

CITY COUNCIL
Municipal Building, Room 114
318 Dorney Plaza
Findlay, OH 45840-3346

Telephone: 419-424-7113
Fax: 419-424-7245
Email: CityCouncil@ci.findlay.oh.us

PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

A Public Hearing was held on May 15, 2018 at 6:50 PM in the Council Chambers, Municipal Building to rezone 2131 Spruce Drive from R2 Single Family, Medium Density to R4 Duplex/Triplex, High Density Residential District for the property situated in the City of Findlay (Ordinance No. 2018-038).

Situated in the City of Findlay, County of Hancock, State of Ohio:

Situated in the City of Findlay, County of Hancock, State of Ohio, and being a part of the southeast quarter (1/4) of Section nine (9), Range eleven (11) east, together with an easement over the west forty (40) feet of Lot eight (8) in George Ede Subdivision, Plat Book 3, Page 69, a tract described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of Lot eight (8); thence south 80° 15' 10" west, a distance of 224.50 feet; thence south 09° 44' 50" east, a distance of 92.50 feet; thence north 80° 15' 10" east, a distance of 224.50 feet; thence north 09° 44' 50" west, a distance of 92.50 feet to the point of beginning.


Aforementioned to be rezoned from R2 Single Family, Medium Density to R4 Duplex/Triplex, High Density.

Council President Monday asked if anyone wished to address Council.

1. Cathy Weygandt, 204 Greenlawn Avenue, is not adjacent to the property that is requesting to be rezoned, but she afraid the same thing could happen to her back yard. She is greatly opposed to something like this. Residents were not alerted to this situation. She was under the understanding that letters are to be sent out to more than just a couple of abutting neighbors for this well-thought out ordinance. The area that this property is located in is a single-family residential area in a very nice neighborhood, She cannot imagine how anyone would ever think it is an appropriate spot to put in a tri-plex and have another curb cut in the little street behind all the retail spots. Not long ago, Spruce Drive residents had to replace the trees in that area for retail businesses and are now thinking of changing it which does not make sense to her.
2. Kevin Casselman, 1005 Sunset Dr, noted that the property that is requesting to be rezoned is right in his back yard. He is opposed to the rezone. The area is all single-family homes and should not be rezoned and should stay single-family. He just found out about this on Saturday from someone coming around the neighborhood. He is just a little bit south of the property. He does not think much was communicated on this. He thinks it should stay single-family.
3. Becky Myers, 2201 Tiffin Ave, pointed out that all the trees on the overhead map on the screen in the Council Chambers tonight are on her property which is abutted up next to the property that is requesting to be rezoned. There is no extra parking to accommodate a two (2) or three (3) family residence nor is there street parking in that area. Her driveway curves around the property. If a two (2) or three (3) family residence is built there, there could be up to six (6) cars, and if anyone was to visit them, there would no place for those cars to park. The businesses across the street will not want anyone parking in their parking lots. There is no place for kids to play in that area. There is some yard there, but no actual neighborhood for that property. All the other properties back yards face this property. She asked about water diversion. One of the two (2) residences on the right side of the property has a pool where they built up their land, so their water drains onto her yard. The other house is built up and that water also drains onto her yard. She asked if the water from the proposed property rezone will also drain onto her yard. A couple of years ago, she was unable to mow for three (3) months because her yard was sopping wet that entire time. The City was talking about land use goals and objectives which is the complete opposite of what this property is asking for. Instead, it would be a haphazard, stand alone development. This does not support a multi-family development to an area that can properly support its unique needs. There are businesses there on a busy road.
4. Councilman Hellmann asked that the Clerk of Council read a letter he received from one of the abutting property owners Jeffrey and Denise Sexton who could not be here tonight. The Clerk of Council read the letter in its entirety (see attached).

Council President Monday adjourned the Public Hearing at 7:00PM


Clerk of Council
Denise DeVore


President of Council
R. Ronald Monday

May 14, 2018

Jeffrey & Denise Sexton
2201 Chestnut Lane
Findlay, OH 45840
419-424-8962 (H) 419-348-4744 (C)
jeffasexton@marathonpetroleum.com

The Honorable Dennis Hellmann
Findlay City Councilman – 2nd Ward
720 Timberview Drive
Findlay, OH 45840

Subject: Ordinance No. 2018-038 (via email)

Dear Council Member Hellmann,

It has come to my attention the subject ordinance will have its 3rd reading before city council on May 15. I understand this ordinance seeks to change the zoning of a property on Spruce street to "*R4 Duplex/Triplex, High Density Residential District*". I was informed of this potential zoning change this past weekend after 4 members of the Pine Ridge neighborhood visited my residence on separate occasions. Unfortunately, I cannot attend the Council meeting on May 15 due to a work obligation. In lieu of my attendance, I am writing this letter to object based upon the following:

- The Pine Ridge neighborhood is a single-family residential community. The property in question is located between Sunset and Chestnut Lane. Allowing a "*High Density Residential District*" in the middle of a neighborhood is not consistent with good city planning practices and would lower the property value of all homes in the neighborhood.
- The subject property does not have access to sewer and water. This would have to be done by accessing through the neighborhood. I am not aware of anyone in the neighborhood or surrounding properties that would allow this. The Spruce property owner has not secured the rights and ability to do so. As such, allowing this property to be rezoned is not even feasible.
- My family and I have lived in this neighborhood since 2001. We investigated the Davidson property located directly behind our home and the Spruce property as due diligence before buying. We were told these locations were zoned as single family residential and was part of our decision to purchase our home. If city council allows this ordinance to pass, we will feel betrayed by the city for allowing this to happen.
- We have 1 son that lives in Louisiana, 2 sons in college and a daughter currently a junior at Van Buren high school. We enjoy the privacy of our backyard with our kids inviting friends to use our pool. If a "*High Density Residential District*" were allowed on the Spruce property, it would take away all privacy. Any structure built on Spruce would have a direct view of our property and pool area (see attached)
- I am a property owner that is directly impacted by this potential zoning change. However, I never received notice of this issue until a few days before the final reading and did not have an opportunity to provide comments and feedback. I am "lucky" to have 4 concerned neighbors bring this to my attention. I would ask the council to review your procedures to understand how this potentially sensitive zoning change could have gotten this far without providing notification to the neighborhood.

I urge you as the 2nd Ward councilman to protect the rights of your constituents and reject this ordinance change.

Thanks for your consideration.



Jeffrey & Denise Sexton
Concerned Neighbors