

# City of Findlay City Planning Commission

Thursday, June 11, 2015 - 9:00 AM  
Municipal Building, Council Chambers

## 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:**

Mayor Lydia Mihalik  
Jackie Schroeder  
Dan Clinger

### **STAFF ATTENDING:**

Matt Pickett, FFD  
Matt Cordonnier, HRPC Director  
Judy Scrimshaw, HRPC  
Todd Richard  
Don Rasmussen  
Brian Thomas

### **GUESTS:**

Dan Stone, Genna Freed, Don Malarky, Paul Smith,  
Stefanie Griffith, Lou Willin, Garland Parrish, Phil  
Rooney, Todd Jenkins, LeRoy Schroeder, Brad Bloomfield,  
Gina Bloomfield

### **CALL TO ORDER**

### **ROLL CALL**

The following members were present:

Mayor Lydia Mihalik  
Jackie Schroeder  
Dan Clinger

### **SWEARING IN**

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

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Jackie Schroeder noted that on the last page it mentions a 36' pipe, this should say 36". Ms. Schroeder made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 14, 2015 meeting with that typo corrected. Dan Clinger seconded. Motion to accept carried 3-0.

**1. PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-08-2015 filed to rezone 101 Shinkle Street, Findlay from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to M-1 Multiple Family.**

**HRPC**

**General Information**

This request is located on the northeast corner of Shinkle Street and River Street. The lot is zoned R-2 Single Family Medium Density. All surrounding parcels are also zoned R-2. It is located within the 100 year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Plan designates the area as Single Family Small Lot.

**Parcel History**

None

**Staff Analysis**

The applicant is requesting to change the zoning of this parcel from R-2 Single Family to M-1 Multiple Family. It is listed as a three family unit.

According to research done by Zoning Inspector, Todd Richard, this was a single family residence until 1990. It became a duplex at that time. There is no record of a zoning permit to change the dwelling to a duplex. It was zoned B Residential at that time. A duplex would have been permitted and protected if a permit would have been obtained for the change. It became a three (3) unit dwelling in 1996 without a permit as well.

None of the conversions from a single family home to either a duplex or triplex were done with a permit and are thus considered illegal.

Required parking for a triplex is 2 ½ spaces per unit. This home would need 8 off street parking spaces in order to meet code. There is an old 2 car garage off of River Street which may have room for two additional cars in the driveway. The garage is in poor shape and we're not sure if it is usable. At best this would allow for 4 off street parking spaces.

**Staff Recommendation**

HRPC Staff recommends that FCPC recommend to Findlay City Council to deny **PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-08-2015 filed to rezone 101 Shinkle Street, Findlay from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to M-1 Multiple Family because:**

- Neither the 2 family nor the 3 family conversions were done legally
- Cannot supply the off street parking as required.

**ENGINEERING**

No objections

**FIRE PREVENTION**

No comments

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that FCPC recommend **denial to Findlay City Council of PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-08-2015 filed to rezone 101 Shinkle Street, Findlay from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to M-1 Multiple Family because:**

- Neither the 2 family nor the 3 family conversions were done legally

- **Cannot supply the off street parking as required.**

## **DISCUSSION**

Dan Clinger stated that he agreed with the recommendation from HRPC because it is not compliant as it is now. If we change it to M-1 it is still not compliant. He said he doesn't know what purpose changing this to M-1 serves. The property can't meet parking, setbacks, and he doesn't know if it can meet the living standards such as size of unit. Dan said it also appears that the buildings cover more than 40% of the site. For these reasons he doesn't see any advantage of changing this to M-1.

Christina Snoke said she bought the house back in 2005 as an investment to help pay for college. It was a foreclosure and she and her father worked hard to improve the property which was in terrible shape. Ms. Snoke said she was never made aware that the place was not to be a triplex. She was under the impression that it was a converted single family home to a multi-family home. She stated she feels like she was blindsided. She said they put a lot of word into the property. She had it on the market multiple times. Ms. Snoke said she finally had an offer on it in the last month and a half and with the potential buyer's appraisal she found out that it was not zoned properly. She said she was never made aware of this at the time of purchase. Ms. Snoke said she had it appraised herself once or twice since she purchased it and no one made her aware of this. She said if she would have been made aware she would have never purchased the property in the first place and/or she would have made the proper changes years ago when she refinanced. Her current financial position means she needs to sell now. Ms. Snoke said she feels like she is not responsible for something that someone else has done. She would have thought a bank that she purchased from would have been aware. She said she is being taxed as a multi-family home, she pays insurance as a multi-family home, and she feels that the City is partly responsible for not following the property and allowing it to be sold and refinanced multiple times. Ms. Snoke said she doesn't feel it is solely her responsibility to take care of converting it back to a single family property.

Christina Snoke stated that she is all for justice and making sure things are safe and upholding things but she begs for mercy. She said she had no clue going into this and what all it would entail. She said she really tried to make the property better. She stated that she had setbacks with flooding in 2007. Ms. Snoke is just really begging to have this be reconsidered.

Mayor Mihalik asked Todd Richard what the usual mechanism is for the City to know if a property has been converted. Is it typically when it changes hands? Todd Richard replied that since about 2008 the appraisers have been more active in talking to the City. It would be impossible for him to keep track of all the real estate sales daily. He said that since we don't have any building code enforcement there is no really good way to detect when things get converted. Mr. Richard said that the appraisers often call to verify if the use of a property is legal. That is when he finds out that they are not. There are thousands of parcels in the city and daily transactions that are impossible for him to track. It is usually when a realtor or appraiser calls to find out the status of a property that these come to light. He does the best research he can and in this case it was just evident that there had been conversions without approval.

Phil Rooney spoke up and stated that last month a guy came in on the corner of W. Main Cross and Western Avenue and got a little relief on a building he had converted to a triplex. He said that is what they are looking for here. Judy Scrimshaw stated that it was not the same thing in

this case. It was zoned single family but had been zoned otherwise prior to him purchasing it and he was asking for the change to be permitted to add a third unit. He had not put in the additional unit yet. It had been a legal duplex before; it had adequate parking and had just been legal all the way. Ms. Scrimshaw commented that she didn't know where people were parking for this home now. They may be using the lot across the street in Rawson Park. Ms. Snoke said that they used to but did not any longer. They park on the street. She stated that two (2) of the tenants park in the drive and the others park on the street. She said that one of her arguments with converting back to a single family home is that she has no money other than what is generated from the income of renting. She would be getting college students in there to rent as a single family home. It could have six bedrooms with as many as six renters then and six cars. That is more than what is actually using the site now. Mr. Rooney said that at the very least they would be interested in a change to R-4 to at least allow a duplex. A duplex would have been permitted under the old zoning. He said if the commission can't live with M-1 perhaps they can live with R-4. Mr. Rooney said he assumed this area might be rezoned to R-4 when the changes are made. Mr. Cordonnier stated that the new R-4 would also add triplexes but they still must meet parking standards.

Mayor Mihalik asked to verify how many parking spaces they would need for the duplex. Ms. Scrimshaw replied that four (4) were needed; two for each unit. Mayor Mihalik asked if they have four now. Judy Scrimshaw asked the applicant if the garage is useable. Ms. Snoke responded that the garage door doesn't open and close. Ms. Scrimshaw said that if the garage was useable they would have the four off street parking spaces. Our code requires off street parking and doesn't consider on street as a solution. The complaint about many of these conversions in neighborhoods is that cars are all over the street, parking in the front yards, etc.

Dan Clinger asked if the reason that the house is not selling is because the zoning is not correct for what exists. Mr. Rooney and Ms. Snoke replied yes. Ms. Snoke said she had a buyer and lost them when this was discovered. Mr. Rooney said he assumes that if the zoning does not change they have to convert it back to single family. Mayor Mihalik said yes. Dan Clinger stated that the R-4 would allow a duplex now and the code revision could allow a triplex. Mr. Cordonnier clarified that even with the R-4 allowing triplexes, there are still the parking requirements to deal with. Mr. Clinger asked what size the units are. Ms. Snoke responded that there is a 2 bedroom, 1 bedroom and efficiency apartment. Matt Cordonnier asked if the garage was a living space. Ms. Snoke said no, that it has become storage for all the tenants. Mr. Clinger asked how we would confirm the change. Mr. Richard said that they would fill out a change of use permit application. He would issue that permit and then we could say it is a legal duplex on record. Ms. Snoke asked if she opened up a wall to connect the studio apartment to the 2 bedroom and make it a 3 bedroom unit if that is what would be needed. Todd Richard stated that they have to prove there is free movement from all areas to make one unit. There could only be 2 independent living units.

Dan Clinger said he understands the hardship she is having and it is unfortunate that things have evolved the way they have but he can only recommend changing this to R-4 as opposed to M-1. He says that will at least give her some relief.

### **MOTION**

Dan Clinger made a **motion to recommend that Findlay City Council rezone 101 Shinkle Street to R-4 Two Family Residential.**

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Jackie Schroeder

Mayor Mihalik asked to see the zoning map again. She noted that everything here is zoned R-2 Single Family and we would now have one parcel of R-4. Mr. Clinger noted that we did this with the parcel on W. Main Cross. Jackie Schroeder asked if this area would be looked at again when we redo the map. Mr. Cordonnier stated that yes, when the map is reworked, we will be looking at the entire City. We will go section by section and it will be a long process. We would guess that there are other duplexes in the area.

**VOTE:** Yay (3) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

**2. ALLEY/STREET VACATION PETITION #AV-02-2015 to vacate an east/west alley between 1315 & 1319 N. Main Street Findlay.**

**HRPC**

**General Information**

This is the first alley running east off of N. Main Street just south of E. Foulke Avenue. The area is zoned General Commercial.

**Parcel History**

None

**Staff Analysis**

The alley in this request is located between an existing office building and the new University of Findlay Admissions Office (former Stately Raven bookstore site). The alley is primarily used to access both of these buildings parking areas.

The improved part of this alley dead ends into a north/south alley. It appears that the north/south alley is unimproved from this intersection north. There is a path that an older garage belonging to 119 E. Foulke Avenue uses as access through the end of that alley. The alley is gravel heading south to Allen Avenue.

1315 and 1319 N. Main Street are the only properties immediately abutting the alley in this request. We do not feel that access to any other parcels would be affected by its vacation,

**Staff Recommendation**

HRPC Staff recommends that FCPC recommend **approval to Findlay City Council of ALLEY/STREET VACATION PETITION #AV-02-2015 to vacate the east/west alley between 1315 & 1319 N. Main Street Findlay.**

**ENGINEERING**

No objections. Easements for the existing sanitary sewer will need to be maintained.

**FIRE PREVENTION**

No comments

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that FCPC recommend **approval to Findlay City Council of ALLEY/STREET VACATION PETITION #AV-02-2015 to vacate the east/west alley between 1315 & 1319 N. Main Street Findlay.**

## **DISCUSSION**

Dan Clinger asked if the University owns both buildings now. Todd Jenkins replied yes. Ms. Mihalik stated that the University had a master plan several years ago. She said it has obviously expanded. She asked if the University continued to plan more acquisitions east of Main Street. She asked if we should be looking for an updated master plan. Mr. Jenkins said he did not know if they had expanded the master plan. They have acquired parcels on the east side on Main Street so long range they may look to acquire more. He believes that acquiring the old bookstore was an opportunity they saw as a good choice. Judy Scrimshaw stated that we did put the University Overlay on the first block east of Main Street on the zoning map.

Mr. Clinger noted that there have been improvements to the alley and all the parking pavement. So they have cleaned it up and made it very nice. Mr. Clinger asked if they were going to continue to lease out those office spaces. Mr. Jenkins said that as far as he knows that will continue for now.

## **MOTION**

Dan Clinger made a **motion to recommend approval to Findlay City Council of ALLEY/STREET VACATION PETITION #AV-02-2015 to vacate an east/west alley between 1315 & 1319 N. Main Street Findlay.**

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Jackie Schroeder

**VOTE:** Yay (3) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

### **3. PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-09-2015 filed to rezone 810 N. Cory Street from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Two Family.**

#### **HRPC**

##### **General Information**

This parcel is located on the west side of N. Cory Street about a block and a half south of Howard Street. It is zoned R-2 Single Family Medium Density. Parcels to the north, south and west are also zoned R-2. To the east is zoned R-3 Single Family High Density. It is not within the 100 year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Plan designates the area as Single Family Small Lot.

##### **Parcel History**

None

##### **Staff Analysis**

The lot in this request was zoned B Residential before the new zoning code was adopted. From the zoning department records, it had been a duplex as early as the 1960's. In October, 2009 the owner received a permit to convert it back to single family. A Certificate of Compliance was issued by the zoning department in May, 2010 that the work was complete and the home was now a single family unit. The zoning was changed to R-2 in 2012 and the dwelling was single family at that time according to records. The area is near the University and there are several rentals/multi-family units located along this street. (814 and 815 N. Cory are duplexes according to the Courthouse records and 819 N. Cory is a multi-family building)

There is a two car garage at the rear of the property with space on the gravel drive for at least an additional 3 parking spaces. Two spaces per unit are required in the R-4 district.

If the owner wishes to reestablish this as a duplex, Staff is comfortable with the change to R-4 Two Family residential. The owner must obtain a change of use permit for the two family dwelling once the zoning is changed.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

HRPC Staff recommends approval to Findlay City Council of the **PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-09-2015 filed to rezone 810 N. Cory Street from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Two Family.**

#### **ENGINEERING**

No objections

#### **FIRE PREVENTION**

No Comments

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that FCPC recommend approval to Findlay City Council of the **PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-09-2015 filed to rezone 810 N. Cory Street from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Two Family.**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Dan Clinger commented that this seemed to be consistent with what we have done before. There are a number of other duplexes in the area and he has no objection to this rezoning.

#### **MOTION**

Dan Clinger made a **motion to recommend approval to Findlay City Council of PETITION FOR ZONING AMENDMENT #ZA-09-2015 filed to rezone 810 N. Cory Street from R-2 Single Family Medium Density to R-4 Two Family.**

2<sup>nd</sup>: Lydia Mihalik

**VOTE:** Yay (3) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

#### **4. SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-13-2015 filed by Liberty Ridge Investments, LLC, 7300 TR 136, Findlay, OH for Liberty Ridge Apartments to be constructed on Thimbleberry Ln. in Liberty Township.**

#### **HRPC**

##### **General Information**

This development is located off the north end of Thimbleberry Drive in Liberty Township. (north off of SR 12) It is zoned RM-1 Multiple Family in Liberty Township. Land on the north, east and west sides abutting this parcel is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. The land to the south is zoned RM-1. A very small strip along Oil Ditch is located within the 100 year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Plan designates the area as Single Family Large Lot.

#### **Parcel History**

None

### **Staff Analysis**

The property in this application is located in Liberty Township but will be reviewed by the City of Findlay zoning code because they are requesting city services. We will use the M-2 Multiple Family High Density classification.

The applicant is proposing to construct seven (7) buildings with 92 two bedroom units on 7.610 acres. All the buildings appear to have some attached storage sheds on one or both ends. Zoning allows one unit per 3500 square feet of land. By this calculation, 95 units could potentially be built here.

The next item to be addressed is total lot coverage. The City has a maximum of 40% lot coverage. This includes buildings and pavement. I have calculated about 52% of impervious lot surfaces on the site.

Parking is calculated at 2.5 spaces per unit plus one (1) for every two (2) units for visitors. 92 units will require 276 spaces. Each unit has a single car garage with space for two vehicles in front of each unit. There are also 52 extra parking spaces in strip lots in the development. At 3 spaces per unit ( $3 \times 92 = 276$ ) plus the 52 available spaces in the strips there are a total of 328 parking spaces.

A landscaping plan shows minimal landscaping around the property. Because the east, west and north sides all abut industrial zoning there is really no requirement for a multiple family use to buffer from these. Although zoned Industrial, there is a home on the property to the east. The plan does show a landscape berm and some trees on that side that also wraps around along the south side over to the entry. There are also a few mature trees here. The south property line from the drive west only shows a few trees on the plans but there is an existing mature tree line here that is not shown. If that tree line is to remain, we don't see the need for additional landscaping or fencing in this area other than possibly filling a couple of gaps. If it will not remain, then a good buffer needs to be in place as the homes south of the apartments will have a view of the back of a very long building.

As stated earlier, this is in Liberty Township and they will issue the building permits for this development. The City has more stringent guidelines on Multi-family housing than the Township

### **Staff Recommendation**

HRPC Staff recommends approval of **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-13-2015 for Liberty Ridge Apartments to be constructed on Thimbleberry Ln. in Liberty Township subject to the following:**

- **Verification of the plan for existing tree line as screening**
- **If sticking with the Findlay zoning code guidelines, this complex would have to be altered to bring the lot coverage down to 40%. Because it is outside the Corporation limits at this time and the City will not issue any actual building permits, CPC may or may not wish to enforce this.**

### **ENGINEERING**

Access – Access for the site is being proposed from the end of Thimbleberry Drive.



Water & Sanitary Sewer – Sanitary sewer will connect to the existing 36” sanitary sewer located on the west side of the site. The waterline for the site will connect to the existing dead end at Thimbleberry Drive and the dead end line at the end of Yarrow Court. The proposed layout will loop these two (2) existing dead end lines. Waterline stubs are being provided to the east side of the site so that it will be possible to extend the waterline to the existing twenty (20) inch waterline on County Road 140. Engineering is working with the design engineer on easement locations and some minor changes to the utility layout based upon comments from Water Distribution.

Stormwater Management – This site is located in Liberty Township so the County Engineer will review and approve all stormwater calculations for the site.

Sidewalks – This site is located in Liberty Township so sidewalks are not required.

Recommendations: Conditional approval of the plan subject to the utility layout and easement locations being revised to the satisfaction of Engineering.

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- An approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
- Water permits
- Sanitary permits
- Storm permit
- Annexation agreement
- Bonds and inspection fees for public improvements

No objections however several City and private utilities are located within these rights of way; easements will need to be retained for these utilities should the vacation request be approved.

### **FIRE PREVENTION**

- Provided comments from LTFD Chief Gene Stump to Peterman Associates

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-13-2015 for Liberty Ridge Apartments to be constructed on Thimbleberry Ln. in Liberty Township subject to the following conditions:

- Verification of the plan for existing tree line as screening (HRPC)
- Decision of CPC on allowing the density as proposed (HRPC)
- The utility layout and easement locations being revised to the satisfaction of Engineering. (ENG)

### **DISCUSSION**

Mayor Mihalik stated that they will be accessing this development through a single family development. Mr. Jenkins said yes, but he wanted to add that that single family development is zone RM-1 Multiple Family in Liberty Township and it is a PUD (Planned Unit Development). Initially it was to be condominiums and then was converted to single lots. The parcel was I-1 and was rezoned to RM-1 by the Township. Mr. Jenkins reported that they have gone through the Township and received their approval last Tuesday.

Dan Clinger said that one of his biggest concerns is that they will be exiting over 200 more cars over a small residential street. He said that Liberty Township zoning allows you to exit RM-1

onto a road with an 80' right of way and they don't have that. So he has problems okaying such a high density. Todd Jenkins stated that with the previous industrial zoning, the alternative could have been industrial uses with semi-trucks and so forth exiting through there. Thimbleberry is the only access that the parcel has. Mr. Clinger said he sees what he is saying but if it had been industrial they would have had to find another means of access. He would not have put industrial traffic on the residential street.

Dan Clinger said they have also exceeded the density per the City zoning. Todd Jenkins said that is correct but the Township requires a maximum 25% lot coverage of buildings. They do meet that. They do exceed the 40% impervious surface with the extra parking, etc. He stated that they have provided the necessary detention for that. They are not increasing the runoff from storm water. Mr. Clinger said he would see the Commission as staying with the City guidelines for approval. He said that in this location it could be very likely that it would get annexed eventually and then we will have a non-compliant situation. Mr. Jenkins said they can look at the impervious areas and see if they can reduce some of the concrete in front of the buildings, etc. Mayor Mihalik said she would like to see the 40% requirement met if possible. She said she does have concerns with the amount of cars and traffic that you will be throwing through the single family neighborhood. She said she understands that the Township has approved this. She said there is a similar situation over in Hillcrest with a single family area that is used very heavily to access quite a few apartments.

Mr. Jenkins said he can understand the concerns with traffic, etc., but they could have put 95 units there under the City code and they do have a few less. Ms. Scrimshaw commented that the 95 is "max" without taking out all impervious surfaces. She said that she had calculated it down to about 78 with all of the impervious surface considered. Mr. Jenkins said if they had a better alternative for access they would certainly be happy to change this but there is none. Dan Clinger asked if this will be the same land owner that has the development in the front. Mr. Jenkins stated that it is now but it will not be. A different person is purchasing it to develop the apartments. Mr. Clinger says he still has issue with putting a lot of apartment traffic through the residential area. Lydia Mihalik commented that the Township approved the zoning change. Mr. Jenkins confirmed that they had and have also approved the site plan last week.

Ms. Mihalik asked if any members in the audience had questions or comments. Garland Parrish of 1927 Yarrow Court came forward. Mr. Parrish stated that the homeowner's association representative was not available today and he was there in their place. He stated that the residents do not want the traffic on their roads. He stated that the tree line we had referred was more of a shrub/brush line. He said he would not consider that a means of screening. Mr. Parrish said that everyone that has lived there was under the assumption that that area would probably be developed as homes and not an apartment complex. They may be nice units, he said, but inevitably you can get the wrong type of people living there. Andrew Yates said that he proposes to put in probably the most high end rentals in Findlay. He said he is going for the young professional crowd, not the mid-range rentals. He is keeping in mind the design aesthetic of the exterior surface, knowing that they will be seen from the homes. Mr. Clinger commented that if it was a little lower density, there are 22 units in one building. That is a pretty expansive building mass. Mr. Yates said they will be townhouses and he is trying to break that up with landscaping, colors, etc. Mr. Clinger also noted that it looks like most of the visitor parking is congregated in one area. He also commented that there were not enough storage units for all the apartments. Mr. Yates said he didn't anticipate that everyone would want one. He feels that the parking is scattered and they could maybe get 4 more spots in the northwest corner.

Mr. Parrish commented that even though the zoning may have been industrial or commercial there are farm fields and residential areas around here. Mayor Mihalik asked Mr. Jenkins if the property to the east is one owner. Mr. Jenkins said yes it is a large chunk owned by one person. They have a narrow driveway that comes up from SR 12. Ms. Mihalik said so we have the same property owner for this site, and Findlay Cartage owns to the west. Mr. Jenkins confirmed that. Mayor Mihalik asked if there had been any consideration to platting some right of way along those lots rather than having to access through the single family development. She stated that she doesn't know how much authority they have to say anything about it. We can dislike the amount of density and be grumpy about the access through the single family, but I don't know if we have the ability to say we don't agree. Mayor Mihalik said she can see this eventually becoming a part of Findlay although it may be 20 or 30 years down the road. We want to be consistent with how we apply our codes when people ask for water. She said she can see trying to hit the 40% lot coverage but doesn't know that we can control the access issue. Mr. Jenkins said he can understand that and if they had an alternative for access they would certainly pursue it.

Mr. Parrish asked if the traffic in and out is not an issue for us. Mayor Mihalik said it is an issue, but she doesn't know if it is something that can be used to hold up the water. They are meeting the other requirements if they can get to the 40%. Mr. Parrish said he thinks it will decrease property values in his neighborhood, trash, people. Ms. Mihalik said she was more concerned about safety. The volume of extra people is a concern. Ms. Mihalik turned to Mr. Rasmussen and said she didn't see how they could hold things up if they met all the criteria we have asked them to do. Dan Clinger asked if the area of single family has always been zoned RM-1. Mr. Jenkins replied that prior to development it was RM-1. Mr. Parrish said the residents were never notified of the rezoning. He said at this point all they can do is go back to the Township and speak to them. Matt Cordonnier commented that overall this is somewhat of a poor zoning situation. You have industrial, multi family, single family. It's a tough situation. To have industrial with residential in front of it and not have planned for a proper roadway is bad. He said he agrees with Lydia. He doesn't know if the City of Findlay has any ability, he thinks Liberty Township would have more authority on this issue. Unfortunately the time to have brought up these issues was when the zoning was being considered. He said if Mr. Parrish was not contacted, that is an issue that he will have to address with the Township.

Mr. Clinger asked if in reducing the coverage to 40% they would be reducing the number of units or just trying to squeeze the useable space from each unit. Mr. Jenkins said they would look at reducing the concrete area from each unit and see where that takes them. They still want to have the 92 units. Mr. Cordonnier said that he and Judy Scrimshaw are skeptical that they can possibly keep 92 units and get this down to 40%. We don't know how much concrete they can possibly take out. It is all either drives or parking spaces. Ms. Mihalik said they will just have to bring it back and see what happens before we do the water and sewer.

Mr. Parrish asked again if there is any way to get access from Stanford Parkway or CR 140. Ms. Scrimshaw replied that right now they don't own anything out to either road. Mr. Yates said tried talking to all the owners around him and did not have any luck.

### **MOTION**

Mayor Mihalik made a motion to approve **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-13-2015 for Liberty Ridge Apartments to be constructed on Thimbleberry Ln. in Liberty Township. subject to the following conditions:**

- **Verification of the plan for existing tree line as screening (HRPC)**

- **That the applicant come back with a reduction to the 40% impervious surface requirement**
- **The utility layout and easement locations being revised to the satisfaction of Engineering. (ENG)**

2<sup>nd</sup>: Dan Clinger

**VOTE:** Yay (3) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

**5. SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-14-2015 filed by BVMA Investment Association, Ltd., 200 W. Pearl Street, Findlay for a new parking lot north of 200 W. Pearl Street.**

**HRPC**

**General Information**

This site is located south of the BVMA Medical offices and west of the Sherman Park Addition. The property is zoned O-1 Institutions and Offices. Land to the north, west and south is also zoned O-1. Land to the east is zoned R-1 Single Family Low Density. It is not located within the 100 year flood plain. The Land Use Plan designates the area as Office.

**Parcel History**

None

**Staff Analysis**

The applicants are proposing to construct a parking lot north of their offices to accommodate staff. Staff currently share a part of the visitor lot and lease some additional spaces. With a high patient volume, the extra parking has become a necessity.

The lot will be accessed via an existing driveway connecting a hospital staff parking lot on the east side of the BVMA building with medical offices located north on Lake Cascades Parkway. The drive was initially established as a connection for doctors to use to get from those offices to the hospital quickly in emergencies. The drive is currently gated so it is unavailable as a short cut for anyone that is not permitted access.

The lot will provide 125 parking spaces all at 90 degrees. Required plantings are shown in the islands and bump out areas. The east side of the drive which abuts the residential area has an existing fence and shrub row that was put in place when the driveway was initially established.

There are four light poles indicated inside the lot. The lighting plan shows acceptable levels. The code states a maximum of .5 foot candles at a residential property line and the plan indicates .2 before it gets to the line. The plan shows the height of the poles at 18' which is below the 25' maximum allowed.

**Staff Recommendation**

HRPC Staff recommends approval of **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-14-2015 for a new parking lot at 200 W. Pearl Street.**

**ENGINEERING**

Access – Access for the proposed parking lot will be off of the existing asphalt drive.

Stormwater Management – The site of the proposed parking lot currently drains into the quarry. The property owner will need to work out any details with the owner of the quarry before they will be allowed to discharge any additional stormwater that result from the additional pavement.

Recommendations: Conditional approval of the plan subject to the owner working out any drainage details with the owner of the quarry.

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- An approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

### **FIRE PREVENTION**

No comments.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-14-2015 for a new parking lot at 200 W. Pearl Street subject to the following conditions:**

- **Owner working out any drainage details with the owner of the quarry (ENG)**

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Clinger asked if the parking lot is used primarily for staff of the hospital or the medical offices. Ms. Mihalik stated that BVMA staff would use the parking. Dan Clinger asked if the access road is hospital property. Mr. Jenkins said no it is an easement to the hospital. He said there is a hospital owned piece at the beginning of the drive and then it belongs to BVMA. He said it was originally put in to allow doctors to respond quickly to the hospital.

Judy Scrimshaw asked if it would still be gated. Mr. Jenkins replied yes. Ms. Scrimshaw said she remembered that that was an issue with residents in Sherman Park long ago that didn't want a thoroughfare going behind their houses. Mr. Clinger said his concern now is moving all those cars through the existing parking lot which is tight now and not very conducive to that kind of traffic flow. Todd Jenkins replied that you are looking at employee only parking so it would be beginning and end of day travelling through a parking lot that is for the same purpose. Ms. Scrimshaw commented that they could also come through the Lake Cascades end as well.

Dan Clinger asked where the drainage went after it hit the corner of the lot. Todd Jenkins replied that it goes to the quarry. They will work out the details with Enelco.

### **MOTION**

Ms. Mihalik made a motion to approve **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-14-2015 for a new parking lot at 200 W. Pearl Street subject to:**

- **Owner working out any drainage details with the owner of the quarry (ENG)**

2<sup>nd</sup>: Jackie Schroeder

**VOTE:** Yay (3) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

Ms. Scrimshaw asked if the Commission would agree to look at Item 7 at this time and move Item 6 to the end of the agenda. The Commission agreed.

**7. SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-16-2015 filed by Findlay City Schools, 1100 Broad Avenue, Findlay for a parking lot to be located at 323 Baldwin Avenue.**

## HRPC

### **General Information**

This site is located on the south side of Baldwin Avenue. It is zoned R-1 Single Family Low Density. All surrounding parcels are also zoned R-1. It is not within the 100 year flood plain. The City of Findlay Land Use Plan designates the area as Single Family High Density and Schools

### **Parcel History**

This site is currently the location of a single family home and a drive and parking strip for Donnell School.

### **Staff Analysis**

The applicant is proposing to demolish the home at 323 Baldwin Avenue and create a parking lot over this and the current driveway/parking area. The lot will have 37 – 90 degree parking spaces. There are 17 spaces on the west side and 20 spaces on the east side of a 25' wide drive lane.

Our main concern with the project is the screening provided on the west side. A single family home is located here. It has always had the drive with cars parking parallel on the side abutting it. However, this plan will permit 17 vehicles to park face in at the residence. For this reason Staff recommends a solid fence along this side instead of just a continuation of shrubs as proposed. There are two (2) mature trees here that may prohibit the viability of a 6 foot fence, but a minimum of 3 ½ feet should suffice to keep headlights from intruding on the neighbors.

### **Staff Recommendation**

HRPC Staff recommends approval of **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-16-2015 for a parking lot to be located at 323 Baldwin Avenue with the following condition:**

- **Provide minimum 3 1/2' privacy fence along west side of property abutting 405 Baldwin Avenue**

## ENGINEERING

Access – Access for the proposed parking lot will be off of the existing drive.

Stormwater Management – Stormwater detention will be provided in the proposed detention basin located to the east of the proposed parking lot.

Recommendations: Approval of the plan.

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- An approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

## FIRE PREVENTION

No comments

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-16-2015 for a parking lot to be located at 323 Baldwin Avenue with the following conditions:**

- **Provide minimum 3 1/2' high privacy fence along west property line abutting 405 Baldwin Avenue**

## **DISCUSSION**

Engineer Brian Thomas stated that he had recently found that there is a water meter pit in the drive and they would like that moved to the grassy area to the west. They should work on coordinating that with the water department.

Dan Clinger asked if all of the parking lot is on the school property. Dan Stone replied yes. He then asked if the tennis courts are on school property. Yes. Mr. Clinger asked if they will continue to allow access through it as they have for the public. Mr. Stone said the intent is to keep it as it is. It is currently used as a public roadway. Ms. Scrimshaw asked if this will be staff parking. Dennis McPherson stated that it would probably be overflow staff parking and event parking. He said it may be empty a lot of the time. He said it will not be closed off so it could be used by the public at any time available. Jackie Schroeder commented that with her experiences at the stadium, the additional parking will be great and probably welcomed by most people but she does have some concern with home that is right there. She would certainly want to see some screening to protect them from headlights, etc. Dan Stone said the school is definitely willing to work with the property owner and he believes they may have already had some conversations. Mr. Cordonnier stated that the property owners are in attendance and would probably like to address the commission.

Brad Bloomfield introduced himself as the owner of 405 Baldwin Avenue, the house immediately west of the new parking lot. Mr. Bloomfield stated that they would prefer that the parking lot was moved over (east) so that it would not abut their property physically. Cars will be parked within 15' of the side of their home. They have concerns with the two mature trees beside them which are actually on school property. Mr. Bloomfield said they had actually thought the trees were on their property. They are concerned about whether they will survive with the construction. Mr. Bloomfield stated that the plan shows shrubs now and they would prefer to see some type of privacy fence. He said they support Donnell, they love the stadium, and they love living there. He said he understands why they want the parking, but they are the only one that is directly affected by it. Mayor Mihalik replied that the agent has said the school is more than willing to work with them. She asked if that is okay with them, or do they have concerns about the layout and don't feel that any amount of screening will help. Gina Bloomfield stated that they would prefer a 6' privacy fence in the rear of their property and it could be shorter on the side and front. Mr. Bloomfield commented that during the last flood they had basement water and they are trying to fix that problem. On the prints that he had seen of this project he couldn't distinguish the drainage. He said he just wants to be sure that this won't increase their current problem until they can get that fixed. Dan Stone said he could address those questions. Mr. Stone said that the existing asphalt will be milled off and repaved. They will not be digging it out and potentially disrupting tree roots. So it should have no effect on the health of the trees. Mr. Stone said that as of now all the water sheet flows north out to the roadway. They will try to intercept that at the northern edge of the property, push it and bring it east through kind of a retention area and take it to the storm sewer system.

Mayor Mihalik asked if the applicants are willing to accept the privacy fence. Mr. Bloomfield replied yes. Mr. Cordonnier pointed out where the trees are and the property line and said he is kind of hard pressed to figure out how a fence will be placed there. Mr. Stone said they could put the fence near the curb and then have maintenance issues or they could break the fence at the trees. He would like to have a sit down with the owners and see what they would prefer. The school would like to be sensitive to them. Mr. Stone said he does think there are a couple of different options that they could do.

## **MOTION**

Mayor Mihalik made a motion to approve **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #SP-16-2015 for a parking lot to be located at 323 Baldwin Avenue subject to the following conditions:**

- **Providing a 6' high privacy fence along the west side and other accommodations that would satisfy the property owner at 405 Baldwin Avenue**

2<sup>nd</sup>: Dan Clinger

**VOTE:** Yay (3) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

**6. SITE PLAN APPLICATION # SP-15-2015 filed by Blanchard Valley Port Authority c/o Marathon Petroleum Corporation, 539 S. Main Street, Findlay for proposed streetscape, reconfiguration of surface parking lots and roadway improvements in the Marathon Campus area.**

## **HRPC**

### **General Information**

This site is generally bounded by vacated E. Hardin Street on the north, S. Main Street on the west, Lincoln Street on the south and East Street on the east. It is zoned C-3 Downtown Commercial. Land on the north and southwest sides is also zoned C-3. Land to the east and south is zoned C-2 General Commercial and C-3 Downtown Commercial. It is not within the 100 year flood plain. The Land Use Plan designates the area as Downtown.

### **Parcel History**

This project is the location of the Marathon Petroleum campus.

### **Staff Analysis**

Marathon is proposing an extensive plan to landscape their campus and improve the remaining surface parking areas. The plans are divided into various sections. We will talk briefly about each individual area as labeled.

**Area A:** This is E. Hardin Street which was vacated by the City and is now private property. The area involved is from S. Main Street east to East Street. They propose new sidewalks, lighting, street trees, planters, a drop off area and new building entrance. It will present a “gateway” into the Marathon office complex.

**Area B or Marathon Green:** This area will have a dramatic effect on the streetscape of S. Main Street. Located at the corner of E. Hardin and S. Main Street, what was once the site of the Elks Lodge will become a private, multi-use plaza for employees and guests. Pergolas, tables and seating, decorative lighting and abundant landscaping will make the corner a very aesthetically pleasing urban “park”.

**Areas C & D:** This covers the area around the Sandusky Street parking garage. These areas were a part of the approvals for the plan of the garage. New sidewalks, street trees and shrubs along the building as well as general landscaping at the ingress/egress points are in the process of happening as the garage construction has been completed.

**Area E:** This area is along E. Lincoln Street and is the front of the south garage landscape plan. Lawn space with ornamental trees is the main focus of this area.



**Area F:** Abutting East Street, the area is a general tree lawn with street trees.

**Area G:** This is also a general tree lawn area abutting E. Lincoln Street.

**Area H:** This is a part of the vacated Beech Avenue north of E. Hardin Street between the Marathon Building and the Marketing Building. New sidewalks will be installed and areas for bike parking both covered and uncovered will be provided.

**Area I:** Located on the east and south sides of the MPLX Office Building this area was reviewed with the site plan for the building in 2014. It is stated that the area will be planted to help with water retention and as a wildlife area.

**Area J:** Area J is on S. Main Street in front of the Marathon Green. The sidewalks will be widened and street trees will be located in planters.

**Area K:** An existing surface parking lot on the south side of E. Hardin Street across from the Marketing building will be reconfigured for a visitor parking lot. The current parking lot has four (4) access points onto Hardin Street and did run all the way to Lincoln Street with the same access configuration. Every lane had to exit onto a street to be able to enter the next lane. The parking was oriented north and south. The proposed lot will turn the lanes east/west and there will be no access onto Hardin Street. All ingress/egress will be from vacated Beech Street on the west or a new drive area on the east.

**Area L:** Area L is directly east of Area K and will be a surface lot running between E. Hardin and E. Lincoln Street. The layout will still be in a north/south direction, but what would be three (3) curb cuts is now down to one onto each street. Circulation from one lane to another will take place inside the lot.

**Area M:** Located just east of the Marketing Building and around the Avis Car Rental Building is Area M. The lot immediately abutting the Marketing Building is set up as reverse angle parking with entry from E. Hardin Street on the south end. Cars will exit at the north end onto the vacated Cherry Alley. A "Right Turn Only" sign is shown at the exit so that vehicles will travel east to exit out onto East Street.

The lot area east of the Avis building will remain the same as existing now. The area directly north of the building will also stay the same. A new drive aisle with parallel parking on the west edge will be added west of the building. It will exit out onto Hardin Street. All ingress and egress in this block are onto private roadways.

**Area N:** This is the site of the existing parking lot on the corner of S. Main Street and E. Lincoln Street. It may become the site of a hotel in the future.

**Area O:** This is the intersection of E. Sandusky Street and East Street. When the Sandusky Street parking garage was approved, this area was approved to be reconfigured with new turn lanes and signals. We believe that this has been completed.

### **Staff Recommendation**

HRPC Staff recommends **approval of proposed streetscape, reconfiguration of surface parking lots and roadway improvements in the Marathon Campus area.**

## ENGINEERING

Water & Sanitary Sewer – No changes are being proposed on the sanitary sewer system. The owner is proposing some rerouting to the existing waterline in the vacated Hardin Street. Engineering is working with the design engineer on some minor changes to the utility layout based upon comments from Water Distribution. To limit any confusion in the future, Engineering is requesting an overall plan with the landscaping and utilities and utility easements turned on. This will make it easier to verify what utilities will be private and which ones are public.

Stormwater Management – The existing site is 100% impervious so stormwater detention will not be required.

Sidewalks – The site is currently surrounded by existing sidewalks. Any sidewalks damaged or removed will be replaced.

Recommendations: Approval of the plan.

The following permits may be required prior to construction:

- An approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan or proof that the proposed work area is included in or has been added to an existing Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
- Water permits
- Easements for public utilities under vacated property

## FIRE PREVENTION

- Until hotel plans are finalized, maintain access on the west side of the South Parking Garage for the fire hydrants and the Fire Department Connection.
- Do not block with curbs or landscaping along Lincoln St. Talks are ongoing with RCM.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of **proposed streetscape, reconfiguration of surface parking lots and roadway improvements in the Marathon Campus area.**

- **Until hotel plans are finalized, maintain access on the west side of the South Parking Garage for the fire hydrants and the Fire Department Connection. (FIRE)**
- **Do not block with curbs or landscaping along Lincoln St. Talks are ongoing with RCM. (FIRE)**

## DISCUSSION

Dan Stone commented that since this has been an ongoing project they have received several phase approvals through EPA. They have worked closely with all the utility departments on permits etc.

Matt Pickett questioned some access along Lincoln Street at the garage. He wants to be sure there is access maintained here. Mr. Stone replied that access will be maintained in this phase as well as when a potential hotel is built.

Don Malarky stated that this is the 5<sup>th</sup> time they have gone before this body. They have thus far navigated their way around the campus sharing bit and pieces as they have developed. At the

last presentation for the garage they had advised that they would come back with a plan that would kind of knit everything together. The one piece that is still in play is the future hotel area. We plan to maintain that as surface parking for the time being. If and when something else happens we will move forward with another separate presentation on that. Now they want to present the overview of the plan and what things will look like as plantings, etc. mature over time.

Mr. Cordonnier started a video presentation supplied by Marathon. Audio was not available on our computer so Mr. Malarky narrated. He noted that they had worked very closely with Paul Schmelzer on the streetscapes. They wanted to keep in harmony with the downtown style with the street lights. He stated that they are in the midst of redoing Hardin Street. It is being narrowed and made more pedestrian friendly. The “Marathon Green” area immediately west of the MPLX building will be an employee gathering, outdoor working, and meeting area available for lunches, etc. He said it will be an urban greenspace. They have included some historic monumental features. He showed a simulation of how it would look at night. Mr. Malarky noted that he thinks this gives a visualization of what their plan is for not only the greenspace but the campus buildings inter-relate. He showed looking down Hardin Street at night. He compared Hardin to looking down your driveway. It’s transforming from a city street into basically a driveway into their campus. It will be the way their visitors come in, the employees will be parking in garages on the north and south sides and enter via bridges.

Mayor Mihalik thanked Marathon for their vision, for turning downtown Findlay into world class. She said this is incredible and she is thankful that they have been willing to accommodate the City’s requests as we have gone through this process.

Dan Clinger asked if parking lot L will still be accessible to the YMCA for overflow parking after hours. Paul Smith replied that it would. He stated the lot would be resurfaced so it fits in and looks new along with the rest of the area.

Mr. Clinger asked if the visitors will mainly come in from S. Main to Hardin Street. Mr. Malarky said yes. He noted that Lot K would be the visitor parking lot. He stated that they have historically been short on visitor parking and this will essentially double the parking available. Paul Smith noted that Hardin will continue to be two way. The main lobby does not have the traffic it used to for employees. They will come in from the bridges so the main lobby area will have a very significant decrease in traffic.

Mr. Clinger asked if the “Greens” will be fenced off. Mr. Malarky said yes, it is a workspace for the company and not a public space. There will be gates and security monitoring. Mr. Smith added that their maintenance crew will maintain the area.

Dan Clinger noted that in Area J they have bumped out into Main Street. Mr. Malarky said they want to create a little more pedestrian surface and more privacy for the green space. Mr. Clinger asked if there have been discussions with the City on the elimination of parking spaces. He said he is a little concerned about seeing five or six parking spots eliminated. Mr. Malarky said they had discussed the elimination on a temporary construction basis but not on a permanent basis. He said they will have those discussions once they have site plan approval. They will work with the Traffic Commission. He stated the main reason for them is to create a separation from vehicles and the green space because they will have functions out there.

Jackie Schroeder asked if as part of the downtown plan we are looking at bump outs at all intersections or some of them. Dan Stone said that the majority of them from Lima up to Main Cross will have them. These will serve to reduce the time it takes a pedestrian to cross the street. He said the team that is working on Main Street is also part of the team that has been working on Marathon. So it has been looked at as one scheme in the process. Ms. Schroeder said then there will probably be parking spaces eliminated throughout the downtown with the bump outs. So, are we looking at other parking alternatives in that process? Mayor Mihalik commented that she feels that parking is like “Groundhog Day”. The same discussion happens over and over. So much has to do with what people are comfortable with as far as distance to walk, etc. Mr. Malarky commented that prior to this project, parking was short and many of the employees were borrowing space off churches, other neighbors and a lot of employees were parking around the perimeter of the site. With the additional 1000 spaces added now the encroachment of the employees in public areas should disappear.

Mr. Clinger asked what process the elimination of spaces would go through or if it just became fact with the plan. Brian Thomas said it would go before Traffic Commission. Mr. Thomas noted that the travel lanes of Main Street will not change. The cars will have to shift their driving patterns. It will just bring the sidewalk area out farther in the right of way.

**MOTION**

Lydia Mihalik made a motion to approve **SITE PLAN APPLICATION # SP-15-2015 for proposed streetscape, reconfiguration of surface parking lots and roadway improvements in the Marathon Campus area subject to the following conditions:**

- **Until hotel plans are finalized, maintain access on the west side of the South Parking Garage for the fire hydrants and the Fire Department Connection. (FIRE)**
- **Do not block with curbs or landscaping along Lincoln St. Talks are ongoing with RCM. (FIRE)**

2<sup>nd</sup>: Jackie Schroeder

**VOTE:** Yay (3) Nay (0) Abstain (0)

---

Lydia L. Mihalik  
Mayor

---

Paul E. Schmelzer, P.E., P.S.  
Service-Safety Director