

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Wood County Planning Commission**  
**March 6, 2018 @ 5:30pm**

The Wood County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, March 6, 2018 at the County Office Building in Bowling Green, Ohio. Planning Commission staff in attendance was David Steiner and Katie Baltz. Planning Commission members in attendance were Tony Allion, Rob Black, John Brossia, Doris Herringshaw, Craig LaHote, John Musteric, Barbara Ruland, John Schuerman and Eric Wineland. 3 guests were in attendance.

Rob Black called the meeting to order.

Mr. Steiner introduced Barbara Ruland as the newest Planning Commission board member, and stated that Ms. Ruland was a resident of the City of Bowling Green. Planning Commission members introduced themselves to Ms. Ruland.

**Old Business**

**New Business**

Mr. Wineland stated that he was impressed by the level of detail that went into the monthly meeting minutes. Ms. Herringshaw made a motion to approve the February 2018 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Mr. LaHote seconded the motion. Commission members responded in full support.

**Staff Activities Report**

Mr. Steiner read a list of activities that had been completed from the staff activities report for the month of February 2018.

**SUBDIVISION VARIANCE - PERRYSBURG TOWNSHIP**

A Jerry and Helen Krall had submitted an application for a variance from the Wood County Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Steiner stated that the applicants desired to split off approximately 2-3 acres off of an existing 8.35 acre parcel of land in Section 2 of Perrysburg Township and that in order to accomplish this, the applicant would need a variance from the Subdivision Rules and Regulations to create a 20 foot strip to access the back two to three acres. The current road frontage minimum requirement in the Subdivision Regulations was 175 feet.

Mr. Steiner stated that the subject parcel was located in Section 2 of Perrysburg Township. Mr. Steiner stated that the parcel was located on the east side of Glenwood Road, the Ohio Turnpike was approximately 805 feet to the south of the parcel, and State Route 795 was approximately 1960 feet to the north.

Mr. Steiner stated that the subject parcel was unzoned and that lands to the north, south, east, and west of the parcel were also unzoned. Mr. Steiner stated that there were no floodplains or wetlands on the parcel, and the Wood County Land Use Plan had designated the parcel as being in an enhancement and reinvestment area. Mr. Steiner read the County's definitions for

enhancement and reinvestment areas. Mr. Steiner stated that if this parcel were located in a zoned area of the township, there would be no frontage requirement, provided that each parcel had access to an established road right of way.

Mr. Steiner stated that the issue was whether or not there was reason to grant this variance, or whether it was a self-created hardship. Mr. Steiner stated that he did not feel that the application met the four reasons for justification of a variance, and recommended denial of the variance.

Mr. Rex Huffman stated that he was an Attorney and represented the Krall family. Mr. Huffman stated that Chris Krall, the son of the applicants, was present and could answer any additional questions, as Mr. and Mrs. Krall were of advanced age and unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Huffman stated that a creek ran through the property and acted as a natural barrier. Mr. Huffman stated that the property was located within the targeted reinvestment area, and was located next to rail. Mr. Huffman stated that there was a high pressure pipeline that went through the rear of the property and building on the property would be problematic.

Mr. Black asked if the request was to reduce the required 175 feet of frontage down to 20 feet. Mr. Krall stated that yes; it was the request in order to allow for a driveway for access to the rear of the property.

Mr. Black asked if the applicant could split and access the property south of the storage buildings. Mr. Krall stated that there were fences in place, and that the existing fences would not meet the 40 foot setback requirements.

Mr. Brossia asked where the pipeline was located at on the rear of the property. Mr. Krall stated that the pipeline was in the rear 1/3 of the property. Mr. Krall stated that the pipeline held an easement to access the rear of the property. Mr. Steiner asked if the pipeline would allow others to use the driveway. Mr. Krall stated that his family still owned the land and that the pipeline just had rights to access it.

Mr. Wineland asked what would be the highest and best use of the land if it were to be allowed to be split. Mr. Huffman stated that the best use would likely be rail siding. Mr. Wineland asked what would be the most realist use of the property if the variance were not granted. Mr. Huffman stated wasteland. Mr. Huffman stated that if the property were zoned that this lot split would be permitted.

Mr. Wineland asked if variance requests were required to meet all four reasons of justifications for variances. Mr. Steiner stated that at least one of the requirements should be met. Mr. Wineland stated he thought that the property being unzoned rather than zoned could be considered a "Literal interpretation of the regulations that would deprive the applicant of rights enjoyed by other property owners", as listed on justifiable reason for a variance.

Mr. Black stated that he felt that 20 feet of road frontage was not enough, and that it was not enough room for vehicles to turn in.

Mr. LaHote asked if asphalt or a parking lot could be put over top of the pipeline. Mr. Krall stated that it could possibly be done, but would require going through a lengthy process.

Mr. Allion stated that he would be concerned about the pipeline owning the access to the rear property and not allowing a new owner to access the property. Mr. Krall stated that the pipeline easement was non-exclusive and that future owners would own the land and be able to access the property.

Mr. Musteric stated that he rented space from this storage facility and was recusing himself from this agenda item.

Mr. Wineland made a motion to grant the 20 foot frontage variance from the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. Ms. Herringshaw seconded the motion.

Mr. Black called for a vote.

Tony Allion-No, Steve Arnold-Absent, Rob Black-No, Theodore (Ted) Bowlus-Absent, John Brossia-Yes, Doris Herringshaw-Yes, Craig LaHote-Yes, John Musteric-Abstain, Barbara Ruland-Yes, John Schuerman-No, Eric Wineland-Yes. Motion carried.

### **ZONING - TROY TOWNSHIP**

Mr. Steiner stated that the Troy Township Zoning Commission had submitted changes to the permitted, conditional and prohibited uses allowed within the Troy Township land use matrix.

Mr. Wineland asked what was being changed and stated that the changes were unclear. Mr. Hagg stated that the Prosecutors office had suggested that some changes be made within the land use matrix. Mr. Wineland asked what it meant when it stated that a Child Day Care Center would add a "C". Mr. Steiner stated that within the land use matrix "C" meant that the use was Conditional; "P" meant it was a permitted use, and a blank box within the matrix meant that the use was prohibited. Ms. Baltz stated that Section 4.01.01 of the Zoning Resolution explained the land use matrix organization and symbols.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Allion made a motion to recommend that Troy Township approve the zoning text amendments. Mr. Musteric seconded the motion. Mr. Black called for a vote.

Tony Allion-Yes, Steve Arnold-Absent, Rob Black-Yes, Theodore (Ted) Bowlus-Absent, John Brossia-Yes, Doris Herringshaw-Yes, Craig LaHote-Yes, John Musteric-Yes, Barbara Ruland-Yes, John Schuerman-Yes, Eric Wineland-Yes. Motion carried.

### **PUBLIC FORUM**

**CHAIRMAN'S TIME/COMMISSION MEMBERS' TIME**

**DIRECTOR'S TIME**

Mr. Steiner stated that some of the Planning Commission members would be meeting with the County Engineer and members of the development community on April 2<sup>nd</sup> to discuss concerns regarding the Subdivision Rules and Regulations, timelines, and the platting process among any additional concerns that were brought forward.

Following a brief discussion, Mr. Black stated that the meeting would be held at 2:30 PM in the Commissioners' Hearing Room and that Planning Commission members were welcome to attend.

There being no further items of business, Mr. LaHote made a motion to adjourn the March 6, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting, Mr. Wineland seconded the motion, Commission members responded in full support, meeting adjourned.

DRAFT