**Meeting Minutes**

**Wood County Planning Commission**

**October 5, 2021**

**5:30 pm**

The Wood County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, October 5, 2021 at the County Office Building in Bowling Green, Ohio.  Planning Commission staff members in attendance were: David Steiner and Jamie Stanley. Planning Commission members in attendance were: Ted Bowlus, John Brossia, Brendyn George, Doris Herringshaw, Craig LaHote, John Musteric, Jeffrey Schaller, and Brian Swope.  Twenty-eight (28) guests were in attendance.

Chair John Musteric called the meeting to order.

**Old Business**

None

**New Business**

Mr. Schaller made a motion to approve the August 2021 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Mr. Bowlus seconded the motion.

Mr. Musteric called for a vote.

Mr. Arnold - ABSENT, Mr. Bowlus – YES, Mr. Brossia - YES, Mr. George – YES

Ms. Herringshaw - ABSTAIN, Mr. LaHote - ABSTAIN, Mr. Musteric - ABSTAIN, Mr. Schaller – YES, Mr. Schuerman - ABSENT, Mr. Swope – YES, Mr. Wineland – ABSENT.

The motion to approve carried. Vote: 5 yes, 3 abstain and 0 no.

**Subdivision– WASHINGTON Township**

Mr. Steiner explained that the applicants, Danberry and Feller Finch & Associates, had submitted a preliminary plat entitled “The Reserve at Williamsburg on the River” for preliminary approval. Mr. Steiner explained that the plat consists of 32 single family lots covering approximately 43.82 acres of land in Section 36 of Washington Township and will be adjacent to the existing Williamsburg on the River development.

Mr. Steiner explained that the proposed plat currently consists of approximately 43.82 acres in Section 36 of Washington Township. The existing Williamsburg on the River development borders it to the north and east. It is bordered by Back Bay Road, and access to it will be through stub streets off of Back Bay Road.

Mr. Steiner stated the parcel where the proposed plat is located is zoned R-2 Residential. Mr. Steiner explained that the lands surrounding the parcel to the north and east are zoned R-2 Residential and the lands to the south and west are zoned A-1 Agricultural. Mr. Steiner stated that the land use in the area is lower to medium density residential within the Williamsburg on the River development, with lower density residential development and agricultural land uses occurring further away from the existing development.

Mr. Steiner explained that there are no floodplains located on the parcel and all utilities are available to the site.

Mr. Steiner explained that the subject plat is the final stage of development of the long established Williamsburg on the River development. Mr. Steiner explained that the original development dates back to the 1960’s. Mr. Steiner explained that there has been another phase added since then, and the subject plat is the last phase.

Mr. Steiner stated that public water is available per a waterline from the Village of Grand Rapids and sanitary sewer is available via a package plant that has been designed to service the Williamsburg on the River development. Mr. Steiner explained that the developer seeks to preserve several of the existing trees on the property and intends to utilize bioretention methods and conservation easements to control runoff.

Mr. Steiner stated that the developer has asked for the following variances from the Wood County Subdivision Rules and Regulations:

1. Elimination of the curb and gutter requirement for the streets.
2. They wish to install 20’ ft. of pavement with 2” inch stone shoulders on each side.
3. They wish to eliminate sidewalks.
4. They wish to eliminate streetlights.
5. They would like a variance from the maximum cul-de-sac length. They would like to have a cul-de-sac that is 1,033’ ft. instead of the current maximum of 800’ ft.
6. They want to eliminate the requirement for street trees. The developers plan to place conservation easements throughout the subdivision in order to preserve the existing trees on the site.

Mr. Steiner explained that the Planning Commission staff has no issues with granting these variances. Mr. Steiner explained that given the nature and location of the existing Williamsburg on the River development, and the unlikely possibility of future development occurring in this area, these variances are more than reasonable. Additionally, Mr. Steiner explained that not granting these variances would negatively impact the overall aesthetic of the established development.

Mr. Steiner stated that he did have some questions and concerns regarding the plat drawing as submitted.

Mr. Steiner stated that the primary concern he had was stormwater runoff and drainage. Mr. Steiner stated that additional concerns he had were: the amount of open space was not listed on the plat drawing; issues of access to lots 31 and 32; access to the retention pond behind lots 6, 7, 14-16 needed to be clarified; and flood plain located on lots 31 and 32 needed to be noted.

Mr. Steiner explained that the Director would like to make the requirement that the Developer place all necessary plat improvements under maintenance via an escrow agreement be a requirement for final plat approval. Mr. Steiner explained that this would allow for the County to repair and maintain failing plat infrastructure, primarily storm water and drainage infrastructure in the future as it ages and breaks down.

Mr. Steiner also highlighted the following questions and concerns raised by existing Williamsburg on the River homeowners:

***Question and Concern:***

*The placement of the proposed retention pond seems very close to the property lines of lots (Circle Numbers) 13, 14, 15, and 16. The drawing does not show any dimensions from the rear property lines of these lots, but looks very close as it is presented on this drawing.  (Using the 41' reference as a bench mark to judge upon.)*

*Will this retention pond require any fencing to prevent children and grand-children from entering this area as an attractive nuisance?  All of the current families in these lots have children and grand-children, and they are asking me to bring these issues up now, before you submit for initial approval.*

***Other questions:***

*This same retention pond appears to be land-locked and does not have easy access for maintenance.  Also, the question of liability of an accident in this area, since it appears to be placed on five (5) separate lots.  It might be a little too early to discuss these questions, but they have been raised and I told those asking that I will pass these concerns to you and others.*

***Option:***

*One home owner has expressed interest in purchasing Lot #14 now, and including a deed restriction to allow a service access easement along the west property line to service and support this proposed retention pond.*

Mr. Steiner also noted that the County Engineer had drafted a letter to him that also identified questions and concerns from the Engineer’s Office.

Mr. Steiner noted that the proposed plat is compatible with the existing development in the area in regards to residential density and land use. Mr. Steiner noted that the main concern is the impact that any stormwater or any other water run off will have on the existing Williamsburg on the River plats that will abut this new plat. Mr. Steiner explained that the currently the existing plats utilize two lakes for their storm water run off and drainage needs.

Mr. Steiner explained that these lakes were constructed in the 1960’s and were designed using methods and standards from that era. Mr. Steiner stated that in the intervening years the lakes have experienced sufficient silting and methods for managing storm water have changed. Mr. Steiner stated that as a result, storm water and drainage have become a major issue for the homeowners in the existing plats.

Mr. Steiner stated that the homeowner’s association have enlisted the services of a civil engineering firm to study and mitigate their flooding and drainage problems. Mr. Steiner stated that so far, the only viable solutions are quite costly and beyond the economical means of the homeowner’s association. Mr. Steiner stated that any additional water would be even more detrimental to their developmental given their limited means to mitigate the problem.

Mr. Steiner stated that the developer is required per County regulations to hold all drainage and run off levels to the levels that existed prior to development. Mr. Steiner explained that while this does not mean there will be no storm water run off after the development is constructed, it will theoretically mean that no additional stormwater will be discharged onto the existing development. Mr. Steiner stated that the developers appear to have taken several active steps to keep the potential stormwater and drainage problems to a minimum. Mr. Steiner explained that the developers have opted to create larger lots than the underlying zoning allows for which will reduce the amount of impervious surface area that contributes to run off. Mr. Steiner stated that they have designed bio retention filters to hold water naturally during and after rain events and have created conservation easements to keep some the existing trees on site.

Mr. Steiner noted the concerns and questions that have been submitted by the existing homeowners in the adjacent development. Mr. Steiner stated that he feels strongly that these need addressed and adequately answered before approval be granted.

Mr. Steiner stated that as for the variances from the Subdivision Rules and Regulations that the developer has requested, the Director feels these are appropriate given the nature of the area and the design and aesthetics of existing development that is adjacent to the proposed development.

Mr. Steiner noted he feels quite strongly that the Planning Commission should make approval of the plat conditional on the developer placing the adequate infrastructure in the plat under maintenance. Mr. Steiner explained that this will allow a method whereby the County has the fiscal means to repair and replace the subject infrastructure if needed as it wears down in the future.

Mr. Steiner explained that after taking all of this into consideration, the staff recommends that the Planning Commission grant conditional preliminary approval to the plat with the following conditions and or provisions:

1. The questions and concerns of the homeowners in the existing Williamsburg on the River development are answered and adequately addressed to their satisfaction.
2. The scrivener errors identified by the Wood County Engineer and the Planning Commission Director are corrected on the plat drawing.
3. The developer agrees to place the appropriate infrastructure under County maintenance prior to receiving final plat approval.

Mr. Steiner explained that if the plat receives preliminary approval, the developer has one year to submit a final plat and during this one year period developers typically submit their construction plans to the various agencies, begin building roads, installing utilities, laying out lots, etc.

Mr. Brossia asked why the Commission would not deny the variance request and require sidewalks or streetlights.

Mr. LaHote asked about decreasing number of street trees versus maintaining current trees.

Mr. Greg Feller if Feller Finch & Associates, on behalf of the developer, stated that the variances are necessary so the new development blends with what currently exists. Mr. Feller explained that there is not a prescribed number of trees per lot but the developer is looking at a conservation easement to maintain a majority of the trees found on the site.

Mr. Feller addressed the concerns with Lots 31 and 32 by stating that they are seeking access permits from ODOT regarding access from State Route 235 and are looking at the conservation easement as a solution. Mr. Feller explained that Portsmouth Road is a stub street and will be used for access.

Mr. Feller addressed the following concerns with proposed solutions:

100 year flood plain Lots 31 and 32: he will denote those lots and clarify

Infrastructure under maintenance is acceptable to the developer

Stormwater: all stormwater will be run through treatment processed prior to discharge and

quantity requirements will be met per the Engineer’s Office standards

Retention Pond and Access: placement will meet setbacks when final design is submitted

Heavy Equipment Access: will be addressed

Mr. Musteric asked questions about Lots 2 and 3 and a road vacated in 1968 along with question on right of way possibly adding 30 feet to each lot.

Mr. Feller stated that initial research on questions from Mr. Musteric indicated no.

Mr. Brossia asked about the problem with streetlights and sidewalks.

Mr. Musteric stated that variances may be requested but not necessarily granted. Mr. Musteric further stated that the current pavement is less than required.

During the public question and concern time there were a large number of homeowners who stated their concerns, questions and comments. The following were the concerns raised:

-this is a walking community that doesn’t have sidewalks and doesn’t need them and appreciates the attempt to maintain the culture of the community

-question about the sanitary sewer tap in -Mr. Feller showed on the plat map where the location was and assured that the pump station has the capacity to handle the sanitary load

-question about the silt – Mr. Feller explained that there are options but would be governed under the EPA water quality rules

-wish to maintain the lack of sidewalks and streetlights

-question on stormwater’s final destination – Mr. Feller indicated that it would collect in retention ponds, bioretention areas and ultimately to the lakes

-stormwater must be treated and current holding ponds need dredged and how will they hold additional run-off – Mr. Feller that current run-off is more detrimental than from the future development because it is currently unprocessed

-conservation easement and what it means – will work to make it beneficial

-access to Lots 31 and 32 – believes it should only be from State Route 235

-what if the water retention systems receive above the water limit – developer Smith indicated that is why the lots are larger and the treatment systems are in place

-potential loss of trees – conservation easement should mitigate

-increased traffic concerns – developer indicated that the number of homes would not be a significant increase

-the new plat would it have access to the current private lakes – no because it would not be part of the current development

-concerns raised over information dissemination – seemed to indicate an issue not under the purview of the planning commission

Mr. Steve Powell, representing the Township as a Washington Township Trustee, noted that there was concern about heavy equipment on Back Bay Road as well as access for emergency vehicles on the subdivision roads if parking on the side of the roads is allowed.

Mr. Wade Smith, developer, noted that Lots 31 and 32 are not intended to be built and are intended to become open area.

Mr. Musteric noted the stormwater run-off concerns by explaining that the current plan is preliminary and the current issues with the current lakes can be remedied with a petition to put the relevant parts under maintenance which would result in a shared cost to the homeowners into perpetuity. Mr. Musteric indicated that he and Mr. Steiner are attempting to mitigate future concerns with the new development by having the ditch under county maintenance part of the subdivision development process.

Mr. Swope and Mr. Musteric noted that the meeting was not to re-design the plat but to consider it as presented. Mr. Swope noted that it may be more prudent to have the developer and HOA meet to discuss the plan.

Mr. Smith indicated that there had been meetings with a committee from the HOA but he is willing to discuss it.

Mr. Musteric made a motion to table the plan because of the corrections to be done on the plat. Mr. Swope seconded the motion.

Mr. Musteric called for a vote.

Mr. Arnold - ABSENT, Mr. Bowlus – YES, Mr. Brossia - YES, Mr. George – YES

Ms. Herringshaw - YES, Mr. LaHote - YES, Mr. Musteric - YES, Mr. Schaller – YES , Mr. Schuerman - ABSENT, Mr. Swope – YES, Mr. Wineland – ABSENT.

The motion to recommend tabling the plan carried. Vote: 8 yes, 0 no.

**Subdivision– Troy Township**

Mr. Steiner explained that the applicant, Feller Finch and Associates have submitted an extension request for a preliminary plat entitled “Eagles Landing” located in Troy Township. Said request is for a one (1) year extension for preliminary approval.

Mr. Steiner explained that the subject parcel is located in Troy Township on the north side of Truman Road, west of the intersection of Truman Road and Route 420.

Mr. Steiner shared that with building materials and supplies in short supply and high demand, there is no surprise that there has been a delay in completion of the plat. This being the case, the Director recommended that the Commission grant the extension.

Mr. George made a motion to approve the request for an extension. Mr. Bowlus seconded the motion.

Mr. Musteric called for a vote.

Mr. Arnold - ABSENT, Mr. Bowlus – YES, Mr. Brossia - YES, Mr. George – YES

Ms. Herringshaw - YES, Mr. LaHote - YES, Mr. Musteric - YES, Mr. Schaller – YES, Mr. Schuerman - ABSENT, Mr. Swope – YES, Mr. Wineland – ABSENT.

The motion to approve carried. Vote: 8 yes, 0 no.

**Zoning– Plain Township**

Ms. Stanley stated that the applicant, Don Rose, had submitted a request to rezone 1.98 acres of land in Section 12 of Plain Township from an A-Agricultural Zoning Classification to a C-Commercial Zoning Classification. Ms. Stanley explained that the applicant had indicated that they would like to place a storage unit facility on the parcel.

Ms. Stanley stated that the subject parcel is located in Section 12 of Plain Township. More specifically, the parcel is located approximately 1,700 feet west of the intersection of North Dixie Highway and Bishop Road.

Ms. Stanley explained that the parcel is currently zoned A-Agricultural. Ms. Stanley stated that the parcels to the west of the parcel and those located north are zoned A Agricultural; the parcels located immediately south of the property are zoned A Agricultural, and the parcel immediately east is within Bowling Green City limits and per their zoning map is zoned M-3 Business Park and has commercial activities on it.

Ms. Stanley stated that the Wood County Comprehensive Land Use Plan has the area where the parcel is located at as being in a growth management area and that these are areas where growth will occur, so decisions must be made carefully to ensure that this growth is guided correctly.

Ms. Stanley explained that utilities are available and there are no floodplains or wetlands on the that parcel.

Ms. Stanley stated that the proposed commercial use would fit for the area and that the staff recommended recommending to the Township to approve the rezoning request.

The commission briefly discussed the surrounding parcels and the related zoning classifications.

Mr. George made a motion to recommend the Township approve the rezoning request. Ms. Herringshaw seconded the motion.

Mr. Musteric called for a vote.

Mr. Arnold - ABSENT, Mr. Bowlus – YES, Mr. Brossia - YES, Mr. George – YES

Ms. Herringshaw - YES, Mr. LaHote - YES, Mr. Musteric - YES, Mr. Schaller – YES, Mr. Schuerman - ABSENT, Mr. Swope – YES, Mr. Wineland – ABSENT.

The motion to recommend approval carried. Vote: 8 yes, 0 no.

**Zoning– Perrysburg Township**

Mr. Steiner explained that the applicant, Premier Bank, had submitted a request to rezone a forty (40) acre parcel of land in Section 35 of Perrysburg Township from an A-1 Agricultural zoning classification to an I-2 General Industrial zoning classification. Mr. Steiner explained the applicants stated that they wished to place an industrial building on ten (10) acres at the corner of Mandell and Glenwood Roads and leave the remaining acreage on the parcel for future industrial development.

Mr. Steiner stated the subject parcel consists of approximately forty (40) acres in Section 35 of Perrysburg Township. Glenwood Road borders the parcel to the east, Mandell Road borders the parcel to the south, and the City of Rossford borders the parcel to the north.

Mr. Steiner stated that the parcel is currently zoned A-1 Agricultural. Mr. Steiner explained the lands to the east are zoned I-2 General Industrial; lands to the west are zoned A-1 Agricultural and R-2 Residential; lands to the north are located in the City of Rossford and are zoned M-2 Industrial; and the lands to the South are zoned A-1 Agricultural, R-2 Suburban Residential, R-3 Suburban Residential medium density, and there is a small portion of the City of Rossford bordering it to the south that is zoned “P” Public because it is part of the Rossford Elementary school. Mr. Steiner stated the lands to the west are zoned A-1 Agricultural and R-2 Residential.

Mr. Steiner further explained that the Wood County Land Use Plan has this area as being located in a growth management area, just west of a targeted economic development area and an enhancement area and that there are no floodplains or wetlands on the parcel.

Mr. Steiner explained that the existing zoning and land use is diverse in the surrounding areas.

Mr. Steiner explained that he had some concerns regarding road access and land use. Particularly concerns on the ability of the roads (Glenwood, Lime City and Mandell) to handle industrial traffic.

Mr. Steiner stated that the land use is diverse and that the medium density residential use on Mandell Road and the proximity of the Rossford City Schools property presents concerns. He stated he felt that an industrial use may not be the most compatible with what was in the area.

Mr. Steiner stated that due to the concerns about road access and land use that his opinion is to recommend denial of the request to rezone.

There was discussion of the diverse zoning and land use fitting the request and the buffering requirements to limit any negative impact on non-industrial parcels, and the applicant representative stated they were trying to come to a mutually beneficial plan for the area.

Mr. Musteric noted that there was a traffic study being done on Lime City Road and that the ditch along Glenwood Road is under maintenance.

Ms. Herringshaw made a motion to recommend the Township approve the zoning change. Mr. Bowlus seconded the motion.

Mr. Musteric called for a vote.

Mr. Arnold - ABSENT, Mr. Bowlus – YES, Mr. Brossia - YES, Mr. George – ABSENT

Ms. Herringshaw - YES, Mr. LaHote - YES, Mr. Musteric - YES, Mr. Schaller – ABSTAIN, Mr. Schuerman - ABSENT, Mr. Swope – ABSTAIN, Mr. Wineland – ABSENT.

The motion to recommend approval carried. Vote: 5 yes, 2 abstain and 0 no. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

**CHAIRMAN’S/COMMISSION MEMBERS’ TIME**

**DIRECTOR’S TIME**

**Staff Activities**

Mr. Steiner referred the members to the Staff Activities report.

Mr. Steiner shared that there has been a significant increase in zoning questions.

Mr. Steiner stated what the staff has assisted Middleton and Troy Townships with zoning questions.

Mr. Steiner shared that the staff met with homeowners at Williamsburg on the River the developers of the new Reserve at Williamsburg on the River plat, the Washington Township Trustees, the Wood County Engineer’s Office and the Planning commission Office to review and discuss the proposed plat of the Reserve at Williamsburg on the River.

Mr. Steiner noted that the office provided Freedom Township with zoning language and information for solar fields and wind turbines.

Mr. Steiner stated the staff met with a landowner and various representatives to discuss the best way to split their property.

Mr. Steiner stated that the staff met with a landowner to discuss how to leave some of their land for development to convert it into a wetland area.

Mr. Steiner stated that the staff provided Perry Township and the Prosecutor’s Office with information regarding a zoning violation in Perry Township.

Mr. Steiner stated that the staff assisted a potential land buyer in Middleton Township with numerous questions regarding land use and floodplain.

Mr. Steiner noted that the CHIP grant is well underway and work continues on it.

Mr. Steiner stated that the staff met with the Village of Bradner to discuss applying for a neighborhood revitalization grant (NRG).

Mr. Steiner noted that the Planner finished and submitted the required environmental reviews to the Ohio Department of Development for PY2020 grant projects. The projects will be bid out as soon as release is granted.

Mr. Steiner noted that the office provided floodplain information and development guidance to several landowners and potential buyers.

Ms. Stanley shared that 50 rural addresses were issued from July 29, 2021 through September 24, 2021.

Ms. Stanley shared that twelve (12) parcel splits and seven (7) parcel combinations were processed.

Mr. Steiner noted that there have been multiple zoning classification requests from citizens, title companies and real estate professionals.

**Motion to Adjourn:**

Mr. Swope made a motion to adjourn the October 5th, 2021 Planning Commission meeting. Commission members responded in full support. The meeting adjourned.