

**PERRYSBURG TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION**  
**26609 Lime City Road**  
**Perrysburg, Ohio 43551**

Zoning Commission Meeting  
February 14, 2005

The Perrysburg Township Zoning Commission held a commission/public meeting on February 14, 2005, at 26609 Lime City Road, Perrysburg, Ohio. Robert S. Black, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A roll call was taken. The meeting was tape-recorded.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert S. Black, Jeff Schaller, Carol Warnimont, John J. Benavides, and Jeffrey Normand.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arthur Rometo and Stephen J. Stanford.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to approve the agenda for this evening. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Benavides to approve the agenda. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Benavides, Mr. Normand, Mr. Schaller, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 5-0-0.

APPROVAL OF THE 1/10/05 MEETING MINUTES: Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to approve both sets of minutes, the organizational and the regular meeting minutes from 1/10/05. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Schaller to approve the minutes as typed. There was no other discussion or corrections. Mr. Garn asked if this motion was for both sets of minutes, and Mr. Black so confirmed. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Schaller, Mr. Normand, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 5-0-0.

Mr. Black swore in all persons who wished to address the commission this evening.

**ZONING CHANGE APPLICATION NUMBER ZC 2005-01.** Penta County Vocational School District owns approximately 148.67 acres of land located in Section 27 of Perrysburg Township, which is south of Buck Road, east of Bates Road, and west of Lime City Road, and north of I-75 in Perrysburg Township. They wish to have this property rezoned. The property is presently zoned PUD-RS and PUD-MX respectively. They are requesting that the zoning be changed to A-1 (agricultural district). They plan to construct an educational (public use) facility on this property. The Wood County Planning Commission at their February 1, 2005, meeting unanimously approved of this change. A copy of their letter is attached.

Fred Susor addressed the commission regarding this application. He informed the commission that they are requesting a zoning change from PUD to agriculture in order

to make it a bit easier for them to construct a new facility, and also to take away the fear that they were going to sell off the outside as commercial or whatever. It's their intent to use the whole area as school property.

Beth Wilson also addressed the commission. She informed the commission that they have submitted at least a preliminary rendition of what the building is going to look like. Of course this is only just to request the zoning change, but essentially the school did hold an open house recently, invited members of the community to come in, take a look at the plans. Basically they gave an explanation of what they were requesting as far as the agricultural zoning, gave them the opportunity to ask questions, and they have had a chance to look at that. There is also a drawing up front tonight, and essentially they are just trying to change the zoning to make the building process easier.

Mr. Black asked if there was anyone present who wished to address this application. Doug Crocker addressed the commission regarding this application. He informed the commission that he really does not have an objection as much as a concern that he has. His home and at least one of the other homes in the neighborhood located right in the development, whenever there is heavy rains they experience sewer problems that literally back up into the house. The good news is they have check valves to prevent that from backing up in the house. The consequences when they have heavy rains and run-off into Grassy Creek or the adjacent area, the sewers can't handle it, and they can't run any water and dispose of it through the sewers for a two-day time period. No showers or anything else on the premises. His concern with this construction and the parking lot and the run-off that will be created, how will that be handled. How can they be assured that it won't exacerbate the situation as opposed to either making it better. The question is more broad than just the impact that Penta may have or what's going to happen in the area to address the sewer issue, and will this exacerbate the situation they have.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Susor if there had been any discussion about the storm water issue. Mr. Susor said not storm water, but a sanitary sewer issue. He is not sure if this is a storm or sanitary issue from what was said. It's his understanding that the Northwest water/sewer is going to be putting in another line to the Perrysburg Township sewage treatment plant, and he thinks it runs along the pumping station that is right at the railroad tracks and Ford Road, and they anticipate that will be in by 2007. They are anticipating moving in in 2009.

Phil Enderle addressed the commission regarding this application. He said to answer the questions, they are working very closely with the county engineers. This is the first time he has heard of any sewer back-up or any issues like that. If it helps to put forth ease, all of the construction drawings, the site engineering drawings will be reviewed by an engineer that is separately hired by the township to review these drawings. So before they can start moving any dirt or doing any kind of work a separate consulting engineer group will review all the drawings. Mr. Black asked him if after the meeting if

he would spend some time with Mr. Crocker and assure him that the appropriate action is being taken, and he said he would.

Mr. Crocker informed the commission that he had made a call to the Northwest Water and Sewer District, and they did advise him in connection with this that they expected that there would be run-off reservoirs, holding tanks or whatever that would release the water on a more limited basis, which all sounds good, but they also indicated it was likely to be released into Grassy Creek and, in fact, suggested that it likely would create a bigger problem, so hence his concern. So the confusion about storm versus sanitary, he wishes they were separated, but the fact is it is the storm run-off that overflows the sanitary sewer and causes their problem. It's inconvenient for 2 days not to run any water in the home. They have lived with that for 10 years. He has continued to be told by Northwest Ohio water and sewer that they are working on it, they are doing repairs, they have found leaks, they are going to make people take sump pumps and get them out. But it's been 10 years, and he's viewing this as maybe an opportune time to make the issue to get something more positive done from the township or the district level, not looking upon this development as a negative thing, but knowing that it could make a bigger problem.

Mr. Black asked if there were plans for detention ponds, storm water run-off to catch and upon that would then release the water into Grassy Creek in a regulated flow, and Mr. Enderle responded yes, there will be a number of detention ponds on the project. In fact, two of them are visible which would actually be retention ponds. They hold water year-round. Then there would be a detention pond which would hold the water just for a limited time, but it does discharge into Grassy Creek. Their engineering would simply be meeting the code as far as what's allowable as far as run-off.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. Larry Wojnar addressed the commission regarding this application. He informed the commission that he has lived in his residence for the past 25 years. This past two-year period they had construction as far as the intersection goes to relieve some of the traffic problems. The work that has presently been done has addressed some of the issue with the flow through that intersection either going into or out of town or the expressway. His concern is whether Penta County has addressed with the state for any type of increased intersection construction to help relieve the additional traffic flow of the school. Now, it maybe fair to moderate as far as he is concerned living there at the corner and seeing the traffic that comes down through that area. With the school being there they are going to have to possibly do something else, and he does not know whether that's been addressed, or whether the state is looking at that or not.

Mr. Enderle addressed that saying they can certainly appreciate the concerns as far as traffic. They are in the process of conducting a traffic impact study. They haven't gotten that yet, but they will be getting that very shortly. They are following all the standard rules and procedures as far as the data that they need to collect. They are

specifically looking at Lime City and Buck Roads. He thinks it is safe to assume that there are going to be some improvements that will be needed at that intersection.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. Barry Kaufman addressed the commission regarding this application. He has a big concern with it as far as going from agriculture. He does not know a whole lot about zoning, but he would think that agriculture at any time could be rezoned for commercial. He knows that they can't get a statement as far as a guarantee, but he would like to know that on Buck Road that is not going to be a Meijer's or something like that. To him just because it's being rezoned agriculture doesn't make him feel good that in 6 years from now it won't be rezoned something else.

Ms. Wilson responded to that concern. She said she appreciates his concerns, but at this point what they are asking for is agricultural. If at some point in the future down the road they would like to split off certain parts and make them commercial, then there would be an application filed to have the opportunity to come at that time and express their views. They are not asking for that at this time, so it's an issue that's only a potential maybe in the future.

Mr. Black felt it was appropriate for him to share his thoughts with the audience. First of all, Penta County doesn't necessarily have to come in at all. All they had to do was make an attempt for rezoning. Because of the unique classification the school has they could actually not do anything, not come in and make an application at all and still build their school. What they have decided to do is the right thing and that is to make an attempt to comply with the zoning. Because it's a residential planned unit development at this point, so anyone who moved in in the last 25 years thought it would be a housing development as its laid out in the PUD. What Penta County has decided to do is to come in and change that PUD zoning to agricultural in general. As it works out as a matter of law, all they have to do is apply for the zoning. Even if they got turned down, they can still build the school because of the unique characteristics of their school system. Not just Penta County, but schools in general. He thinks they should be applauded for coming in and doing what he considers as part of their community as the right thing, to give everyone an opportunity. And he thinks they have made some changes from the very beginning of this process of their site plan and will continue to make adjustments as they get input from the neighbors from problems that will occur as it grows. If, in fact, it will be zoned agricultural, they would still have to come in. Just because they are a school, they can't have a Meijer in their front yard. They still would have to comply with all zoning as a regular commercial use or whatever other use they would want to do.

Mr. Susor addressed Mr. Kaufman's concerns saying that with the present board and present administration, they have no desire to sell off any of the property at this point. He thinks that each of their board members have been on a school board where they have purchased property, and they haven't had enough to build something else in the

future. But 10 years down the road, that's a different board and probably a different administration.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. Rob Wood addressed the commission regarding this application. He started off saying he hears the discussion about the concentration of traffic flow to Buck and Lime City. He sees a problem going west where anybody gets on Buck, comes down to Bates and goes either way. He hasn't heard anything being addressed, no signal, no flags, no issues here. This is going to change that traffic pattern in that area greatly. Lime City Road, the entrance to 75, they have a lot of residents over there. He has already seen students late for Penta going up Ford Road early in the morning 55 miles an hour passing vehicles in a 35 mile an hour zone with no passing. He does not know what it does in the afternoon. He knows in the morning there are a lot of people, and they are all usually going towards 75, so it's not too bad. But in the afternoon those people are going to be coming back the other way. He does not know what it's going to do for the local traffic flow, and he thinks it ought to be looked at seriously. He agrees with the other issues about the water control. They have had a lot of problems over the past 10 years he has lived there. The intersection of Buck and Bates has been flooded a number of times. He does not know if they have been down there or talked to their maintenance people. He is sure they have seen it. It's a real issue. This is not something they are going to improve with if they just meet the code. The run-off is going to be a problem.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Susor if he had had any discussion with the county or the township from a traffic standpoint because that is a good point. Mr. Susor said they have had discussions with the township and the county in determining what to do with Buck Road, and it's their intention that the upgrade of Buck Road will be from their entrance to 75. They anticipate that the traffic study's going to come back with probably more than 75 percent of their students coming from 75 or Lime City Road, from that direction, and not the other way. It sounded to him from the county engineer's office and all that there was going to be no upgrade of the bridge over Grassy Creek, so it's their intent to try and force all of the student traffic out towards 75. They anticipate that that's where most of them will come in and go out, especially if they make it easy for them to go that way rather than through the neighborhood.

Mr. Black asked if the school had any program to help kids understand their impact. He commented if you go by the high school and see them as they leave out Roachton Road and go through Levis Park. He has no idea what that high school does, but there ought to be something that the school administration can do to help guide the students. The light turns green at Roachton Road, and that's exactly what's going to happen here. Some of them will go down Bates. He realizes that may be a little bit beyond their purview, but it's something that they should consider how they can mitigate some of those issues because that is a serious concern. There are families that live down those roads. There will be people going to Rossford that way, and there will be students driving in inappropriate manners.

Mr. Susor addressed that saying just from their past experience with Oregon Road and especially not so much going out because once they get west they usually get on 75, but with Oregon Road they have had some issues, and they have worked with the township police department to come in and do some discussions with the student body on what's expected. And he will say that the township as far as the police department has been outstanding in coming and helping them out when it comes to it. It's a constant reminder. Mr. Black said Bates Road is much different than Oregon Road, and Mr. Susor agreed. Mr. Black said it's almost a country road versus an urban road to a certain degree, and the ability and inability to have more margins for errors is different on Bates Road than it is on Oregon Road. Just as a point to consider.

A question was asked if the driving privileges for students were automatic, do they have to have a parking permit. Mr. Black interrupted this discussion and said these were things that could be discussed with Mr. Susor after the meeting.

Mr. Black asked if there were any commission members that wished to make any comments or Mr. Garn.

Mr. Garn had a couple of things. There was a road that they did have, a service type road from Bates Road over to the circle, and they have taken that out. That was helpful. On the issue that a fair amount of the property was zoned commercial which probably had a higher dollar value, and they are rezoning that back to agricultural, he thinks that is something that is important.

Mr. Susor commented that it is their intent to farm what they don't develop there. So it isn't like they are going to do anything else with it. It is their intent to continue to farm it.

Mr. Black asked if the access road was now just an emergency access drive, or is it eliminated altogether. The response was that's a fire access, so that was the result of Mr. Enderle and others. Mr. Garn said the one on to Lime City is just for the fire and EMS.

It was further commented going back to the road issue, there is a lot of residential area with family and children that travel the Buck Road area that either go to Denny's, McDonald's, the bowling alley, has the school and the state gotten together to try and take care of the people that do walk and ride their bikes down the Buck Road area. And there are a few on Lime City, but the majority is on Buck Road. As far as family traffic flow, that they do come through that area, and it's just not the morning or the afternoon time periods, it's just about any time during the day. And as it stands right now, there is no availability to move off the road other than walking off into the field on one side or the other. No sidewalks, no accessibility for these families to get out of the way of the vehicles that will be coming out of that school area.

Mr. Black commented to Mr. Susor that he has received some good input about this, and hopefully between now, and there will be another hearing at the trustee level, he can bring back some feedback of some remedies they have to address the concerns of the people that live in the area. He then asked if there were any other comments from anybody, and then Mr. Garn.

Mr. Garn said there is a possibility if this attaches to the Perrysburg sewer system that they may require sidewalks. He can't speak for them, but they have done some things like that in other developments in the township.

There was a question asked from a commission member if the information received in the packet on the zoning was correct, and Mr. Garn said yes. He did not include a copy of the drawing showing the subdivision that was there. So the pieces that are currently out of the Penta County control are currently zoned agriculture, is that correct, and Mr. Garn said correct. So what's happening is you're taking what is a mix of commercial and agricultural and creating a total agricultural piece; is that correct, and the response was correct.

Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to approve the zoning change. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Normand to approve the zoning change. There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Normand, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Mr. Schaller abstained. Motion carried 4-0-1.

Mr. Black said they will pass this recommendation along to the township trustees, and they will have a public hearing where they can all have input again. And this closes the public hearing.

Mr. Black asked if there was anyone in the audience who has any comments they would like to share with the zoning commission that is not an agenda item. Mr. Crocker had some questions if anybody can make some recommendation to the Northwest sewer district to get a resolution. Mr. Black referred to Mr. Garn saying that Mr. Crocker brings up a good point that it is very difficult to get performance out of the Northwest Water and Sewer District and wanted to know what he would suggest Mr. Crocker could do to assure that this issue is looked at. Mr. Garn said he would get their administrator, John Hrosko, involved, and he can help some. There was a discussion with these neighbors and Mr. Garn. Mr. Garn was asking if it was a sewer or a storm water problem, and the response was both. Mr. Black told Mr. Garn that maybe they could sit down with Mr. Hrosko, and Mr. Garn said this is the first he has heard about this. There was a further discussion with Mr. Garn about other problems. Some of these issues were before Mr. Garn's time.

Mr. Black told Mr. Crocker that they have to carry on with the remainder of their meeting. Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he was all set. Mr. Garn said as long as these neighbors are here talking, the microphones will not work with all their conversations.

Mr. Black asked if the audience members could be quiet because the microphones get the background noise, and they have business to continue with.

Stephen R. Mitchell of Mitchell Development Company is proposing an amendment (changes) to the Lakes at Woodmont Apartments, Phase 2. This is a PUD-RS. You are to decide if these are major or minor changes to the PUD. Please review Article X, Section I which discusses the criteria and procedure to follow.

Steve Mitchell addressed the commission regarding this proposal. He informed the commission that they were in a couple of months ago presenting informally what they wanted to do. He believes everyone was present except maybe Mr. Normand and heard that. Essentially what they are doing is a request to do a minor change to the approved PUD at Woodmont. What he is circling is the apartment portion of the project. Phase 1 has been built, 174 units. They are approved to do 120 units, and this plan is the original PUD that was approved. What they are asking to do is still have 120 units. They are primarily responding to the comments that have been made over the last 18 months from tenants, potential tenants that have a desire for larger units, additional bathrooms. Larger units that can either accommodate more people with roommates or be used as a den. They went back to the drawing board, came up with a plan, the same exact number of units, but it adds some three bedroom apartments which primarily will be built along this as yet to be built street, and he pointed to the unit. He pointed out the three building types they have already built in Phase 1 and are what could be built now in Phase 2. He pointed to the proposed elevation looks of the buildings they want to build. One is identical. They are both eight unit buildings that are identical. He pointed to the units that have the garages that again primarily are built at a location he pointed out. One of the comments they got from people buying in the single families that did not like living across the street from these, so these will have more of an appearance of a traditional single family home. So they killed two birds with one stone on that.

There are four criteria that are in the code book that they have to not violate to be considered minor, and he went through those. The proposed change in Phase 2 does not result in any additional units, and that's correct. 120 units in each one. It does not encroach materially into established setback areas, and that is correct. Any setback area they had before on any part of this project is still in place. There is no alteration to access drives or provision for additional parking, which is correct. These access points are identical to the as yet to be built road, and they tie into the same spots in Phase 1. There is also actually a handful of additional parking spaces that are a result from this primarily because of the attached garages they are adding. Then finally it does not create a large building mass through an increase in height or length that magnifies their effect on adjoining areas, and their position would be these are not significantly larger buildings that would do that type of thing, that are not going to encroach on what is commercial up here or residential to be built. So he would be happy to answer any questions and get into more detail that they might want.

Mr. Black asked if the members had any questions. One of the members asked if Mr. Mitchell could expand a little further on his last comment regarding the larger building mass, and he said does not materially do that.

Mr. Mitchell responded saying in his opinion does not materially change. They are different styles, they are slightly larger, but he does not feel there is any defined materially section in the zoning code. They don't have anything that's any larger pointing out into the commercial areas or the residential areas. That's basically the side by side comparison of what would be pointing out into the future Woodmont development. The question was asked so they are the same height, and the response was the same height. They are all the same height. These units are a little wider, and he pointed it out, which makes the building wider. So the footprint itself. This is a twelve unit building. It is wider. This building really is replacing the town home units that are there. They are not doing any twelve unit flats anymore. They have done away with that type. They felt that there is really not a market for people that want small, small apartments out there. So a lot of these are town homes that are just bigger. The total square footage, they are going from just under 54,000 square feet cumulatively in Phase 2 to just about 58,000 square feet. So about 4,000 square feet total spread over all the buildings.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. The comment was made, so you're adding three bedroom units now, and the response was yeah, they are adding three bedroom units and not building the flat units anymore. They really are just shuffling the building types that they have in there. So they are going to do more of the larger type apartments, still the same number of units though. 120 units.

The question was asked, more residents, and the answer was potentially more bodies. What they are finding is a lot of roommate situations that come in, and they want two bedrooms and a den. They don't like sharing a bathroom. Currently the two bedroom flats they have are only one bathroom. They like having their own bathroom. So the three bedroom units actually have two and a half baths and then three rooms upstairs that they can use whatever they want to do with it. So conceivably there could be more people if every bedroom had a person in it.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. He then asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments. Mr. Garn said from that he was presuming that will be slightly more family or children oriented than had been before, and are they in the Rossford district. Mr. Mitchell said it's possible, it's a split school district. There is some Perrysburg, some Rossford. They really don't get lots of school aged children in these apartments. He thinks the last count he heard in Phase 1 was they have like two school aged children. There are some young kids, but typically by the time they have kids going to school, for the amount of rent that's charged in here, which ranges from high sixes to with the bigger units \$1,200.00 a month, people are typically buying a home. This is a twelve to eighteen month cycle usually where people stay there. Young singles or young families

or retirees. They don't have lots of school aged kids. That's consistent with their experience up in Sylvania where they have a similar project to this. Mr. Garn said you are just having some three bedroom units, and Mr. Mitchell said right, trying to respond to what the market is asking for basically is what they are doing.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments and if there was a motion to classify this as a minor change. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Schaller to classify this as a minor change. There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Schaller, Mr. Benavides, Mr. Normand, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 5-0-0. Mr. Garn said this goes on to the trustees now for them to also determine the amendment. It was asked if Mr. Garn knew what date that would be, and Mr. Garn said no, he did not.

abc Toledo, LLC, of 9797 Fremont Pike would like an informal site plan review. This property is located in the overlay zone.

John DiSalle addressed the commission regarding this informal site plan review. He introduced the personnel with him this evening from abc that hopefully can answer any questions the commission might have. They appreciate the opportunity to discuss informally their site plan changes. The reason they are here primarily is a building expansion that they would like to undergo, and the good news is that business is good. He thinks in business there is probably always room for improvement, but their business is good, and they would like to add some more space to their site. They would like to add to their building and also improve their building. Basically what the new addition will do will consist of six auction lanes to run their cars through on sale days, which is Friday. They currently have six auction lanes, but they run in a different direction. This will allow the auction to run more efficiently. The primary complaint from their customers, the dealers that attend their sale is that the building is not configured correctly to run an auto auction. Primarily the auction lanes currently sit in an east/west direction. And when the doors open up and you run cars through pretty fast on a sale day, the wind out there in the field can be difficult, especially during the winter. This will change the direction of the cars running through and the doors opening so hopefully it will be more comfortable for their customers.

The building expansion, the existing building where the auction lanes are now will be reconfigured and largely turned into office space. They currently have a temporary sales trailer, and that will be eliminated, its need. If they can make this addition and then convert some of their current auction lane space and offices, they can negate the need for the trailer. The site plan, because it's their understanding to make changes to their site plan at this time they need to comply with the Route 20 overlay district, which originally it's his understanding that their site plan was grandfathered from the requirements of the overlay district. But to make any changes it's his understanding they need to comply with it, and they don't have any problem with complying. They can see some of the plantings that are going to be added along Route 20. There is also

some islands in the parking area that are going to be added that are going to be landscaped. He pointed to the larger islands, some new landscaping, some redone landscaping in front of the building.

Also the last time they discussed their site plan with this commission was in June of 2003 when they were going through some zoning changes to the rear of their property which they were later approved. It was requested when they discussed their site plan at that time that they draw in conceptually plans for an access road that runs parallel or somewhat parallel with Route 20, and he pointed to that. It reads possible future access drive right-of-way. The direction that they have received from Mr. Garn and from the commission is that should run the same distance back from Route 20 or thereabouts as the access road on the other side of Thompson Road. Their intention with this site plan is that it matches exactly with the access road on the other side of Thompson Road. They are okay with the idea of the access road. It's conceptual at this time. It's for illustrative purposes only. They don't necessarily want to be bound to it in the sense of the exact location in case circumstances change. They understand it's the township's position that an access road needs to go in this area at some point, but if the plans for the parcel that they are using, if their neighboring parcels change, they are hoping that there will be some sort of flexibility involved if it needs to move back or forward 25 feet or something like that. They don't want to necessarily be bound to putting it in now particularly when the parcel to the west of theirs is vacant, and the mobile home park to the east is reducing residents. His understanding is they are not replacing mobile homes as people move. Certainly at this point, because they don't feel that it needs to go in right now, they don't want to pay the entire cost of it.

So they are here to listen to any suggestions that the commission may have and answer any questions. It's their intention to submit an application and more detailed drawings for formal site plan review for next month's meeting.

Mr. Black asked if Mr. Garn had any comments. He has just a few comments. When he did look up the locations, the Arby's, McDonald's and so on, and that 250 feet is approximately the right distance back. There will probably be some problems because Market Center Drive is about 350 feet back because it jogs out. He is not sure it's 350, but there is a jog in there. That will probably be taken up with the property to the west of theirs that's for sale. He does have a call in to ODOT just to double check with them about frontage, some additional frontage from in front of the Lowe's and Kohl's and that whole area there. They took about 40 feet at one point. He does not know that they have any intentions of doing that in their area, but it would be nice to know if they have some intentions, and it would just maybe shift everything back some. Mr. DiSalle asked if ODOT was utilizing that space now, and Mr. Garn said it isn't that they are utilizing, but they took it. He can't say what their plans are, but they obviously are looking at long term traffic in the area. And they may be fine where they are, he would just like to have some idea as he's sure they would also. Mr. Black asked who was his

person to contact there, and Mr. Garn said he contacted Mike Stormer. Mr. Black thought that would be a good person to talk to. Mr. Garn said just to make sure.

Another concern he had, Wood County used to do their site plan review section for ponds and overflow areas, and they no longer do that. But in talking to the previous county engineer, he did approve the pond that was there, but he never came out and took a look at it when it was built to verify that it was to all the specifications. But as he remembers he did have a statement that the overflow, he thinks it was the overflow, but there was a pipe running out from the pond going out to the front of the property, and it was there from the previous owner, but it was a smaller sized pipe which evidently the pond could have been smaller if there was a bigger pipe going out. It's just something else that maybe should be looked at by the engineering firm that's working on that because there were some questions. And he knows they use large areas of their parking lot now also for water overflow, which isn't good for their asphalt. So it's something that you may take a look at.

Also he didn't know if it would help the zoning commission if there were some type of larger drawing that came along that would show the property all the way from Market Center Drive to the other light. It wouldn't have to be a big drawing, but so they could have an idea of the access road, and how it matches up with the other properties in the area. Mr. DiSalle asked which light he was referring to, in front of the mobile home park, and Mr. Garn said right, from that back to Thompson Road, and to know where the Market Center Drive came out. He said it may or may not, he does not know whether it would, but he thinks it might help the commission in envisioning that whole area. Mr. DiSalle asked if that was what he was referring to as the access road that's Market Center Drive, and Mr. Garn said yes. And actually that access road was put in before they had the overlay district. Mr. Black asked if any other commission members had any comments.

Mr. Black asked if the 60 foot, is that what the standard access road width would be. Mr. Garn said yes, it's a 60 foot wide. It's in their section where they talk about the access road. And Mr. Black said, and that's back to curb to back to curb, and Mr. Garn said correct, he believes so. The comment was made that would be a pretty good sized road, and Mr. Garn said it would be a road that would be built to county specifications. Mr. Black thinks if they are going to ask him to dedicate some width of access road, that we all agree early on what it is. First of all is 60 feet appropriate, and second, what does the 60 feet encompass. Mr. Garn said that's the right-of-way. The road itself is only probably going to be 24 feet wide. Mr. Black asked if Mr. Garn could explore that.

Mr. DiSalle said just as a point of clarification, it's not going to be dedicated now, correct, and Mr. Black said that is correct, but we are requesting that you preserve a 60 foot spot on your property. Mr. DiSalle said and by preserving he interprets that to mean for one thing easily not to erect a building, but we would still plan on going ahead

with their parking setup the way that it is along with some landscaped islands. And then when the point arrives that the access road goes in, their pavement would be torn out then, any landscape islands would be removed. Mr. Black said unless he wanted to decide now where it is at. Mr. DiSalle said you mean not put in a landscaped island or something like that where the road would be. The comment was made, adjust your parking. Mr. Black thought it would be cheaper to do it now than down the road, but that's up to you. Mr. Schaller said but down the road is a little theoretical right now. Mr. DiSalle said it's speculative. Mr. Black commented only to the extent they can decide where they want it right now and it's done. You can't force them to put it somewhere else later. So the item up for discussion tonight is do you want to just leave some arbitrary 60 foot width that will be decided later, or do you want to decide it when you do it. Because once it's decided, they can't make them change it. Obviously it has to be in an appropriate spot. So that's something for them to think about also. That's why they are having an informal discussion. Then you have determined where it's at within reason, and they can't come back and change that because they have approved the site plan. Mr. Garn said because in talking to one of the engineering firms, they said that when you finally decide, you are going to effect your neighbors on either side as to where they will have to place it eventually because the first one to do it is the one that's going to set precedent for everyone else. Mr. Black said that's no different than any other zoning issue or planning issue. Mr. DiSalle said the question that pops into his mind is if they finally decide and they pave it at least on their property and not put landscape islands and so forth, if they later make a change to their site plan, would the location of the access road be subject to change at that point. Mr. Black did not know. The comment was probably if the other people have not tied into it. I think it's kind of first one in dictates. Mr. Garn said right, where it's going to be. He personally felt they would put in everything that you would normally put in because it would be quite expensive. Mr. DiSalle said for the road, yes. Mr. Black said well, the one location on the easterly property line can only go so close for sure because that's where the traffic light is going to be, and you are going to need some stacking. So, you know, pretty much the minimum distance from the road that you can be on the east side. The west side is a little different because there is a lot more distance between there and Thompson Road. We know those are where the two ingress and egress will be, Thompson Road and that light, because there is a light at the trailer park as well as a light that goes directly across to the shopping area. So those two points are pretty much fixed. Mr. Garn said that was his reason for asking for a larger map, just so that everyone could get some idea that if you were putting it there, it would be a feasible location for them also. Mr. Black said it would be his opinion that if they physically put in the access road, that future site plans will not be affected as far as that location is concerned. Mr. DiSalle said outside plans, yes, that's his question. If they would later make an addition to their building, or move a fence or change something. Mr. Black said once you put your access road, he thinks they have approved that site plan for that location of that property. Mr. Schaller asked Mr. Black when he said put it in, does he mean physically put it in place. Mr. Black said, in fact, that eliminates it, it takes risks out of their hands because they don't have to worry

about where it's going to be in the future, or the cost it's going to be 10 or 5 years down the road. They have taken that cost. That would be his recommendation. Mr. DiSalle asked if he was speaking of actually putting curbs in on both sides of the road and paving it like any other road, and that might hinder their current use. That's part of their problem with that with traffic trying to cut across it. Mr. Black said they could put in the actual definition of where you want it. Mr. DiSalle said into their site plan. Because part of their thinking, at one time there was some discussion of a big box store going in on their property, and then selling and going on to the property to the west and possibly the mobile home park to the east. And there was some conceptual drawings at least that he saw, he does not know about the commission, of a road extending further back. He is not sure if something like that as the only access road. He gets the feeling that would not suffice as the only access road, but his position right now is to be as flexible as possible going forward just in case a plan like that pops up.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. He wondered if they answered enough of his questions, and he is not sure. Mr. DiSalle said as an additional item, and he wasn't sure if he was going to discuss this or not, but he will point out that the islands on the end of part of the parking in front of the building, and he pointed to it, there is a note at the bottom that indicates that those are not intended to be curbed, they are just striped. They are ovals at the end of those parking rows that are striped. He thinks, and he has heard in the past that there was some disagreement as to what those were. Mr. Black said a site plan a year and a half ago, and that was an issue. That is correct. Mr. DiSalle said they have tried to clarify that. Mr. Black said to Mr. DiSalle as he knows, there has been a laundry list of issues relating to the Toledo auction, and the township as well as township residents. And Mr. Garn will have to go through all those past issues and make sure they have been addressed properly, because these are the times that allow the township to make sure that past promises have been kept, not the least of which was dozens of bushes, and whether they are alive or dead. Mr. DiSalle said that's another issue. Mr. Black said it's only another issue as it relates to this issue, and it will be an issue that will be considered in the site plan review. Mr. DiSalle said they have 700, 750 trees on the west, the mound over there, and it's been difficult to keep them all alive. He is not sure exactly how that was decided. But they know that's there now, and they are trying to do their best. He does not know much about plantings, and landscaping, and things like that, but it's difficult to grow that many trees and keep them alive on a mound. And they have spent a lot of money. A question was asked are they irrigated, and the answer was yes.

Mr. Black said to Mr. Garn those are specific issues that he will share with them among others that were talked about. And whether the painted islands are appropriate or not, he can sit down with Mr. Garn and decide that. Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn about the pond he was talking about, was it the existing detention pond in the lower right hand corner, and Mr. Garn said yes. Mr. Black continued that storm water is an issue, and as he understands it, they are using some of their parking lot as a detention pond, and wondered if that was correct. Mr. DiSalle said he had to defer to others. He does not

know if that is the intention. He does not know if in practice that's actually what's happening.

One of his representatives volunteered that the county engineer has been out to visit the pond. The old county engineer, she does not know if he is any longer, but he had been out to visit the pond even after it was all finished. Mr. Garn agreed and said what he did, but he didn't do any topographical sightings, he just looked at it and said gee, that's a nice pond. He didn't do any measuring to make sure that the person when they dug dug it as large and as deep as they said they would. He approved a set of numbers and said yes, it will be the right size, but he physically didn't go out to have it engineered to make sure they did it the right size. She said he did, and Mr. Garn said he was told by him he didn't. The response then was actually when they were there last June, that was one of the things that was brought up. And they all met out there, and they did do all those things. Because it was an issue that the pond was deep enough, retaining water correctly, and distilling out correctly, and he did come out and do all those measurements. So she does not know how you find that out, and she will check into it. Mr. Garn said he knows the county engineer said he didn't do it because he can't send a county crew on to private property, so maybe DeBois had done some things.

Mr. Black said there was a site plan review, and the site plan review process is much more lengthy than it was when they were last here. They send this out to an outside consulting engineer that they pay for, and this will all have to be done. Mr. Garn said the new engineer will go over all of that. What he was trying to say was, and this is just from his memory, and presently it is showing a 12 inch line going from the pond out to the front, and for some reason his memory says it's not 12 inches, it's smaller than that, it's like an 8 inch line. And that if it were a 12 inch line, then the pond is plenty big enough. It's just there was a small line out there that should have been larger. It was undersized before their time. He thinks the pipe was put in before they brought the property. Mr. Black informed Mr. DiSalle that there is some concern that the parking area is a de facto detention area even though it's not shown as such on a site plan, and he thinks that's what needs to be determined. If, in fact, it's going to be used as a de facto detention pond, then it needs to be shown as such. And if it's appropriate, the engineers will say it is or isn't. But there is some flooding on there which makes it a detention pond. Mr. Garn said which for them is not good. Mr. DiSalle said for their asphalt, and Mr. Garn said yes. Now, it's their business and not the commission's. Mr. DiSalle asked Mr. Garn if there has been a change in the county engineer recently, and when did that take place, and Mr. Garn said January 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. DiSalle said Mr. Allion was the former engineer, and Mr. Black and Mr. Garn said Ray Huber is the current engineer. Mr. Garn said but they no longer do any engineering work for the township like they used to, and before their engineering work was normally just checking the calculations over. So it was partially their suggestion that they hire new independent engineering firms to do the reviews for them and do a more thorough review. Mr. DiSalle asked if the county engineer is involved in this site plan

approval process, and Mr. Garn said not anymore. Mr. DiSalle said just the outside engineer, and the response was correct, and Mr. DiSalle said which is just as good or better, he's sure. Mr. Garn said they have been very good for everybody involved. Mr. Black said it's worked out better for the township. Other things have slipped through the cracks that will hopefully not happen as a result of having a consulting engineer that ultimately the applicant pays for.

Mr. Black asked if anyone else had any comments, and then asked Mr. DiSalle if they expected to come back in March with a site plan, and Mr. DiSalle said that's their plan, yes. Mr. Black said so he should work closely with Mr. Garn on some of the past issues and make sure they have properly been documented. Mr. DiSalle said he thinks that a lot of the past issues were with the former ownership of the auto auction, and they have tried to run a good business and do what they are supposed to do, and cross the T's and dot the I's. And they hope they have done that, but that's their intention. They don't intend to take short cuts.

Mr. Black asked if Mr. Garn had anything else. Mr. Garn had one additional item, and that was just in talking with the trustees at the department head meeting, they indicated that they would like some input from the commission about picking and using one of the three engineering firms that they have been using for some time, to have one of them be the lead engineering firm. Mr. Black said so even though a firm would be a leading engineering firm, if they brought something in, there would still be a back-up, and they would then be excluded. Mr. Garn said right. Mr. Black wasn't sure they were qualified and wondered if they had any comments. Mr. Garn said the trustees did not as to the firms. He has a personal preference out of working with them. Mr. Black asked who that was, and Mr. Garn responded Feller Finch. They do the same thing for the City of Northwood, checking everything out. He did find out today, which he thought he wasn't going to pick them because he didn't know that Dave Kuhn who does this is also a traffic engineer. And his two primary things that he does is traffic engineering and storm water detention type issues. Poggemeyer, the person that does it he has been very satisfied with, but he is the only one doing it, and it's not something that he loves to do, but he does a very good job. All three firms have done very good jobs. Mannick and Smith does a very good job. They are probably the most proactive. They are real nitpickers, and their bills have been accordingly, about twice as much as the other firms. Maybe not twice, but close to it for the same work. Mr. Schaller commented out of a little bit of concern for their clients, if you will, what's the basis on which they charge, are their reimbursable rates pretty similar, and Mr. Garn said yes, the rates are very similar as to what they are charging for their engineering services on an hourly basis, it's just how much additional time they must put in. Mr. Schaller said efficient or not, and Mr. Garn said right. And it may be the size of the firm or how they try to approach what they are doing. Mr. Black said none of this would be permanent, it could change at any point in time, and Mr. Garn said that's right. Mr. Black made a motion to make a recommendation to the trustees that Feller Finch be their first line. Mr. Garn said and then the other two will just be back-up. Ms. Warnimont was the

second on the motion. Mr. Black asked if there was any further discussion. They just made a motion and second to pass that recommendation on to the trustees. It's just a recommendation. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Mr. Black, Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Benavides, Mr. Normand, and Mr. Schaller. Motion carried 5-0-0.

There was a further discussion from a commission member regarding why not take a proposal based upon a defined scope of work and see how that goes. He suspects you would see a dramatic decrease in fees. In fact, if there was an overall proposal that had limits, and Mr. Garn said as to how far they should go, and the response was right. Mr. Schaller said yeah, you just can't let the clock run. Mr. Garn said that's sort of what he has found, and he does not know that that's really what's taking place, but it seems that the one has done that. The other two have been very efficient and no fooling around, just yes or no, this is it, and moving on from there. Mr. Schaller deferred to Mr. Normand saying this is obviously his line of work a little bit. He would think that all three firms are technically competent to do what they are asking them to do, to go back to those firms and say hey, we want to narrow this down to one firm, give us a proposal on how you would handle this and on what basis, is that too open ended. Mr. Normand said it takes the work off of Mr. Garn to come up with a written proposal, request for qualifications. He thinks they have determined they are all qualified, and it's just a matter of choosing. You have three people who have done what appear to be very acceptable work, and Mr. Garn said all three, and Mr. Normand continued, you are kind of dumping the two off and then staying with the one, and he's sure if he was one of those firms, he would wonder why. Mr. Schaller agreed. Mr. Normand continued that it just seems a bit fairer. But that's the other issues of being able to come up with good requests. You know, what is it they are actually proposing. Mr. Schaller said he would hear the argument, why aren't we working with the good Wood County firms. Just simple things like that. How do you make it a little more objective as opposed to subjective. Mr. Normand said, but the trustees are going to make the decision. He thinks it's good that this group has said that Feller Finch has done a good job, and if we had to pick, we would pick them, and that's fine. But the trustees are the ones that tow a little bit more of the line in terms of being balanced and fair. Of course, they can do whatever they want. Mr. Garn said that's how this whole thing came about was because the one trustee was used to working with projects in Northwood, and he knew that Feller Finch was working and doing the same job where the other firms are not. He thinks Mannick and Smith are doing it for Tontogany. Mr. Black said, pass along our recommendation and also pass along Mr. Normand's comments at the department head meeting. Maybe they would rather go that way. Mr. Garn said at their meeting Monday he will find out one way or the other. He is truthfully not sure whether he is going to have the time to write something for them. It's nice in the interview process to figure out. He would say that they are all putting their licenses on the line, and everyone was making sure that they were looking out for the township's interests. Ms. Warnimont commented that Perrysburg is doing the same thing, they are going to do the interview process around the 1<sup>st</sup> of March to

go down to one, and that's what they are going to do. The commission members had some further discussions regarding this issue and the interview process.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. Mr. Benavides moved with a second by Ms. Warnimont to adjourn the meeting. All members were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant W. Garn,  
Recording Secretary