

City of Findlay City Planning Commission

Thursday, April 12, 2018 - 9:00 AM

Minutes

(Staff Report Comments from the meeting are incorporated into the minutes in lighter text. Actual minutes begin with the DISCUSSION Section for each item)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jackie Schroeder
Dan Clinger
Brian Thomas
Dan DeArment

STAFF ATTENDING: Judy Scrimshaw, Development Planner
Todd Richard, Zoning Inspector
Jeremy Kalb, Engineering Project Manager
Matt Cordonnier, HRPC Director
Matt Pickett, Fire Prevention

GUESTS: Dan Stone, Leah Wilson, Erik Adkins, Tom Shindeldecker,
Ashley Donaldson, Joe Corron, Todd Jenkins, Tom
Quarrie, Myreon Cobb, Elizabeth Corbitt, Lou Willen,
Mark Bassitt,

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

The following members were present:

Jackie Schroeder
Dan Clinger
Brian Thomas
Dan DeArment

SWEARING IN

All those planning to give testimony were sworn in by Judy Scrimshaw.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dan Clinger made a motion to approve the minutes of March 8, 2018. Dan DeArment seconded.
Motion carried 4-0-0.

NEW ITEMS

1. PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-02-2018 filed to rezone 113 Alexander Place from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to M-2 Multiple Family.

General Information

This request is located on the southeast corner of Findlay and Marshal Streets. It is zoned R-2 Single Family Medium Density. To the north, east and west is also zoned R-2. To the south is zoned M-2 Multiple Family. It is located within the 100-year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Map designates the area as Single Family High Density.

Parcel History

This parcel is the site of four 2 unit residential structures built in 2004.

Staff Analysis

The applicant is proposing to rezone this parcel to M-2 Multiple-Family. The existing units were constructed as an RDO (Residential Development Option). The parcel was zoned B Residential at the time which permitted duplexes. However, only one duplex was permitted per lot. The RDO gave the owner an avenue to submit a plan with multiple units as long as it complied with density requirements of the code. That plan had to be approved by Council. This option was removed from the zoning code when it was rewritten in 2012.

The lot to the south was recently rezoned to M-2 also to allow the development there to resume as Multi-family.

Staff is favorable of the change for this parcel as well. However, the rezoning does not mean that the existing structures can be used. According to the zoning office, there were several issues relative to the flood plain with the original construction. They will not issue any occupancy permits in their current state.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends that FCPC recommend approval to Findlay City Council of **PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-02-2018 filed to rezone 113 Alexander Place from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to M-2 Multiple Family.**

ENGINEERING

No Comment

FIRE PREVENTION

No Comment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that FCPC recommend approval to Findlay City Council of **PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-02-2018 filed to rezone 113 Alexander Place from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to M-2 Multiple Family.**

DISCUSSION

Dan Clinger asked if this was the same ownership as the previous M2 that was filed a while ago. Dan Stone said it was not. Mr. Clinger asked if they were intending to keep the footprint of the structures. The applicant said they were. Mr. Clinger asked if the setbacks meet the requirements for M2 and if anyone had looked at the side yard. Matt Cordonnier stated that they were not sure what the intended use for the property owner was for rezoning so they didn't specifically look at that. He said that he guessed that the structures would most likely not meet the standards for M2 currently.

Mr. Stone stated that the duplexes were constructed in 2004, went through the flood, flooded out and the current developer at the time walked out. It was then purchased by the new owner. They met with the zoning department and went through the problems that exist with the property. Mr. Stone said they know the buildings must be elevated to be above the base flood elevation and they need to work on the cut fill balance to comply with the flood plain permit. There is still some water line extension that needs to be done and fees to be paid. But before the developer could come through, they need to rezone the property to ensure that the buildings comply. The intent is to leave the structures where they are and elevate them by two or three blocks to have them at or above the base flood elevation, go through and redefine the swales they were intended to be there for the cut-fill balance, and extend the water line to provide service there. They plan to stick with the original plans that were submitted to the city but with a few tweaks to comply with the new codes – with the flood development code and with the setbacks. And if the setbacks do not comply, they would need to apply for a variance there.

Mr. Clinger asked how far the structures are in the flood plain. Mr. Stone said the buildings are elevated but are still about anywhere from eight to twelve inches in the flood. There were some issues with the original survey and construction which is why they flooded in 2007. They plan to detach the garage, raise up the house portion by two or three blocks and re-side and reattach the garage. Mr. Clinger thanked the applicant and Mr. Stone for taking on this major project and fixing the deplorable conditions there.

Dan DeArment mentioned that the alley to the south dumps into the parking lot and asked if they obtained permission to use the parking lot as an egress. The applicant stated that he has never approached them about it and has been using it and they've never brought it up. He stated he would talk to the owner to see if they can continue using the parking lot for that purpose. Mr. DeArment said that if the road to the north floods out, they would lose access. The applicant stated that there should be enough space to put a roadway in on their portion if necessary. Judy Scrimshaw stated she thought it was under the same owner when they were doing the school and the buildings so it wasn't important at the time even though they were two parcels then but they should work out an easement of access – although that is up to them as it is a civil matter.

Mr. Clinger asked Mr. Cordonnier if M-2 would be more appropriate for the property than M-1. Mr. Cordonnier stated that he was correct and that M2 is for more dense multi-family properties which would fit this case. He stated he didn't have any concerns with it zoning-wise but said they might have to go for some variances but he would be in support of those.

MOTION

Dan Clinger made a motion to recommend **approval to Findlay City Council of PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-02-2018 filed to rezone 113 Alexander Place from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to M-2 Multiple Family.**

2nd: Jackie Schroeder

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

2. PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-03-2018 filed to rezone parcel #630000084980 (2131 Spruce Drive) from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Duplex/Triplex.

HRPC

General Information

This request is located off the south side of Spruce Drive behind Michael Eller Jewelers. It is zoned R-1 Single Family Low Density. Land to the east and west is also zoned R-1. To the south is zoned R-1 Single Family in Marion Township and to the north is zoned B-2 General Commercial. It is not located within the 100-year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Map designates the area as Single Family Large Lot.

Parcel History

This is a vacant residential lot. It was annexed to the City in 2006 and was zoned B Residential. The previous owners attempted to rezone the parcel to B-2 General Business in 2011. That request was denied. When the new zoning code was adopted, the parcel was changed to R-1 Single Family Low Density.

Staff Analysis

The applicant is requesting to rezone this .476-acre parcel to R-4 Duplex/Triplex with the intent of constructing a triplex unit on the lot.

The lot has a recorded shared access with the drive abutting it on the east side owned by Thad Davidson onto Spruce Drive.

Rezoning the parcel to R-4 will bring it back to the original zoning it had before the map change. Any new construction will have to comply with today's zoning standards for that district.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends **that Findlay City Planning Commission recommend approval to Findlay City Council of PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-03-2018 filed to rezone parcel #630000084980 (2131 Spruce Drive) from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Duplex/Triplex.**

ENGINEERING

- Sanitary Sewer or Water needed?
- How many drive accesses are desired on Spruce Drive?

FIRE PREVENTION

No Comment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Findlay City Planning Commission recommend approval to Findlay City Council of PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-03-2018 filed to rezone parcel #630000084980 (2131 Spruce Drive) from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Duplex/Triplex.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Clinger asked Ms. Scrimshaw if the one section is currently zoned R-2 out of the whole R-1 lot to the south. Ms. Scrimshaw said it was. She said the lot to the south is an island and is in Marion Township and the lot in discussion was annexed sometime around 2006. It was previously B-Residential and was owned by someone else for a long time until the newest owner purchased it. They talked about putting a duplex on the lot at one point but then found out there were issues getting access to the sanitary sewer and getting an easement to gain access. That is still something that needs worked out if they do eventually decide to build something there. The utilities are on the cul-de-sac of Chestnut and on the northeast corner of Sunset but there are no easements to go through those peoples' properties to get access. Mr. Clinger asked if they could go to Spruce Dr. for access to utilities. Ms. Scrimshaw stated that those go to Tiffin Ave. and would have to get an easement to go through there as well. Ultimately, he has a lot he would have to work through to obtain access to utilities. Ms. Scrimshaw stated that she thought that was the reason no one has built there.

Mr. DeArment asked Ms. Scrimshaw if they would have to come back with a site plan. She said they would not as it would just be a duplex or triplex. The applicant showed Brian Thomas and Ms. Scrimshaw a triplex he was considering. He has the option to go either with a two or three family housing unit with the zoning district he is in. Mr. Thomas stated the applicant would still have to go to Todd Richard for the zoning permit, and engineering for water, sanitary, storm and driveway permits. Ms. Scrimshaw reiterated that anything under one, two, or three family housing just gets a permit from zoning and doesn't submit a site plan.

Mr. Clinger stated that this was a tough property to develop. Ms. Scrimshaw said they didn't like it when they tried to develop commercial there despite there being commercial nearby. They didn't want to stick a commercial property in a residential neighborhood. On that side of the street, it is entirely residential. Ultimately, nobody went for that idea and the applicant gave up on it. Now, they have someone interested in purchasing the property. Ms. Scrimshaw stated that regardless of zoning, the applicant has some issues to work through.

MOTION

Dan DeArment made a motion to recommend **approval to Findlay City Council of PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-03-2018 filed to rezone parcel #63000084980 (2131 Spruce Drive) from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Duplex/Triplex.**

2nd: Dan Clinger

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

3. APPLICATION FOR A HOME BUSINESS #CU-02-2018 filed by Elizabeth Corbitt, 1543 Logan Avenue, Findlay to operate a car detailing business in an existing building at 1505 Morrival Blvd.

HRPC

General Information

This request is located on the east side of Morrival Blvd. It is zoned R-2 Single Family Medium Density. All surrounding lots are also zoned R-2. It is not located within the 100-year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Plan designates the area as Single Family Small Lot.

Parcel History

There is an existing garage building on the lot.

Staff Analysis

The applicant is requesting to operate a car detailing business from the existing building as a Home Business. The definition of **Home Business** is: Any occupational activity carried on exclusively by a member of an immediate family residing on the premises and conducted entirely on the premises. No commodity shall be sold on the premises nor mechanical equipment used in the fabrication or alteration of products, tools, gear, etc. from which external effects of which may adversely affect adjacent property. Home businesses shall be clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the premises for dwelling purposes, and shall not change the structural character thereof.

In this instance, the garage that will be used for the business is on a separate lot from the residence. Both parcels are under the same ownership and the applicant does reside in the home at 1543 Logan Avenue.

The garage was previously used for storage of vehicles and equipment for a sewer tapping business.

The applicant has stated that the hours of operation will be 8:00 to 5:00 Monday through Friday and that all work will be done inside the building. Auto detailing is generally not a noisy business. It would seem the only noise producing equipment might be a shop vac. With only one person doing the work, it would be reasonable to assume that there would not be the need for many vehicles to sit outside for lengthy periods of time either.

Staff recommends approval with the notation that the applicant understands that if there are legitimate complaints regarding the operation that the permit can be revoked.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR A HOME BUSINESS #CU-02-2018 filed by Elizabeth Corbitt, 1543 Logan Avenue, Findlay to operate a car detailing business in an existing building at 1505 Morrival Blvd.**

ENGINEERING

How many cars/ customers are going to be parked in the drive waiting to be detailed?

If floor drains are present in the building, are they tied into the sanitary sewer or storm sewer?

FIRE PREVENTION

No Comment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR A HOME BUSINESS #CU-02-2018 to operate a car detailing business in an existing building at 1505 Morrival Blvd.**

DISCUSSION

Jeremy Kalb asked how many cars or customers are going to be parked in the drive waiting to be detailed. The son of the applicant and the person who would be doing the detailing said that it varies. The applicant said cars could be parked in the barn and they would never be sitting outside. He said if he had two or three per day, they would all be parked in the barn and would never be outside. Mr. Kalb asked if the floor is concrete. The applicant said it is. Mr. Kalb asked if there was a floor drain. The applicant said there is. Mr. Kalb asked if the drain connected to the sanitary or the storm. The applicant said he was not sure which one it was hooked up to. Mr. Kalb said that he would need to have the drain hooked up to the sanitary and said they may need to conduct some dye testing to verify.

Tom Quarrie, who resides 1917 Imperial Lane and owns 1642 Byal Avenue which abuts the property in question, stated that he's lived there for 25 years, and it is a quiet neighborhood with no business activity. Mr. Quarrie stated that he found it difficult to understand how the property in question could be used as a detailing business when there's no adequate parking outside the building. He said he would expect multiple vehicles outside at any point with the type of business this would be – and that would be his objection. Mr. Quarrie said he felt that the parking of multiple vehicles outside the business seemed likely regardless of what the owner had to say. He also stated he had no clue how the owner would anticipate only two or three vehicles on the property at one point and that doesn't seem reasonable to him. The applicant replied that there would be no cars outside as there is only one person doing detailing and he can only do so many cars in one day. He said there would be appointments and he would narrow those down so if someone had an appointment, their car would be inside at all times.

Mr. DeArment asked if the applicant would be allowed to hire employees since it's a home business. Ms. Scrimshaw said he could not. Mr. DeArment asked if he could have a son or family member assist with the business. Ms. Scrimshaw said it could only be someone residing on the property. Mr. DeArment asked if a condition could be placed on this to ensure that cars were parked within the building and not on the outside. Ms. Scrimshaw said they could. She said that if it becomes a problem and there are complaints, the use can be revoked. However, there must be a legitimate complaint about noise or cars are stacked up before he would be shut down. Mr. Richard stated that he felt it would be appropriate to have these lots combined. He said it would be very easy for the building to be sold separately from the dwelling creating a semi-commercial building sitting by itself with no attachment to a resident. Ms. Scrimshaw said it isn't zoned for that and they would have to come here before legitimately doing anything and if it were a total separate business, it wouldn't even be permitted. Mr. Richard said that when there are buildings like this sitting by themselves on an auction block and someone who doesn't have as good of intentions for the neighborhood comes in to purchase, that can be a problem. He reiterated that he felt the properties should be combined and it could prevent issues down the line. He said he wasn't sure why anyone would object to that.

Mr. Clinger asked how long ago this property was a sewer cleaning business. The applicant stated that his father passed away in December and they just recently removed all of the equipment from the business and he moved in with his mother to help care for her. He said that in order to reside there to care for her, he needs to have an income so detailing cars is his best option. Elizabeth Corbitt, his mother, stated that they bought the property in 1980 from the Ohio Power Company and it is one lot but with the construction, they were given a separate address. Ms. Scrimshaw stated that she had wondered why they had split – if it was for business or tax purposes. She said that she knew it had been one lot. The applicant asked if they could put it back together, and Ms. Scrimshaw said they could. The applicant said it would be no problem to put them back together if that's what the commission would want. Ms. Corbitt said the properties are attached as there is a sidewalk that goes from the residence to the barn. Ms. Scrimshaw said on paper, however, it is two separate properties with two separate tax cards.

Mr. DeArment said he would like to make a motion to approve the application under certain restrictions – combining the lots, and restricting the parking. Mr. Clinger asked if the parking would be restricted or if there would be no parking on the outside. Mr. DeArment said restricted would be fine. Mr. Richard asked if he meant no outdoor storage of the vehicles. Ms. Scrimshaw said no outdoor storage but he should be okay to move one out of the garage to park it for the customer to pick up in the driveway. The applicant stated that would be the only reason to have any cars sitting outside just so they aren't in the way in the garage. Mr. Cordonnier said his recommendation is to be as specific as possible with these conditions so that it's clear to everyone what the rules are. Mr. Richard said those rules would be reflected in the permit issued for this as well. The applicant said there would be no more than two cars sitting outside at any point in time so the customers can pick up their cars. He said if that would be an issue, he could leave the cars inside until the customer arrives. Mr. Clinger said he wanted to approve the application contingent upon there being no more than two vehicles parked outside the property at all times. Mr. DeArment stated there should be no street parking. Ms. Scrimshaw agreed and said they should only be in his driveway.

MOTION

Dan Clinger made a motion to **approve APPLICATION FOR A HOME BUSINESS #CU-02-2018 to operate a car detailing business in an existing building at 1505 Morrical Blvd subject to the following conditions:**

- **Lots are combined**
- **No more than two vehicles be parked outside the building at any one time.**

2nd: Jackie Schroeder

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

4. APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-02-2018 filed by CFT NV Developments LLC, 1683 Walnut Grove Ave, Rosemead, CA for a 4,500 square foot multi-tenant retail building at 1843 Tiffin Avenue.

HRPC

General Information

This request is located on the south side of Tiffin Avenue east of Londonderry Drive. The lot is zoned B-2 General Commercial. Parcels to the north, east and west are also zoned B-2. It is not located within the 100-year flood plain. The City Land Use Plan designates the site as General Commercial

Parcel History

The east portion of the lot is under construction for a Panda Express restaurant.

Staff Analysis

When the plans were approved for Panda Express in September 2017, there was a second restaurant location shown on the west side of the lot. The concept shown for that building was approved with the understanding that if no permits were issued within one year that they would have to resubmit the site plan. The time frame has not expired, but they have changed the plan to include an additional 2,300 square feet of retail space onto the proposed restaurant.

Setbacks for C-2 General Commercial are 30' front, 15' side and 30' rear. The structure location exceeds all of these. The setback for parking areas is 10' from the property line. The pavement on the south side is part of the total pavement shared with all the other retail in the area. Although this parcel has its own boundaries, (lot lines) traffic will flow through all areas of the shopping center and adherence to the setback along those lines is not a concern. As long as other traffic aisles are not affected, we feel it makes sense.

As stated in the review from September, the plan listed various easements that have been recorded over this parcel concerning utilities and access across the land. It appears that general cross access agreements exist for the drives, parking, walkways, etc. in the development.

Access to the site from Tiffin Avenue is via two curb cuts as were approved on the plans for the Panda Express in September, 2017.

The restaurant is requesting a drive thru window on the east side. Drive thrus are a conditional use and must be approved by FCPC. That was approved in the previous plan along the south side of the building. It is now located on the east side. Stacking required is eight cars from the point of ordering to any road right-of-way. There is only room in the drive up aisle for five (5) vehicles from the order point; however, additional vehicles will not be near any road right-of-way. They will only be backed up in the drive aisles within the site. The situation was similar in the first proposal.

The bare minimum number of parking spaces required by code is only 19 spaces for the total 7,200 square feet of buildings proposed. The site plan has 148 spaces shown.

The dumpster on the west side of the lot was encroaching into the setback on the last plan. This has been corrected.

There do not appear to be any changes in light pole locations on the site. The photometrics were submitted with the Panda site plan and approved.

The elevation drawings submitted show that the building will be approximately 23'-6" in height. This is well under the 60' maximum permitted. The building design is modern and all finishes are within the architectural standards of our code. Three sides of the structure will have some signage. Signage on the building is not regulated.

The freestanding sign details were approved on the original plan. Panda Express was allowing space for one more tenant on their sign. A third tenant on the site will only be permitted the signage on the building.

The landscaping detail shows the required plantings around the building and in the parking lot islands. The green areas will be a great improvement to the current sea of asphalt.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-02-2018 filed by CFT NV Developments LLC, 1683 Walnut Grove Ave, Rosemead, CA for a 4,500 square foot multi-tenant retail building at 1843 Tiffin Avenue.

ENGINEERING

Access –

The applicant is proposing access to the site from multiple locations from the Isaac Market Square Findlay LTD.

Sanitary Sewer –

The proposed sanitary service will connect into the existing sanitary sewer on the south side of the site, with a service come from each of the buildings.

Waterline –

Water Distribution has informed us that there is an existing 2-inch line that is located just to the east of the proposed taps. We would like to utilize the existing tap for one of the taps if not both. The proposed plans do not show any fire line or sprinkler systems.

Stormwater Management –

The proposed plans show a decrease in impervious area after construction. Due to the decrease in impervious area from existing conditions, no additional detention will be required.

MS4 Requirements –

Since the site is located within the City of Findlay corp. limits, the site must comply with the City of Findlay's MS4 requirements.

Sidewalks –

There are no additional sidewalks that will be added within City R-O-W. If any walk is removed for the water line taps, it will need to be replaced per City of Findlay Specs.

General

- Some more information on the Storm and Sanitary lines, such as size and slope of the pipe.
- The exact location of the sanitary sewer will need to be verified before drilling for the light pole bases in the SE island.

Recommendations:

Conditional approval of the site plan subject to the following conditions:

- Need some more information on the sewers to verify the slopes and coverage.

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- Sanitary Tap Permit
- Waterline Tap Permit x2
 - If existing tap is utilized it will just be a Water Reconnect
- Storm Tap Permit
- Sidewalk Permit

FIRE PREVENTION

Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-02-2018 filed by CFT NV Developments LLC, 1683 Walnut Grove Ave, Rosemead, CA for a 4,500 square foot multi-tenant retail building at 1843 Tiffin Avenue subject to the following conditions:**

- Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department. (FIRE)
- Need some more information on the sewers to verify the slopes and coverage. (ENG)

DISCUSSION

The applicant stated that they would likely have irrigation for the landscaping when mentioned by Mr. Kalb with engineering comments. Mr. Kalb stated that he would need a tap for the irrigation.

Mr. Clinger said that when the commission receives site plans like these, he gets frustrated because it does not show the impact on the adjoining buildings or show the relationship to the buildings, their plans, or parking. He stated that the configuration of the drive on the northwest corner would eliminate parking there and it would create a dramatic turn to get into that access. Mr. Clinger asked if there was a way to square off the drive to more of a 90 degree access onto the site. The applicant stated that should work. Mr. Clinger stated he knew they had the forms out there already and that they may have even poured that already. The applicant said they have not and stated he was out there this morning. He said this plan proposes a slight change from that of the Panda Express plan so he asked them to hold off on pouring at this point. He said that if they wanted to make it more squared off, that is still an option. Jackie Schroeder mentioned that when the Panda Express plan came through, they had discussed making that into a one way. Ms. Scrimshaw stated that it still is. Ms. Schroeder asked which way the traffic is going. Ms. Scrimshaw replied that it is one way into the site. Because of the way the angled parking next door for Jimmie John's is, the only way they can leave is to head north and there is no access across the front of their store, so they have to turn right and go out through the Panda Express property.

Mr. Clinger asked if there was an agreement between the owners of the property in question and the strip mall for access to parking. Ms. Scrimshaw said there was and because Koehler owned the area for a while and then Isaac took it over and everything needed to stay connected. Mr. Clinger asked if the owner would have a problem with people using the strip mall parking in their lot. Ms. Scrimshaw said that they would not.

Ashley Donaldson asked what restaurant would be going into the proposed building. The applicant said they weren't looking at a restaurant necessarily but a bagel or coffee shop. Ms. Donaldson asked if it would be a Starbucks. The applicant said possibly. He also said the other side would be a chain jewelry store.

MOTION

Dan Clinger made a motion to **approve APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-02-2018 filed by CFT NV Developments LLC, 1683 Walnut Grove Ave, Rosemead, CA for a 4,500 square foot multi-tenant retail building at 1843 Tiffin Avenue subject to the following conditions:**

- **Reconfiguration of the northwest access to the parking (CPC)**
- **Approval of the drive-thru (CPC)**
- **Need some more information on the sewers to verify the slopes and coverage. (ENG)**
- **Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department. (FIRE)**

2nd: Brian Thomas

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

5. APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-03-2018 filed by the University of Findlay, 1000 N. Main Street, Findlay for a parking lot at 1310 N. Main Street.

HRPC

General Information

This project is located on the north side of the vacated right-of-way of Swing Avenue. It is zoned C-2 General Commercial with the University Overlay. To the east is also zoned C-2 with the University Overlay. To the south and west is zoned O-1 Institutions and Offices with the University Overlay. It is located within the 100-year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Plan designates the area as University.

Parcel History

This was the former site of the Ohio Conveyer Supply business.

Staff Analysis

The University proposes to construct parking for 11 cars and 13 busses along the north side of the vacated Swing Avenue.

The parking area for the cars along the south side of the building already exists, but will be resurfaced. Green space will be added at the front of the portion of the building that will remain. This area was parking spaces.

The bus parking spaces will be to the rear (west side) of the building. Old gravel areas will be seeded and grassed.

There is no additional lighting indicated on the plans.

Due to the proximity to Howard Run and the flood plain issue, the applicant will need to consult with Todd Richard for any flood development permits.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-03-2018 for a parking lot at 1310 N. Main Street.**

ENGINEERING

Access –

The proposed plans are showing access to the site is from the previously vacated Swing Ave. The old drive drop from the existing building will be removed with new full height curb placed back.

Sanitary Sewer –

No Sanitary Sewer is shown.

Waterline –

No Waterline is shown.

Stormwater Management –

The proposed plans show a decrease in impervious area after construction. Due to the decrease in impervious area from existing conditions, no additional detention will be required.

MS4 Requirements –

Since the site is located within the City of Findlay corp. limits, the site must comply with the City of Findlay's MS4 requirements.

General –

- What is the proposed thickness of the stone berm?
- Will need to show a cut/fill plan to ensure there was no additional fill to the floodway/floodplain.

Recommendations:

Conditional approval of the site plan subject to the following conditions:

- Give thickness detail for the stone berm.
- Provide a cut/ fill plan of the site after construction is completed.

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- Curb cut/Drive Permit

FIRE PREVENTION

No Comment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-03-2018 for a parking lot at 1310 N. Main Street subject to the following conditions:

- Give thickness detail for the stone berm. (ENG)
- Provide a cut/ fill plan of the site after construction is completed. (ENG)

DISCUSSION

Mr. Clinger stated he was not aware the Swing Avenue had been vacated and asked when that occurred. Myreon Cobb, the applicant, stated it had been vacated for quite some time – 10-15 years. Mr. Clinger thanked the University for cleaning up that corner.

MOTION

Dan Clinger made a motion to approve APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-03-2018 filed by the University of Findlay, 1000 N. Main Street, Findlay for a parking lot at 1310 N. Main Street subject to the following conditions:

- Give thickness detail for the stone berm. (ENG)
- Provide a cut/ fill plan of the site after construction is completed. (ENG)

2nd: Dan DeArment

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

6. APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-04-2018 filed by Mark Bassitt, 327 E Edgar Street, Findlay for a building addition and storage area at 2311 Bank Street, Findlay.

HRPC

General Information

This request is located on the east side of Bank Street south of E. Yates Avenue. It is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. All surrounding lots are also zoned I-1. It is not located within the 100-year flood plain. The City Land Use Plan designates the area as Industrial.

Parcel History

The applicant came before Planning Commission in April, 2017 as a Special Review requesting to be allowed to build without a site plan. That request was denied.

Staff Analysis

This property sits on a remote part of Bank Street south of E. Yates Avenue. On the west side of Bank Street is the Blue Rock Nature Preserve. There are two homes directly north of his lot, which are also in the Industrial zoning. There are railroad tracks on his east boundary and Hancor owns the lot directly south.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 36' x 40' addition to the south side of his existing building. Front yard setback in the I-1 district is 50'. The building encroaches into the setback, however, the Industrial district does allow for a structure to follow an established building line. Side and rear yards are 30'.

The maximum height in I-1 is 60'. An elevation drawing indicates the maximum height of the structure is only 19'.

Two (2) parking spaces are required per code. There are three (3) potential spots shown at the north end of the site. They are angled and only the one closest to the building is probably deep enough. We know he would not want to block the garage doors, but perhaps a couple of spaces perpendicular to the building would be more logical. It looks like there would be space on either side of the new garage door.

A fenced in stone storage area is shown behind the existing structure. The industrial district is the only one that still permits stoned areas for storage. The area must be enclosed and screening provided if abutting residential. The north side of the storage area does abut residential uses. Because it is a chain link fence, Staff would require some plantings to screen on the north side. We would consider a solid privacy fence on that side instead if the applicant would wish to do that.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-04-2018 for a building addition and storage area at 2311 Bank Street, Findlay subject to:**

- **Screening along the north side of the fenced storage area (HRPC)**

ENGINEERING

Access –

The applicant is proposing a new drive to be placed on Bank Street, just south of the existing pavement drive.

Sanitary Sewer –

No Sanitary Sewer Shown

Waterline –

No Waterline Shown

Stormwater Management –

Detention for the site will be provided by the proposed detention pond located on the east side of the property. Will need to see calculations for the outlet from the detention basin.

MS4 Requirements –

The disturbed area should be less than one (1) acre so the site will not need to comply with the City of Findlay's MS4 requirements. If the actual disturbed area will be larger than one (1) acre, the site will need to comply with the City of Findlay's MS4 requirements

General –

- Is there any kind of drive access needed back to the stone storage area?

Recommendations: Conditional approval of the site plan subject to the following conditions:

- Provide Calculations for the Storm outlet.

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- Curb cut/Drive Permit

FIRE PREVENTION

Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-04-2018 for a building addition and storage area at 2311 Bank Street, Findlay subject to:**

- **Screening along the north side of the fenced storage area (HRPC)**
- **Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department. (FIRE)**
- **Provide Calculations for the Storm outlet. (ENG)**

DISCUSSION

Dan Stone mentioned that he thought he had submitted the calculations for the storm outlet but they must have been misplaced. Mr. Thomas said he thought there were detention calculations but there were none for the outlet.

Mr. DeArment asked what kind of business would be housed on the site. Mark Bassitt, the applicant, stated he did general fabrication mostly for race cars. Mr. Clinger asked if Mr. Bassitt was planning to keep the fenced in front portion of the property. Mr. Bassitt said no and stated that was his reason for putting it in the back. Mr. Clinger asked if the proposed new drive is for truck deliveries. Mr. Bassitt stated it was for both deliveries and for access to the addition. Mr. Clinger said he noticed that there was parking outside the fence and it hardly fits into the property. Mr. Clinger asked if he was planning to relocate the shed. Mr. Bassitt said it would most likely be relocated.

MOTION

Dan Clinger made a motion to **approve APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-04-2018 filed by Mark Bassitt, 327 E Edgar Street, Findlay for a building addition and storage area at 2311 Bank Street, Findlay subject to the following conditions:**

- **Reconfiguration of the parking spaces**
- **Screening along the north side of the fenced storage area (HRPC)**
- **Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department. (FIRE)**
- **Provide address numbers on the building (FIRE)**
- **Provide Calculations for the Storm outlet. (ENG)**

2nd: Jackie Schroeder

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

7. APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-05-2018 filed by Affordable Mike's LLC, 3640 Marathon Way, Findlay for an additional 35' x 150' storage unit building and related pavement.

HRPC

General Information

This site is located on the west side of Marathon Way in the Northend Commercial Park 1st Addition. The lot in this request is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. Land to the east and south is also zoned I-1. To the west and north is zoned C-2 General Commercial. The site is not within the 100-year flood plain. The City Land Use Plan designates the area as Regional Commercial.

Parcel History

The last phase of this development was reviewed and approved by FCPC in October, 2017.

Staff Analysis

This proposal will add one new 35' x 150' storage unit building at the south end of the development. The building will be the same construction and height as the previous units.

The asphalt drive will continue south and go around the building to connect with the current pavements.

The landscaping is shown to continue south along the west side.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-05-2018 for an additional 35' x 150' storage unit building and related pavement at 3640 Marathon Way.**

ENGINEERING

Access –

Access to the site will be from an existing drive off Marathon Way, there is no change in access to the site.

Storm water Management –

Detention for the site will be provided by the existing regional detention facility next to the site. The existing detention facility has been modified since its initial design to handle the improvements from the Cube baseball diamonds as well as the subdivision. The detention calculations for the existing regional facility have been submitted.

Waterline-

There are no proposed waterlines shown on the plans.

Storm Sewer-

The plans show the addition of two 60 LF runs of storm sewer as well as two catch basins. The proposed storm will be tied into the existing lines that are plugged towards the south of the property.

Sidewalk-

The proposed plans shows the existing sidewalk extended to the south. The sidewalk will need to adhere to City of Findlay Sidewalk Standards.

Sanitary Sewer-

There are no proposed sanitary sewer shown on the plans.

MS4 Requirements –

The amount of erodible material that will be disturbed will be less than one acre so the site will not be required to comply with the City of Findlay's Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance.

Recommendations: Approval of the Site Plan:

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- Sidewalk Permit.
- Storm Sewer Tap x2

FIRE PREVENTION

No Comment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends **approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-05-2018 for an additional 35' x 150' storage unit building and related pavement at 3640 Marathon Way.**

DISCUSSION

Mr. Clinger stated there are currently four units on the property and mentioned the last the commission had seen the property was to add the fifth and said that this would be the sixth. Ms. Scrimshaw stated he was correct and that the fifth unit was an administrative approval due to a size increase and moved the pavement but it has been approved; it just hasn't been constructed yet. Mr. Clinger asked if there was still room for one more unit. Mr. Stone said there was. Mr. Clinger stated that he knew the city had a guideline stating that if you disturb more than one acre, you must follow the guidelines for erosion control. Mr. Clinger asked if that guideline should come into play with this application since it is developing gradually. Mr. Stone said they are still providing the general BMP practices. He said it does drain into the existing pond to the east of the property and it does have the capacity for water quality.

MOTION

Dan DeArment made a motion to approve **APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-05-2018 filed by Affordable Mike's LLC, 3640 Marathon Way, Findlay for an additional 35' x 150' storage unit building and related pavement.**

2nd: Brian Thomas

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

8. APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-06-2018 filed by Ohio Logistics, 1800 Production Drive, Findlay for a 150,000 square foot warehouse addition with truck docks at 1800 Production Drive.

HRPC

General Information

This request is located on Lots 19 and 20 in the Findlay Industrial Center Replat. It is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. All surrounding parcels are also zoned I-1. It is not located within the 100-year flood plain. The City Land Use Plan designates the area as Industrial.

Parcel History

The site is currently occupied by an industrial warehouse.

Staff Analysis

This addition will add 150,000 square feet to the existing building. The building addition will include truck docks, office space, restrooms, and breakroom.

Setbacks in the I-1 Light Industrial district are 50' front and 30' side and rear. The plan meets all setback requirements.

Parking for I-1 is calculated at 1.1 space per employee on the largest shift. The plan indicates that 38 employees will be the largest shift. At 1.1 per employee it calculates to 42 parking spaces. The plan shows a new parking lot on the east side with 45 spaces.

The height maximum in I-1 is 60'. The plans indicate the highest point of the building to be at 42'-9".

The only landscaping required in I-1 is for parking lots. The front and sides abutting another lot require a landscape buffer.

Staff Recommendation

HRPC Staff recommends approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-06-2018 for a 150,000 square foot warehouse addition with truck docks at 1800 Production Drive.

ENGINEERING

Access –

The applicant is proposing a new drive to be installed off of Production Drive, just east of the two existing concrete drives. The new drive to be proposed to be asphalt pavement, giving access to the proposed parking lot.

Sanitary Sewer –

The proposed sanitary service will connect into the existing sanitary sewer on the south side of Production Drive.

Waterline –

The proposed plans show a domestic and fire line to be installed for the new building. The fire line will be coming off of the existing 8-inch line that is located on the north side of the site. The 2-inch domestic line will be tied into the 12-inch water main located on the north side of Production Drive. As a note, the City of Findlay does not allow 90-degree bends to be installed on public waterlines.

Stormwater Management –

Detention for the site is proposed to be provided by the existing detention pond. The consultant will need to verify that the pond does indeed comply with our current standards. Will continue to work with the consultant.

MS4 Requirements –

The amount of erodible material that will be disturbed will be more than one acre so the site is required to comply with the City of Findlay's Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance.

General –

- Verify volume in detention pond
- Ex Catch Basin in fire lane need Raised/ Lowered?
- Tops on all CB's seem to be 100 FT too low.

Recommendations: Conditional approval of the site plan subject to the following conditions:

- Verify Volume in Detention Pond
- Adjust Catch Basins on plans

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- Sanitary Tap Permit
- Waterline Tap Permit x2
- Curb cut/Drive Permits

FIRE PREVENTION

Extend the 8" fire line (located to the east of the proposed warehouse) to the south with three hydrants spaced evenly.

The fire lane (located to the east of the proposed warehouse) shall be 25' wide. Extend the drive northward to the northeast corner of the existing warehouse building.

Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-06-2018 for a 150,000 square foot warehouse addition with truck docks at 1800 Production Drive subject to:

- Submittal of a landscaping plan for the parking lot (HRPC)
- Extend the 8" fire line (located to the east of the proposed warehouse) to the south with three hydrants spaced evenly. (FIRE)
- The fire lane (located to the east of the proposed warehouse) shall be 25' wide. (FIRE)
- Extend the drive northward to the northeast corner of the existing warehouse building. (FIRE)
- Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department. (FIRE)
- Verify Volume in Detention Pond (ENG)
- Adjust Catch Basins on plans (ENG)

DISCUSSION

When discussing the extension of the fire line, the applicant stated they were considering taking it down 2/3 of the way from the new northeast corner and asked if that would be far enough. Matt Pickett said he spoke with someone on the phone about the proposed parking/drive on the east side and extending the fire line down into that parking/drive and placing a fire hydrant on the southeast corner of the proposed building off of the drive area.

Mr. Clinger asked if the proposed parking lot is for the addition itself or to accommodate some of the other parking. Mr. Corron said it was strictly for the addition. Mr. Clinger and Ms. Scrimshaw noted that there was parking dotted throughout the site currently. Mr. DeArment asked what was going to be done with the large dirt pile on site. Mr. Corron said it would be hauled off site. He said it had been checked for contaminants and they received the report from Bowser Mourner stating that they are all good. Mr. Thomas asked Fire Prevention if they had concerns about the length of the extension of the loop that will be coming all the way across the building and down to the corner creating a dead end. Mr. Pickett said he was not concerned as it is their private line and it's on a fire pump and the pressure will be there.

MOTION

Dan Clinger made a motion to approve **APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW #SP-06-2018** filed by **Ohio Logistics, 1800 Production Drive, Findlay** for a **150,000 square foot warehouse addition with truck docks at 1800 Production Drive** subject to the following conditions:

- **Submittal of a landscaping plan for the parking lot (HRPC)**
- **Extend the 8” fire line (located to the east of the proposed warehouse) to the south with three hydrants spaced evenly. (FIRE)**
- **The fire lane (located to the east of the proposed warehouse) shall be 25’ wide. (FIRE)**
- **Extend the drive northward to the northeast corner of the existing warehouse building. (FIRE)**
- **Apply for all necessary permits with Wood County Building Department. (FIRE)**
- **Verify Volume in Detention Pond (ENG)**
- **Adjust Catch Basins on plans (ENG)**

2nd: Jackie Schroeder

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

9. REVIEW PROPOSED ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS filed by **HRPC**. The proposed amendments are for the **Downtown Design Review District and the Downtown Design Guidelines, located in Chapter 1138 and 1139.**

See attached documents.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Cordonnier stated that there are two proposed changes to the zoning code – the first being an alteration to Chapter 1138. Chapter 1138 creates the Design District, the board, the powers and duties, and responsibilities. The second, Chapter 1139, is the creation of the Design Review Guidelines. In September of 2017, Chapter 1138 was adopted. Once this chapter was created, the board was populated and the first meetings were held in December. There have been four meetings to work on creating design guidelines as outlined in Chapter 1138. During the process of creating the guidelines, the board had some items they wanted to change and further define such as “administrative review” and “full board review”. They also decided to give the administrator more oversight to decide if a full board review was necessary in certain cases – namely to make the process more expedient. Chapter 1138 currently shows the changes the board has made thus far.

Mr. Clinger asked who the administrator would be. Mr. Cordonnier said it would most likely be Regional Planning, more specifically Jacob Mercer, as to avoid overloading Todd and his staff with more items. Ms. Schroeder asked how frequently the board would be meeting. Mr. Cordonnier said it has been outlined that the board must meet at least once every two months but it is more likely that they will be meeting monthly and meeting a few days prior to the Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Schroeder mentioned that 1138.08 on the last line has the meeting schedule that suggests regularly scheduled monthly meetings and suggested that it may need modified in case there aren't regularly scheduled meetings.

Mr. DeArment said his main concerns with the guidelines are with the maintenance section and the fact that it does not address graffiti. He stated that if there was graffiti on a building, he would think that it would need to be addressed. Mr. Cordonnier said he would place graffiti under the exterior walls and finishes section, although it doesn't explicitly state that. He said he noted to add a statement about graffiti. Mr. DeArment asked if sidewalk issues would fall under the maintenance section in the guidelines. Mr. Richard said he figured that would be something Engineering would deal with. Mr. Thomas said that they currently deal with that. Mr. Cordonnier said that the guidelines do not need to serve as duplicate to something Engineering already takes care of.

Mr. DeArment asked how the guidelines would help in a situation such as the Argyle Lot with the fence. Mr. Cordonnier said that would fall under portion seven with vacant lots – the lot must be maintained, level at grade, and clear of debris. Mr. DeArment asked what the standards are for fencing and if the owner of the lot could continue to have a chain-link fence into the foreseeable future. Mr. Cordonnier asked if the city told the owner to have the fence or if they chose to erect the fence on their own. Mr. Richard said the city did not require it and the owner chose to put up the fence to secure the property. Mr. Clinger said that the fence could easily stay there for 20+ years. Mr. DeArment asked if there was a timeline for how long the fence could stay. Ms. Schroeder asked if the site was level and clean or if the fence was there to keep people from falling in. Mr. Richard said there was initially a concern because there was a drop off and we didn't want people accidentally stepping off the edge. He said that he doesn't believe there is a hazard there right now and he would like to think that someone will do something with this lot here soon. Mr. DeArment mentioned the lot has been there for around seven years so it has been awhile. Mr. Richard agreed. Mr. Cordonnier mentioned he would look further into this and said that there are fence standards. Mr. Richard mentioned that they are in the C3 and a lot of this was put up prior to the standards being put into place so there is some grandfathering in this case. Mr. Cordonnier said he would research. Mr. DeArment said maybe this isn't something we can fix with this particular lot due to grandfathering but perhaps this can be applied to future issues. Mr. Cordonnier said that when they had written the ordinance, they had included "cleared of debris and seeded for grass". Mr. DeArment said if it were seeded for grass, there would need to be regular mowing otherwise it would turn to weeds and become a mess. Mr. Clinger asked if the fence should come down by that point if they are following the procedures to clean the site, plant the grass and follow general maintenance. Mr. Cordonnier said that he is more concerned with and wants to research the standards they would need to meet if they put the fence up today. He stated that if they were allowed to put up the chain-link fence he would want to put something in the guidelines to that effect.

Mr. DeArment asked about the landscaped parking lot across from the courthouse and if it would need a wall. Ms. Scrimshaw stated that that existed prior to having the standards we currently have for landscaping. Mr. Cordonnier said if it was constructed today it would look differently due to the ordinance for landscaping and the wall, and that would be reviewed by the Design Review Board. But the Design Review Board will not force property owners to make any changes. For example, if there is a non-maintenance unattractive building in downtown, the board cannot do anything to enforce that building owner to change the building.

Mr. Cordonnier said the Design Review Board kicks in when a property owner is making changes to their property and is reviewing those changes to determine appropriateness when compared to the design guidelines.

Chapter 1139 is the Design Review Guidelines. The method used for crafting the guidelines was a somewhat vague approach to convey the feeling. The other option was to go with a longer, more stringent, technical document for the guidelines. Mr. Cordonnier stated that he went with the first approach because he felt with the more technical document; one could meet every standard and still design something unattractive whereas the first approach works to convey major concepts such as keeping the urban wall intact, offering a general color palette and so on. The Board has quite a bit of discretion to interpret the guidelines. The Board is a diverse group with many different interests. Mr. Cordonnier stated that they chose to go with a seven-person board to avoid having one or two opinions couldn't entirely dominate the group.

Mr. Thomas noted that projecting signs, awnings, and lights are encouraged and asked how those would be taken care of since they are encroachments onto right-of-way. He said with the Marathon project, he had a large stack of right-of-way encroachment permits that he had to give to Mr. Richard to file for the awnings, cornices, the clock, and etc. Mr. Thomas said that if we do this again with federal funds, someone needs to sign all of the new stuff. He asked who would be made aware of this as things go through – if it would be Mr. Richard, Engineering, etc. He asked what would occur if the City did not want something in the right-of-way. Mr. Richard stated that they do have guidelines for signs and awnings and the permits that were filed for that project were for the items that did not already have a permit on record. Mr. Richard said that he thinks we are now at a general baseline for the items Downtown and that things are now accounted for and that from here forward, the permit process should be able to keep everything accounted for. Mr. Richard gave the example that if ten years from now, twelve permits have been issued for projecting signs, those would now be accounted for by the city and nothing more would have to be done with those. Mr. Thomas stated his main concern was more with the projecting lights. Ms. Schroeder stated that federal money for a project means that if there is anything private that is encroaching on the right-of-way there needs to be a revocable permit on file to satisfy state requirements to receive that money. Ms. Schroeder asked Mr. Thomas if there is a specific permit language that is expected. Mr. Thomas said he would check. Mr. Thomas reiterated that he wanted to ensure that we are covered with the permits so they don't have to go through and file as many permits as they had previously. Mr. Richard stated that he believed that would not happen again and that we should be covered. Mr. Thomas asked who they would go to for a permit if someone were to want to put two projecting lights next to their sign outside to improve their building. Mr. Thomas stated he was not against this but wanted to understand how this would work. Mr. Cordonnier said it sounds like a procedural item.

Mr. Richard stated they do have a miscellaneous permit for items that serves as a catchall. Mr. Cordonnier said that improvements that are in the right-of-way would receive a certificate of appropriateness after filling out the encroachment into the right-of-way document. Mr. Thomas stated we should get together to check the wording because he wasn't sure if a certificate of appropriateness would be enough for ODOT.

Ms. Schroeder asked if anyone saw any confusion on where certain sections of the guidelines would apply to the design review district since it is such a large area with many different properties. Mr. Cordonnier said they had that discussion previously at the board level and they understood and accepted that a building on Main St. will receive a different review than that of a smaller warehouse-type building on a street off of Main St. Ms. Schroeder noted that the guidelines were written for a Main St. type of area. Mr. Cordonnier noted that existing single family duplex and triplexes are exempt, but if a new single family duplex or triplex is constructed, they would be subject to the guidelines and would have to come to the board and present the plans. Mr. Cordonnier said the board feels comfortable taking the context and the use of the building into account. He stated that the design aesthetics of the streets three blocks from Main St. are not considered as important as those of Main St.

Mr. DeArment asked if there were discussions about the size of the Design Review District. Mr. Cordonnier said they had many discussions over this and had a discussion with the city of Urbana. Grant Russell went to Urbana to meet with them and discuss the design review district there and asked what they would change. The officials said if they could make the size of the district larger, they would. The reason they wanted it larger is because they missed redevelopment opportunities that they could've had some input on – which is the reason our Design Review District is the size that it is. Mr. Cordonnier said that you can't later enlarge the district to incorporate new developments. Mr. Clinger asked if it would've made sense to have the district go to Blanchard St. rather than Factory St. Ms. Scrimshaw stated that there was a version that had included Blanchard. Mr. Cordonnier said there were many discussions over that but we ultimately decided on the current version without Blanchard St. because adding Blanchard made it feel a little too big. He stated that over the past year and a half, there were many planning and zoning meetings that discussed the map. The city council members felt most comfortable not including Blanchard St. Mr. Clinger asked if the number of residential properties within the district would be subject to the Design Review Guidelines. Mr. Cordonnier said the existing single family, duplexes and triplexes would not have to come to the Design Review Board to make changes such as painting, but if a new home is constructed, they would then be subject to the guidelines during construction and in the future. Mr. Clinger asked if the apartments being constructed at West St. and Front St. would be subject to review. Mr. Cordonnier said they would not be because of timing since the Design Review Board is not yet in full review at this point.

Mr. Cordonnier stated that there has been a lot of positive feedback – around 20 business owners downtown have voiced their support. There have also been four or five dissenting views on it but after discussion, a few were relieved of their concerns. Mr. Cordonnier said there has been more support than expected. He also stated that the board and the general purpose of the board is to work with property owners and not to be heavy-handed in reviewing changes unless absolutely necessary.

MOTION

Dan DeArment made a recommendation to **approve REVIEW PROPOSED ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS** filed by HRPC. The proposed amendments are for the **Downtown Design Review District and the Downtown Design Guidelines, located in Chapter 1138 and 1139** subject to the following condition:

- **Research graffiti guidelines**
- **Research fencing**

2nd: Dan Clinger

VOTE: Yay (4) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

ADJOURNMENT

Lydia L. Mihalik
Mayor

Brian Thomas, P.E., P.S.
Service Director