

**Wood County Planning Commission  
June 7, 2005**

The Wood County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, June 7, 2005 at the County Office Building in Bowling Green. Planning Commission members in attendance were: John Brossia, Tim Brown, Jim Carter, Chris Ewald, Patrick Fitzgerald, Ray Huber, Richard Kohring, Alvie Perkins, Donna Schuerman, and Tom Weidner. Planning Commission staff in attendance was: David Steiner, Kelly Moore, and Cheryl Riffner. In addition to Planning Commission members and staff, 40 guests were present.

Chairman Weidner called the meeting to order. Upon calling the meeting to order, a motion was made by Mr. Kohring to approve the May 2005 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Mr. Perkins seconded the motion with Commission members in full support.

**New Business:**

**REVIEW OF THE WOOD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIVITIES  
REPORT FOR APRIL AND MAY 2005.**

Mr. Steiner began his review and reported that a meeting was held with the Board of Commissioners to discuss the update of the Wood County Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Mr. Steiner reported that assistance was provided to Henry Township regarding sign regulations. Mr. Steiner stated that a planning and zoning workshop sponsored by the City of Bowling Green was attended along with several TMACOG functions. Mr. Steiner stated that all of the FY05 CDBG Formula Program applications were received and also stated that all necessary FY04 environmental reviews were completed. Mr. Steiner reported that assistance was provided to numerous political subdivisions and community groups in the application process for the FY05 Formula Program. Mr. Steiner stated that notification was received from the State of Ohio, which reported that no findings or orders were issued, and that Wood County was deemed compliant with all 2005 TIRC reporting. Mr. Steiner stated that two public hearings were held to adopt the new Countywide Floodplain Regulations, which would be effective on June 5, 2005. Mr. Steiner reported that 50 parcel splits and 5 combinations were completed, totaling approximately 80 acres.

**ZONING – MIDDLETON TOWNSHIP**

Kainaj Inc. submitted a request to rezone approximately 62 acres in the Southeast ¼ of Section 23, Middleton Township from an A-1 Agricultural Zoning Classification to a R-3 PUD-RS Zoning Classification. The purpose of this request was that the applicants wished to construct a residential subdivision on the property.

Mr. Steiner began his review and discussion and stated that the property was located in the Southeast ¼ of Section 23, Middleton Township. Mr. Steiner reported that the Planning Commission members first heard a request in December of 2004 to rezone the parcel from A-1 Agricultural to R-3 Residential. Mr. Steiner reported that the Planning Commission voted to recommend that Middleton Township deny the request

and consider a mixture of R-2 and R-3 Residential zoning. Mr. Steiner stated the Planning Commission also heard a request to rezone the property in February 2005 from A-1 Agricultural to R-2 and R-3 Residential. Mr. Steiner reported that the Planning Commission again recommended denial due to density concerns.

Mr. Steiner reported that the property was located on the East side of Hull Prairie Road, Five Point Road was 620' to the South of the parcel, and Roachton Road was located approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile to the North. Mr. Steiner stated Saddlebrook and Hull Prairie Meadows Subdivisions were located to the West. Mr. Steiner stated the property was currently zoned A-1 Agricultural and that lands to the North, South, and East were also zoned A-1 Agricultural. Mr. Steiner reported that lands to the West were zoned R-3 Residential and R-3 PUD Residential. Mr. Steiner stated that the Wood County Comprehensive Land Use Plan had designated the area where the property was located as a residential area and an expansion area for the City of Perrysburg.

Mr. Steiner reported there were no environmental constraints, no floodplains, and no wetlands on the property. Mr. Steiner stated that utilities would be provided by the City of Perrysburg and extended from Roachton Road. Mr. Steiner reported major issues to be considered included annexation and the adequacy of Hull Prairie Road. Mr. Steiner stated if the property was rezoned, the development proceeded, and utilities were accessed, the property would be annexed into the City of Perrysburg. Mr. Steiner stated that right of way dedications needed to be addressed along Hull Prairie Road. Mr. Steiner stated the PUD footprint contained 63 acres, 126 single family residential lots, 11.5 acres of green space, interior streets and sidewalks, 60' ft. of right of way with 25' ft. of paving and back to back curbs and gutters, additional right of way dedications along Hull Prairie Road, and water and sewer extension. Mr. Steiner reported footprint errors included: no adjoining property owners listed, roads were not labeled, interior streets were not labeled or named, utilities easements were not addressed, no building setback lines, more right of way needed to be dedicated along Hull Prairie Road, open areas were not labeled, and crosswalks would possibly need added.

When the item was turned over to the Planning Commission members for review and discussion, Mr. Ewald questioned what had been changed since the request was submitted as R-3 Residential. Mr. Steiner stated the lots were bigger. Mr. Ewald questioned what the difference in density was. Mr. Steiner stated the R-3 PUD was less dense than the R-3 Residential zoning classification. Mr. Huber stated that he was concerned about the right of way on Hull Prairie Road. Mr. Kohring stated an acceleration/deceleration lane should be considered with this development. Mr. Rick Prokup, Sulphur Springs Realty, stated a R-3 PUD was requested so that a footprint could be submitted with the rezoning and reported the density had been decreased. Mr. Prokup stated that a home owners association would maintain the 11.5 acres of green space. Mr. Brossia questioned why Mr. Steiner recommended denial. Mr. Steiner stated that he was concerned with density. Mr. Ewald questioned what the PUD preliminary approval would allow the developer to do. Mr. Steiner stated he believed they were not allowed to start any development until a final footprint approval was received from the Planning Commission. Mr. Ewald expressed concern about the number of plat deficiencies and stated that he believed the northern stub street should be re-aligned so that it is in line with the proposed street to the South.

When the item was turned over to the Planning Commission for a motion, Mr. Kohring made a motion to recommend to Middleton Township that the Township

approve the request to rezone the property from A-1 Agricultural to a R-3 PUD Residential zoning classification. Mr. Ewald seconded the motion with commission members in full support. In separate action, Mr. Kohring made a motion to recommend to Middleton Township that the Township grant preliminary approval to the PUD footprint with the following recommendations: 1) right of way issue along Hull Prairie Road be thoroughly investigated before development proceeds, 2) all lots in the plan show setback lines and easements, and 3) the northern stub street is re-aligned so that it is in line with the proposed street to the South. Mr. Fitzgerald seconded the motion with commission members in full support.

**REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR WOOD COUNTY'S FY05 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) "FORMULA PROGRAM"**

Mr. Steiner began his review and discussion and stated that the FY05 CDBG Formula Program had 18 applicants, which had requested a total of \$1.1 million dollars of funding. Mr. Steiner stated there was \$322,000 available for funding in FY05, and that a total of \$289,800 would be allocated for Wood County. Mr. Steiner stated that 10% of the total available would be used for administration of the program. Mr. Steiner also reported that \$54,000 would be allocated to the Village of Luckey. Mr. Steiner stated that the Village of Luckey was funded under the FY04 Formula Program; however, the Village elected to return its FY04 funds and receive FY05 funding. Mr. Steiner then reviewed the FY05 Formula Program applicants and briefly detailed the projects that were proposed. They were as follows:

**VILLAGE OF BLOOMDALE:** ADA renovations to school building to be used as community center.

**VILLAGE OF BRADNER:** Replacement of 950' of waterline on Pline Street.

**VILLAGE OF CUSTAR:** Construction of bulk water delivery station in the Village of Custar.

**VILLAGE OF CYGNET:** Replacement of 1,425 lineal feet of waterline along Front, Walbridge, and Jackson Streets.

**VILLAGE OF HASKINS:** Replacement and resurfacing of 591 lineal feet of roadway on Perry and High Streets.

**VILLAGE OF HOYTVILLE - JACKSON TOWNSHIP FIRE DEPARTMENT:**

Purchase of a new grass truck for the Joint Fire Department.

**VILLAGE OF JERRY CITY:** Asphalt pavement overlay for all streets within the Village.

**LIBERTY TOWNSHIP - UNINCORPORATED VILLAGE OF RUDOLPH:** ADA sidewalk curb and ramp replacement.

**VILLAGE OF LUCKEY:** Project involves providing assistance to LMI residents for sanitary sewer tap-ins.

**VILLAGE OF MILTON CENTER:** Repairs and replacements to the Village's existing storm sewer system.

**CITY OF NORTHWOOD:** Replacement of 161 lineal feet of existing waterline along Sheffield Drive in the City of Northwood.

**VILLAGE OF PEMBERVILLE**: Renovations of existing restrooms in the old Village Fire Hall to ADA compliance.

**PERRYSBURG HEIGHTS ASSOCIATION**: The construction of a new parking lot and sidewalks for the newly completed gymnasium and Community Center.

**VILLAGE OF PORTAGE**: Rehabilitation and repair of 14 sanitary sewer manholes within the Village of Portage.

**CITY OF ROSSFORD**: Roadway improvements and storm sewer upgrades along Roland Court in the City of Rossford.

**VILLAGE OF WALBRIDGE**: The reconstruction of an 8' walking path along Drouillard Road from Elm Street to the Walbridge Corporation limits.

**VILLAGE OF WESTON**: The replacement of 2,850 lineal feet of existing waterline along Locust, Maple, and Walnut Streets in the Village of Weston.

**WSOS**: Request for operating costs for a childcare facility that will assist 78 children with LMI status in Wood County.

After summarizing the details of the applications, Mr. Steiner turned the item over to the Planning Commission members for review and discussion. Mr. Weidner allowed individuals who were present to give a brief summary of their projects. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that he would like to see the applicants who had not received funding in the past, receive funding in FY05. Mr. Kohring stated he had picked preliminary funding which included: Haskins (\$31,250), Jerry City (61,175), Milton Center (\$43,400), Pemberville (\$50,000), and WSOS (\$50,000). Mr. Fitzgerald stated he was concerned about the drinking water in Custar. Mr. Kohring stated it could replace WSOS funding. Mr. Brossia questioned if the Village of Custar project could be completed with \$50,000. Mr. Jerry Greiner, Northwestern Water and Sewer, stated he would need to bid the project out. Mr. Ewald stated that he would like to see information about the population of the villages and when they last received funding.

Mrs. Schuerman made a motion to fund the following projects:

- |                             |          |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| 1. Village of Haskins       | \$31,250 |
| 2. Village of Custar        | \$50,000 |
| 3. Village of Jerry City    | \$61,175 |
| 4. Village of Pemberville   | \$50,000 |
| 5. Village of Milton Center | \$43,400 |

Mr. Fitzgerald seconded the motion with commission members in full support. Mr. Ewald suggested Village of Walbridge and Perrysburg Heights as alternate projects. Mr. Fitzgerald suggested the Village of Portage as an alternate. Mr. Fitzgerald made a motion to accept the following projects in the order which they could be funded: 1) Village of Portage (\$61,360), 2) Village of Walbridge (\$64,950), and 3) Perrysburg Heights Association (\$44,563). Mrs. Schuerman seconded the motion with commission members in full support.

There being no further discussion, the meeting stood adjourned with a motion from Mrs. Schuerman. Mr. Ewald seconded the motion with Commission members in full support.