

Board of Zoning Appeals

December 20, 2018

(SUPPLEMENTAL MEETING)

Members present: Vice-Chairman, Doug Warren; Kerry Trombley; Sharon Rooney, Brett Gies (alternate).

The meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. by Mr. Warren introduced the members to the audience and the general rules were reviewed.

It was first noted for the record, that this was a continuation/supplemental meeting from the December 13, 2018 meeting since there was no quorum at that meeting for this case.

Case# 57886-BA-18 was introduced by Mr. Richard as follows: Filed by RCM Architects, on behalf of Hancock County ADAMHS, regarding a new apartment complex that will need variances from the following sections of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance: 1) proposed rear yard setback is 13 feet. The required setback is 30 feet (Section 1126.05C); 2) proposed lot coverage is 43.3%. The maximum lot coverage is 40% (Section 1126.06C); 3) proposed 5 parking spaces. The requirement for the M-2 district is 2.5 per unit and ½ space for visitor parking, which equals 12 required parking spaces (Section 1131.11.3A); and 4) the proposed parking lot setback of 5 feet is required to be at least 10 feet (Section 1161.11.3B).

This site was reviewed by the City Planning Commission on December 13, 2018. The site was approved, contingent on the variances being granted, but the commission wanted to see more parking. Overall, the feedback was positive.

It is a rather confined area amongst other multi-family housing, so the proposed use is not out of character. It would appear to be part of the existing complex. This building will have 3 units for pregnant women and their children, along with a property manager.

The concern was with the parking, but since the CPC meeting, the applicant has added 3 more spaces that he can discuss in more detail shortly. The lot coverage will increase slightly, but the trade-off for more parking is preferable.

We have also learned that this site will remain as this type of particular use for the next 30 years because of the funding involved to build and operate this facility. It's similar to the senior housing situation on the south end of town.

Mr. Warren noted that the space from the rear of the proposed building to the existing apartment complex is big, even though the proposed building will only be about 13 feet from the rear lot line.

Mr. Trombley, acknowledged the use being long term and the need for parking wasn't as critical as it is for more traditional types of housing. Mr. Richard stated that HRPC is going to be proposing a new parking requirement that is much less than the 3 per unit currently required and the proposal of 8 spaces will be very close the what will probably be required in the near future anyway.

Brett Gies, of RCM Architects, was sworn in. He re-stated many of the comments made by Mr. Richard. He has tried to reconfigure the site many times to fit within the requirements and the current proposal has the least impact on the prescribed development standards. He acknowledged the site will have nearly a 50% lot coverage in order to add the 3 parking spaces.

There was no other testimony offered.

Mr. Trombley noted the hardship presented in this case. He made a motion to grant the request of the 13-foot rear yard setback; 50% lot coverage; 8 parking spaces; and the 5-foot setback for the parking area.

There was discussion and a decision to allow the applicant 6 months to obtain the zoning permit, rather than the standard 60 days.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rooney.

The motion passed 3-0.

Minutes of the December 13, 2018 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Gies was asked to be a part of the approval since he was present at that meeting and this would create a quorum to have those minutes approved.

Mr. Trombley made a motion to approve the December 13, 2018 minutes and Mr. Warren seconded the motion. The motion was passed 3-0 with Mr. Gies acting as an alternate in voting on the motion.

The meeting was adjourned.



Chairman



Secretary