

Wood County Planning Commission
February 6, 2007 @ 5:30pm

The Wood County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, February 6, 2007 at the County Office Building in Bowling Green. Planning Commission members in attendance were: Anthony Allion, John Brossia, Tim Brown, Jim Carter, Patrick Fitzgerald, Ray Huber, Richard Kohring, and Alvie Perkins. Planning Commission staff in attendance was: David Steiner and Kelly Hemminger. In addition to Planning Commission members and staff, five guests were present.

Chairman Fitzgerald called the meeting to order. Upon calling the meeting to order, Mr. Carter made a motion to approve the January 2007 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Mr. Perkins seconded the motion with Commission members in full support.

New Business:

ACTIVITIES REPORT - December 2006 and January 2007

Mr. Steiner reported that the Planning Commission staff met with Weston Township Zoning Commission members to discuss possible updates to the Weston Township Zoning Resolution. Mr. Steiner stated that the Planning Commission had been very busy with community development. Mr. Steiner reported that the annual Tax Incentive Review Council (TIRC) meeting had been scheduled and stated that all reporting forms and notifications had been printed and mailed out. Mr. Steiner stated that the Annual County Commissioner's Association of Ohio's Winter Conference and the TMACOG Winter Assembly had also been attended. Mr. Steiner concluded his summary by noting that 31 parcel transactions had been completed, including 25 splits and 6 combinations, totaling approximately 300 acres.

ZONING – MIDDLETON TOWNSHIP

The Middleton Township Zoning Commission submitted a revised version of the Route 25/582 Overlay Zoning District for Planning Commission review and approval. This item was first presented to the Planning Commission at the March 2006 Planning Commission meeting. At that time, the Planning Commission recommended to Middleton Township that the Township approve the addition of the Overlay Zone to the current Township Zoning Resolution. When the item reached the Middleton Township Trustees for considerations, several issues and concerns were raised, and the Trustees decided to send the item back to the Zoning Commission for revisions. The newest version contained changes to the landscape requirements, the architectural requirements, and the excluded uses section of the overlay zone.

Mr. Steiner began his review and discussion and stated that Middleton Township had approached the Planning Commission Office in 2004 regarding the establishment of an overlay zoning district along the portion of State Route 25 which passed through Middleton Township. Mr. Steiner reported that Middleton Township had expressed concerns regarding problems that could potentially arise due to the increased access points onto State Route 25 and development that would not be uniform. Mr. Steiner

reported that the only recommendation from the Planning Commission Staff would be for Middleton Township to adjust the excluded uses; “truck transport terminals” and “pole signs”.

When the item was turned over to the Planning Commission members for review and discussion, several concerns were expressed with the Middleton Township State Route 25/582 Overlay Zone. Mr. Huber reported that Section 3 of the document needed to state who would conduct the site plan review and approval. Mr. Huber stated that in Section 8, the document required Wood County Engineer review and approval. Mr. Huber stated that since the zone was along State Route 25/582, the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) would review access. Mr. Huber stated that Section 10 of the document referred to an access management plan. Mr. Huber stated that Wood County did not have an access management plan and questioned whether Middleton Township had an access management plan or not. Mr. Huber stated that a traffic impact study was required in Section 11 by Wood County. Mr. Huber reported that ODOT may require a traffic impact study and questioned if Wood County would. Mr. Huber reported that in Section 13, architectural review, nothing was mentioned in regards to drainage. Mr. Huber stated that drainage should be included in this section. Mr. Huber reported that drainage should also be included in Sections 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. Steiner reported that drainage would be covered by the Middleton Township site plan review process within the underlying zoning resolution, which would be required in addition to the Overlay Zone requirements. Mr. Dave Reid, Middleton Township Zoning Inspector, stated that a storm water management plan is required in addition to the site plan. Mr. Reid stated that review by the Wood County Engineer was included as a precaution in case the Wood County Engineer would require a traffic study. Mr. Huber stated that the Middleton Township Overlay Zone needed to be linked to the underlying zoning resolution in some way. Mr. Allion suggested adding language to Section I of the Overlay Zone that would link to the underlying zoning resolution. Mr. Kohring expressed concern as to where the 1000’ foot boundary would be established from, the centerline or edge of right of way. Planning Commission members also discussed how access would be regulated.

When the item was turned over to the Planning Commission members for a motion, Mr. Kohring moved to approve the revised version of the State Route 25/582 Overlay Zoning District with the following recommendations to Middleton Township:

- In Section I of the document, insert language to inform the reader that all regulations in the underlying zoning district apply, as well as the overlay zone requirements.
- Consider adjusting the point of reference for the width of the zone to read, “1000 feet from the centerline of pavement, edge of pavement, or edge or right of way, whichever is greater”.
- Consider removing all verbiage that states the Wood County Engineer shall review plans and proposals or shall require permits. Since the two routes in question are State Routes, issues of review and permitting are the purview of the Ohio Department of Transportation.

- Consider removing “pole signs” from the excluded uses section, and also consider replacing “truck transport terminal” with “truck stop-travel center” in that section.

Mr. Brown seconded the motion with Commission members in full support.

Director’s Time:

Mr. Steiner reported provided Planning Commission members with a copy of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Formula Allocation Program Rating System for Gallia County. Planning Commission members stated that they would like to see how the rating system would work. Mr. Steiner reported that he would score some of the FY06 CDBG applications to see how they would score the Gallia County rating system and Mr. Kohring’s rating system.