spacing (as determined by the 2017 church addition review).

Street Trees – The street tree requirement was previously addressed during the 2017 application. The work associated with this most recent application will not affect this requirement.

Signage – There is no additional signage proposed as part of this request.

Lighting – Sheet E-100 identifies 4 new light fixtures to match the existing fixtures on site. The lighting details specifically the fixture height should be provided by the applicant at the Planning Commission meeting to verify compliance with the code.

Sidewalks – Sidewalks are not shown across the frontage of the property but are required by code. The site plan indicates that if installed the sidewalk would likely be on private property based on where the portion of sidewalk through the driveway is located. If any portion of the driveway is on private property, the city will require an access agreement be recorded with the Wood County Recorder before the issuance of a zoning permit.

Waste Receptacles – The entire property is shown to be serviced by the existing trash enclosure on site.

General Engineering – The applicant shall submit and obtain City of Perrysburg construction review approval for drainage calculations and general engineering prior to a zoning permit being issued. Additionally, a pre-construction meeting must be conducted before the issuance of zoning permits.

RECOMMENDATION

The Deputy Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Final Site Plan Amendment as submitted for Saint John XXIII (Pavilion Addition) at 24250 N. Dixie Highway.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Site Plan Amendment (Pavilion Addition) for Saint John XXIII at 24250 N. Dixie Highway. Brian Gruber, Ridge Stone General Contractors, was present on behalf of the request. Mr. Beredo asked about the previously approved variance for parking at this site, and Mr. Gruber confirmed that the pavilion will be used to host picnics and gatherings. Ms. Williams referenced the site landscaping in the Staff Report, and Mr. Walters noted that was a carryover item from the approved Site Plan in 2019.

Ms. Williams made a motion to recommend the Site Plan Amendment (Pavilion Addition) for Saint John XXIII at 24250 N. Dixie Highway as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Bade, and it was unanimously approved (5-0).

Preliminary Determination of PUD (Planned Unit Development)
Submittal of Planned Unit Development (PUD)
Coventry Pointe North
Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road)
Parcel Q61-100-240000020000 (0 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 1240.06 – Submittal and Request for Qualification
Chapter 1240.07 – Submittal and Approval of PUD Plan
Chapter 1255.01 – Impact Assessment

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property comprises two separate parcels: Q61-100-240000008000, and Q61-100-240000020000 (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. This site is approximately 78.801 acres in size and all properties are zoned R-3 (Single Family Residential).

ANALYSIS OF QUALIFICATION

The applicant is requesting a preliminary determination as to whether the provided plan for these parcels meets the qualification standards for the eventual approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The applicant desires to develop this property for residential purposes in a way that will provide a mixture of residential uses (single-family and multiple-family units). The plan for this property includes both single-story villas and apartments mixed with traditional single-family homes.

Proposed Statistics:

Single Family Lots = **102 units**
Detached Villas = **96 units**
Attached Villas = **86 units**
Total Possible Units = **284**

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:

The proposed Plan Unit Development appears to meets four (4) of the eight (8) objectives per Chapter 1240.03(f) and are indicated below with a numbered circle:

- 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.

In conclusion, it has been determined that the submission materials provided by the applicant are sufficient for making a preliminary determination as to the qualification of the proposed plan.

ANALYSIS OF PUD PLAN APPROVAL

The applicant is requesting PUD Plan Approval per Ch. 1240.07. The applicant has provided an engineered site plan, a building location plan, and an Open Space/Circulation Plan. 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.

Ch 1240.07 Submittal and Approval of PUD Plan

Application may be made for consideration with the submission of the following materials:

- (a) Submittal of Proposed PUD Plan. An application shall be made to the City for review and recommendation by the Planning Commission of the following:
 - (1) A boundary survey of the exact acreage being requested done by a registered land surveyor or civil engineer (scale not smaller than one (1) inch equals one hundred (100) feet) or less if approved by the City.
 - (2) A topographic map of the entire area at a contour interval of not more than two (2) feet. This map shall indicate all major stands of trees, bodies of water, wetlands and un-buildable areas (scale: not smaller than one (1) inch equals one hundred (100) feet) or less if approved by the City.
 - (3) A proposed land use plan indicating the following at a scale no smaller than one (1) inch equals one hundred (100) feet or less if approved by the City:
 - A. Land use areas represented by the zoning districts enumerated in Chapter 1220 of this Zoning Code.
 - B. Vehicular circulation including major drives and location of vehicular access. Preliminary proposals as to cross sections and as to public streets or private places shall be made.

- C. Transition treatment, including minimum building setbacks to land adjoining the PUD and between different land use areas within the PUD.
- D. The general location of nonresidential buildings and parking areas, estimated floor areas, building coverage and number of stories and height.
- E. The general location of residential unit types and densities and lot sizes by area.
- F. The location of all wetlands, water and watercourses and proposed water detention areas.
- G. The boundaries of open space areas that are to be preserved or reserved and an indication of the proposed ownership thereof.
- H. A schematic landscape treatment plan for open space areas, streets and border/transition areas to adjoining properties.
- I. A preliminary grading plan, indicating the extent of grading and delineating any areas which are not to be graded or disturbed.
- J. An indication of the contemplated water distribution, storm and sanitary sewer plan.
- K. 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.

(4) Planning Commission Review of Proposed PUD Plan:

- A. The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the PUD plan and shall give notice as provided in Section 1270.04.
- B. After the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall report its findings and make its recommendations to City Council. The Planning Commission shall review the proposed PUD plan and make a determination as to the proposal's qualification 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 and objectives 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 any other provision of this Chapter, the

provisions of this Chapter shall apply to the lands embraced within a 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 stormwater drainage system are adequate.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission evaluate the provided drawings and written explanations against the requirements of Ch. 1240.06 and if determined to qualify, evaluate the provided PUD plan per Chapter 1240.07 for the proposed Coventry Point North project. Any recommendation for approval should be accompanied by any necessary and specific 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 May 7, 2024, at 6:05 P.M.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary Determination of a PUD (Planned Unit Development and/or the Submittal of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Coventry Pointe North, located on Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road) and Parcel Q61-100-2400000020000 (0 Fort Meigs Road). Developer Steve Mitchell was present on behalf of the request and noted that this property was annexed into the city in 2022 and then assigned permanent zoning shortly thereafter. He added that he gained Preliminary approval for this PUD from the Planning Commission in 2023 and that since then there have been a few changes and updates to the plan. Mr. Mitchell noted that the density has been lowered to include 284 units, that the four-plex product has been eliminated, and that the plan has transitioned from the south to north with three different products, he added that the yellow single-story units are attached villas, and that there will be sixteen (16) acres of open space with the multi-use path around the perimeter of the development. Mr. Vela said that he likes the blending of the units and added that the plan looks less dense. Mayor Mackin agreed with Mr. Vela about density and added that there is still public concern with the community and the schools. Mayor Mackin noted that building materials are an important concern with this submittal, and welcomed the multi-use path and green space. Mr. Mitchell confirmed that this development is still a phased project with the single-story villas being the first phase breaking ground in 2025 and being occupied in 2026. He added that he has had discussions with neighboring property owner Stephen Chovanec about access points and water/sewer to Mr. Chovanec's property. There was a further discussion about the updated density of this project, and Ms. Williams said that she appreciates the decrease in density. Mr. Beredo noted that there are more single-family lots with this plan, and he asked how this is impacting the schools and facilities, as more families utilize the single-

family units. Mr. Mitchell added that there are less single-family units per acre with this plan. There was a brief discussion about the contractual PUD process. Mr. Bade said that he is happy with the reduction in density, that he appreciates the green space, and added that the smaller lots will not have as much of an impact on the schools.

Mr. Mackin made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Determination of a PUD (Planned Unit Development for Coventry Pointe North, located on Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road) and Parcel Q61-100-240000020000 (o Fort Meigs Road), and finding Chapter 1240.03(a-e) to be true, as well as (2) of (8) objectives of Chapter 1240.03(f) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Vella, and the request was unanimously approved (5-0).

ANALYSIS OF PUD PLAN APPROVAL

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Submittal of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Coventry Pointe North, located on Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road) and Parcel Q61-100-240000020000 (o Fort Meigs Road). Developer Steve Mitchell was present on behalf of the request and added that this property is in the corridor of future growth, that he has been working with the city to extend the sewer lines, and confirmed that they have all the utilities available for this development. There was further discussion about the proposed single-family units and the attached villas. Mr. Vela asked if there has been consideration for a dog park and if it would be considered an open space. There was a brief discussion about fences, and Mr. Mitchell confirmed that split rail fences would be allowed with the single-family homes. The Commission noted that they would like to see a color variety within the development, and Mr. Walters added that the specifications for the PUD at the nearby Redwood community have been listed. Mr. Mitchell confirmed that this development will feature public streets, and Mr. Walters added that a PUD is a way to mitigate the negative aspects of a development.

Mr. Vela made a motion to table the Submittal of a PUD (Planned Unit Development for Coventry Pointe North, located on Parcel Q61-100-240000008000 (25270 Fort Meigs Road) and Parcel Q61-100-240000020000 (o Fort Meigs Road) and further discuss at the April 25, 2024 Planning Commission meeting. Seconded by Ms. Williams, and the request was unanimously tabled (5-0).

Urban Village Overlay (UVO) Master Plan Harbor Town Place (PBP) Planned Business Park

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

HT Development, LLC
3102 Steeple Chase
Perrysburg, OH 43551

Feller Finch and Associates, Inc.
1683 Woodlands Drive
Maumee, OH 43537

REQUEST

Chapter 1245.01 Urban Village Overlay
through
Chapter 1245.07 Procedures for Establishment of a UVO (Step One)

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Harbor Town Place is located on the west side of SR25 at Harbor Town Blvd. and Progress Drive, south of Roachton Road and north of Five Point Road. The existing development is adjacent to the existing Horseshoe Bend subdivision and the Summerfield subdivision.

The existing zoning is Planned Business Park (PBP) with an Urban Village Overlay (UVO). There is also a small parcel of Multi-Family Residential (RM) towards the west side of the property.

The subject development consists of approximately 86.1 acres.

BACKGROUND

Harbor Town Place is currently a PBP/UVO with an established Architectural Review Committee (ARC) that was established in approximately 2010. As part of the UVO approval process, the applicant provided to the Planning Commission and City Council an overall master plan of the included land (See the sheet that is labeled "Existing Harbor Town Master Plan"). The code states that the UVO approval may introduce uses that are consistent with the underlying zoning of PBP and may also introduce uses that have specifically been identified in the UVO master plan. For this project, the applicant previously established their master plan by creating "areas" of uses labeled as areas 1 – 6, each of which is defined by a chart that outlines potential uses and dimensional standards.

Recently, the applicants presented a plan of development to the city which consisted of attached townhomes within the entirety of Area 6 (south of the ditch), Area 5, and Area 3 (south of the ditch). The Harbor Town ARC rejected this plan due to multi-family residential not being an approved use in Area 3 or Area 5. The governing ARC does have the authority to make minor modifications to the approved master plan, but it was determined by the ARC that such a change would be a significant deviation from the

approved plan. After the ARC issued the denial, the decision was appealed to City Council, where the ARC decision was upheld, resulting in the applicants being unable to develop multi-family residential units in areas outside of Area 6. During the appeal process, the applicants were informed that if there was a desire to change the types of uses that could be introduced to this area there would need to be a reapplication for a UVO accompanied by a revised "area map" (See the sheet that is labeled "Proposed Harbor Town Master Plan"). This revised area map now includes four areas, two of which do permit multi-family residential (Area 3 and Area 4).

ANALYSIS

1245.01 URBAN VILLAGE OVERLAY.

It is the purpose of the Urban Village Overlay to allow for flexibility in zoning when the result will be the development of a compact urban village with the following emphases:

- (a) Unified architectural themes that will allow for freedom in design and building materials while clearly creating an integrated urban village;
- (b) Neighborhoods, activity areas, and open spaces around a well-designed transportation network where pedestrian activity is strongly supported;
- (c) Shops with high pedestrian activity along the ground floors and office space or residential apartments on the upper floors;
- (d) Residential areas intermixed within close proximity of shops and places of work;
- (e) An emphasis on people and the neighborhoods where they live and play; and
- (f) A design where open space, public and institutional uses and recreational uses are interwoven into the urban fabric of the overall village context.

1245.02 DESIGNATION.

The Urban Village Overlay shall be designated by the abbreviation "UVO" on the City of Perrysburg Zoning Districts Map. All property so classified is subject to the provisions of this Chapter. (Ord. 25-2006. Passed 3-7-06.)

1245.03 APPLICABILITY.

- (a) The UVO shall operate as an overlay zone with all the existing zoning districts remaining intact. All provisions of the underlying zoning shall apply, except as provided for in this Chapter.
- (b) A minimum UVO Project area of fifty (50) acres shall be required to establish a UVO. (Ord. 25-2006. Passed 3-7-06.)

1245.04 ZONING PERMIT.

No zoning permit shall be issued for any new construction within an established UVO without approval of the ARC. (Ord. 25-2006. Passed 3-7-06.)

1245.05 USE REGULATIONS.

In addition to those uses permitted in the underlying zoning districts, a building or premises may be used for the following purposes subject to approval pursuant to this Chapter:

- (a) All uses permitted in any zoning district except I-1 and I-2 and all uses considered "special approval uses" with approval of the Architectural Review Committee;

- (b) General manufacturing may be permitted provided that the use is fully enclosed within a building;
- (c) Mixed uses and restaurants, bars and taverns where intoxicating liquor, beer and wine are offered for sale;
- (d) Uses beyond those permitted in this Chapter or in the underlying zoning may be approved by the Planning Commission as part of the establishment of the UVO in accordance with the Zoning Code.
- (e) Subsequent proposed uses, unless substantially different from the approved UVO, shall be reviewed and approved by the ARC. If substantially different, purposed uses shall be approved by the Planning Commission.

(Ord. 25-2006. Passed 3-7-06.)

1245.06 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE.

Owners and developers of property within a UVO district shall establish an ARC (Architectural Review Committee) and bylaws under which the ARC shall perform its duties and responsibilities. Such bylaws shall establish requirements of membership, duties and powers, meetings and voting procedures. The ARC shall be composed of the Planning and Zoning Administrator or designated representative, an architect and two (2) representatives of the owner and developer. The City shall appoint the architect. Any quorum of the ARC necessary to take action on a project must include the Planning and Zoning Administrator, or his designated representative. In the case of a tie vote, the Planning and Zoning Administrator shall be favored.

(Ord. 25-2006. Passed 3-7-06.)

1245.07 PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A UVO (STEP ONE).

The owner and developer of a property within a UVO Project shall be subject to the following two-step procedure to establish the district and develop lots within the UVO:

- (a) Establishment of a UVO (Step One): The owner or developer shall be subject to all application and review requirements set forth in Chapter 1285 with regard to changes and amendments to the Zoning District Map.
- (b) In addition to the requirements set forth in Chapter 1285, the owner and developer shall be required to submit a master plan that illustrates the following information along with the application for an amendment to the Zoning Districts Map:
 - (1) The general location and types of permitted land uses;
 - (2) The yard requirements for each use category;
 - (3) The general transportation network including streets, alleys, multi-use paths, sidewalks, and other pedestrian pathways;
 - (4) Proposed residential densities and proposed minimum lot sizes by use category;
 - (5) Illustrations of the general design theme and character for each land use;
 - (6) A comprehensive sign master plan shall be provided that illustrates or requires compliance with the following requirements:
 - A. Signs shall be designed and built of materials and colors that are consistent with the architectural style of the building for which the signage is representing and the overall architectural style of the project;

- B. Ground signs shall be designed to be permanent in appearance; portable signs modified to be used as ground signs are prohibited; and
- C. Fluorescent lighting is prohibited in signage.
- (7) Development standards which include architectural standards, landscaping, parking and any other items as required by the Planning and Zoning Administrator shall be submitted.
- (c) City Council may approve development standards which deviate from the requirements of the Zoning Code so long as such standards will promote the purpose and intent of this Chapter. The requirement of the Zoning Code shall be observed unless City Council approves design standards which deviate therefrom.
- (d) The information outlined in Section 1245.07(b) may be made in any format that will adequately demonstrate the concept and intent of the proposed development.
- (e) The foregoing information shall be submitted and adopted in accordance with Chapter 1285 of the Zoning Code.
- (f) Upon the establishment of the UVO District, the owner and developer may then proceed with the subdivision of the project area in accordance with the subdivision regulations of the City of Perrysburg Zoning Code and with Final Design Plan review (Step 2). Exceptions to improvement standards may be made with the City's approval.
- (g) Approval is valid for a five (5) year period.
(Ord. 25-2006. Passed 3-7-06.)

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends:

1. Review of the requirements of Chapter 1245.01 to determine if the goals of the UVO are being met by the proposed master plan.
2. Evaluate if the applicant has provided the necessary information to recommend approval based on the requirements of Chapter 1245.07.

NEW INFORMATION SINCE LAST SUBMISSION can be found under the “NOTES” section of the map legend located in the bottom right quadrant of the Plat Map. This note indicates that “a total of 180 proposed new dwelling units, excluding the existing units, split between areas 3 and 4 are permitted. Area 3 currently includes 65 existing dwelling units and area 4 currently includes 56 existing dwelling units.” This plan, as proposed, would result in a maximum of 301 total dwelling units within the existing Harbor Town Development (121 existing and up to 180 additional)

Additionally, the applicant has provided a copy of the development standards for the Planning Commission’s review.

Further, it is recommended that a Public Hearing be set before City Council on May 7, 2024, at 6:15 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Urban Village Overlay (UVO) for Harbor Town Place (PBP) Planned Business Park. Brian Gruber, Ridge Stone Builders

& Developers, Greg Feller, Feller Finch, Jerry Parker, Gressley, Kaplin & Parker, LLP, and Brian McCarthy, McCarthy Builders, were present on behalf of the request. Mr. Walters referenced Chapter 1245.01 (UVO) and added that this is a proposal by the Developer. Mr. Gruber confirmed that the Urban Village Overlay was added in 2010, and added that they are present today with their request to amend the master plan as the existing plan is not meeting the current market needs. He stated that this updated plan will provide better connectivity, feature renter-by-choice units, and incorporate the Perrysburg Tomorrow Plan.

Mr. Gruber noted that the Harbor Town ARC approvals currently allow for storage units within this development, and Mr. Vela noted that the new overlay does not prevent them from building “flex space” and three-story units. Mr. Gruber confirmed that the previous meeting stirred up activity for future tenants within Harbor Town.

The Commission briefly discussed the proposed Area 3 and Mr. Walters asked if they had considered C-2 zoning within this portion with apartments above the first floor as an option. Mr. Williams referenced Chapter 1245.01 and said that she remembers Mr. Gruber’s dad’s vision for Harbor Town, and Mr. Gruber added that he envisions townhouses around the restaurants. Mr. Vela agreed with Mr. Walters about a C-2 zoning utilization of the undeveloped parcels in Area 3. Mr. Gruber said that they could change the density and transition to a two-story brownstone unit. There was a brief discussion about future multi-family units.

The Commission briefly discussed the proposed Area 2 and there was further discussion about the outdoor storage component. Mr. Gruber said that he sees this as a collective flexspace to accommodate commercial up front with industrial in the rear. He added that the plan is for Ridge Stone Builders & Developers to stay in Harbor Town while bringing in McCarthy Builders and Noneman Real Estate, too.

The Commission briefly discussed the proposed Area 4 and there was further discussion about the concerns with self-storage in this area. Mr. Bade referenced page 6 section 6 of the Development Standards which states “building variation is greatly encouraged”. Mr. Walters noted that this is a unique property as a Planned Business Park with its own Development Standards which feature a fundamental use of the land. He said that there is a reasonable expectation of what is allowed per the existing Development Standards. Mr. Bade and Mr. Vela agreed that self-storage should be removed from Area 4, and Mr. McCarthy confirmed that they do not want to build units per say, but that they would like to retain the right for self-storage just in case. Mr. Walters noted that there ought to be a fundamental use of the land and that the ARC is charged with the aesthetics of the development. Mayor Mackin said that he is not comfortable extending Area 4 if the developers want to keep the storage units, and Mr. McCarthy said that Mr. Walter’s comments about the scope of the ARC review gives him comfort.

Mr. Feller confirmed that he will generate an updated master plan to reflect the discussions and motion made tonight. Mr. Parker said that this is one of the most productive meetings that he has witnessed, and thanked the Commission and Mr. Walters.

Mr. Vela made a motion to recommend conditional approval of the Urban Village Overlay (UVO) for Harbor Town Place (PBP) Planned Business Park, and that a Public Hearing be set before City Council on May 7, 2024, at 6:15 p.m., with the following conditions that the applicant provide before the Public Hearing:

1. Revised Master Plan Map with updated Legend to reflect the changes as identified in Exhibit A (as attached)
2. Update to the Site Development Standards for Harbor Town

Seconded by Mr. Bade, and the request was unanimously approved (5-0).

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro
Zoning Clerk

EXHIBIT A

Area	Permitted Uses	Uses allowed with approval of the ARC	Min. Front Yard	Min. Rear Yard	Min. Side Yard	Min. Lot Area	Min. Frontage
1	Uses Permitted under C-1 zoning, doctors office, medical office, dental office, urgent care, hospital, office, retail, bank	All uses allowed under C-3 zoning, both permitted and special approval uses.	50'	25'	0'	10,000 SF	100'
2	Office and bank, medical office, self-service storage, warehousing, flex-space	Outdoor storage as an accessory use	50'	25'	10' (15' for flex space/warehouse)	20,000 SF	100' (200' for flex space/warehouse)
3	Uses Permitted under C-2 zoning, Restaurant uses (both permitted and special approval use), office, banks, and medical office	All other uses permitted under C-4.	50'	25'	0'	0 SF	0'
4	Zero lot line single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, multiple-family dwellings, office and banks, medical offices and clubhouse	Flex space*	25'	15'	Residential 8'; all other uses 20'	Residential 9,500 SF; all other uses 0 SF	55'

*NOTES: Unless otherwise noted, the uses above are defined in the current City of Perrysburg Planning and Zoning Code. Flex space is defined as space that can be apportioned in variable amounts to offices, research laboratories, internal light industrial purposes or warehousing.
-A total of 165 proposed new dwelling units, excluding the existing units, in Area 4 are permitted. Area 3 currently includes 65 existing dwelling units.