

**Wood County Planning Commission
September 5, 2006**

The Wood County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, September 5, 2006 at the County Office Building in Bowling Green. Planning Commission members in attendance were: Anthony Allion, Tim Brown, Jim Carter, Chris Ewald, Ray Huber, Richard Kohring, Patrick Fitzgerald, Alvin 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, one guest was present.

Chairman Weidner called the meeting to order. Upon calling the meeting to order, Mr. Perkins made a motion to approve the August 2006 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Mr. Kohring seconded the motion with Commission members in full support.

New Business:

PRESENTATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S WEBSITE BY GAIL CHRISTOFFERSON OF GAIL M. CHRISTOFFERSON:

Gail Christofferson of Gail M. Christofferson gave Planning Commission members a brief presentation that highlighted the website that had been created for the Planning Commission. Planning Commission members questioned whether or not submittal of forms would be offered online in the future, and suggested that there be links to City and Village Planning Commissions provided on the links page.

ZONING -PERRYSBURG TOWNSHIP

McCarthy Builders, Inc. submitted a final PUD footprint entitled "Emerald Lakes Plat Two" for final Planning Commission recommendation. The footprint that was reviewed was the second phase of development in the overall PUD Development of Emerald Lakes, which will contain 184 lots, and will be developed in three phases. Mr. Steiner began his review of this item by noting the location of the development, the underlying zoning of the development, and by identifying the zoning classification of the parcels surrounding the development. Mr. Steiner then noted that the land use in the area surrounding the development was primarily residential, with commercial uses occurring closer to Route 20. Mr. Steiner concluded his discussion on the land use and zoning of the parcel by noting that the area had been designated as a residential area, and an employment opportunity corridor.

At this point in his review, Mr. Steiner moved on to describe the history of the development. Mr. Steiner explained that the original rezoning request to a PUD-RS zoning classification along with the corresponding footprint was recommend for denial at

the May 2004 Planning Commission meeting due to the development's fragmented and somewhat inaccessible open space areas. Mr. Steiner then stated that a new request was presented to the Commission at the August 2004 Planning Commission. At this time, the rezoning of the underlying ground to a PUD-RS zoning classification was recommended, along with a preliminary approval of the overall PUD development plan. Mr. Steiner further explained that in August of 2005 the applicants returned with Phase 1 of the project, and the Planning Commission recommended approval.

Mr. Steiner then began to discuss the specific details of Phase 2. He noted that he had made an error in the planning summary write up, specifically, the number of lots being proposed was 70 lots rather than 66. Mr. Steiner then stated that Phase 2 covered approximately 22 acres and included streets with 60' ft. of right of way, 25' ft. of back to back paving with curbs and gutters, sidewalks, all utilities, and open space. This concluded Mr. Steiner's discussion, and the item was then turned over to Planning Commission members for review and discussion.

When the item was turned over to Commission members, Mr. Kohring asked about the street name change of Waterview to Stillwater Drive that occurred in the middle of the street. Mr. Steiner stated that the name change in that location made it easier to assign addresses to the lots because of the north-south, east-west grid that the Planning Commission uses in the assignment of addresses. Mr. Kohring stated that he felt the name change should be moved up to the intersection. Mr. Kohring then stated that he felt the green space provided was questionable. He further stated that it met the open space requirements, but he was unsure how useable it was. Mr. Ewald stated he was concerned that the Planning Commission hadn't given Phase 2 preliminary approval. He believed preliminary approval had been given to the overall development, and that the 12 months normally granted for preliminary approval had lapsed. Mr. Steiner stated that the development was a PUD development, and that it wasn't required to follow the County's Subdivision Rules and Regulations which placed the 12 month approval time on a preliminary approval. Mr. Ewald then asked if the development being reviewed was the one that had mounding running along Eckel Junction Road. Mr. Walt Opaczewski, engineer for the development, stated that it was.

Hearing no further discussions from Commission members, Chairman Weidner called for a vote. Mr. Kohring made a motion to recommend approval of Emerald Lakes Phase Two. Mr. Fitzgerald seconded the motion. Upon calling for the vote, Commission members responded with a vote of eight (8) in favor, one (1) (Mr. Ewald) Opposed, motion carried.

ZONING-BLOOM TOWNSHIP

The Bloom Township Trustees submitted a series of text amendments to the current Bloom Township Zoning Resolution. These amendments included the addition of "junk yards/recycling centers" to the definitions section, changes to setback requirements for fences, hedges, and rear yards, and changes to the minimum lot size and minimum building floor area per family.

Ms. Moore began her review and discussion of this item by explaining to Commission members that the Bloom Township Trustees had asked the Planning Commission staff to attend a meeting in Bloom Township in April of 2006. At the meeting, the Bloom

Township Zoning Commission proposed some concerns that the Township had regarding the current zoning resolution. Ms. Moore further explained that it was decided that the Planning Commission would provide some examples of new zoning text language to Bloom Township, and the Township could decide what to include in the new amendments. Ms. Moore concluded her history of the item by noting that what was before the Planning Commission for review and recommendation was the end result of this update process.

Ms. Moore then went on to quickly highlight the changes, then turned the item over to the Commission members for further discussion. Once the item was turned over, several issues were raised and several questions were asked. Mr. Ewald asked why the Township was changing the rear yard setback from 25' ft. to 15' ft. He further stated that he felt that 15' ft. was not much of a setback. Mr. Allion asked if the Commission could suggest to the Township that they have different minimum rear yard setbacks depending on what zoning district was being looked at. Mr. Steiner stated that the Planning Commission could make that suggestion. Mr. Ewald asked if the change in minimum lot area was due to septic tank regulations. Mr. Steiner stated that he felt that was the reason. Mr. Ewald then asked if it was the Township Zoning Inspector's role to ensure that there was enough lot area to install a septic system on. Mr. Steiner stated that it wasn't necessarily the zoning inspector that made that determination, but rather the Health Department. Mr. Ewald then stated he felt that this method was taking up more land by going to a larger minimum lot area. Mr. Huber asked about the wrecking yards definition, specifically the issue of possible contamination from oil leaks, and also his fear of fences being allowed into the right of way. Chairman Weidner asked Mr. Huber if he was suggesting that some language be placed into the requirements that prohibited uses in the right of way. Mr. Carter stated that the problem was that hedges grew over time and encroached into the setbacks. Mr. Allion suggested that they include language that hedges had to be maintained so that they didn't encroach into the right of way.

Upon calling for a motion, Mr. Ewald made a motion to recommend to Bloom Township that the Township approve the text amendments with the following suggestions: 1) The setback distance for fences and hedges be changed from 10' ft. from the edge of the road to 10' ft. from the edge of the road or 15' ft. from the edge of the road right of way, whichever is greater, 2) The rear yard setback be adjusted for each zoning district, and 3) the minimum lot area be 1.5 acres rather than 2 acres. Mr. Fitzgerald seconded the motion, and Commission members responded with a vote of 9 in favor, none opposed, motion carried.

DIRECTOR'S TIME:

During Director's time Mr. Steiner explained to Commission members that the Planning Commission Staff was beginning to hold Town Hall meetings throughout the month of September for the land use plan update. Mr. Steiner further explained that a sign up sheet was being passed around. Mr. Steiner encouraged members to sign up to come to one of the meetings and participate in the facilitation and discussion process. Upon hearing no further items, the meeting stood adjourned after a motion from Mr. Allion, which was seconded by Mrs. Schuerman.