

Minutes of Regular Meeting September 17, 2025

4:00 p.m.: Robert Mack calls the meeting to order.

Roll Call: Mr. Britten, Mr. Schaller, Mr. Mack, Mr. Eckel, Ms. Welch

Okay, we did not have executive session at 3:30 because some of our team is addressing a brush fire up near Owens. So, we can begin with the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Mack asked of any changes or additions to agenda:

Chief Gazarek – modification to police

Mr. Eckel - Mr. Mack, obviously our fire chief isn't here, so we weren't able to meet our new part-time, potential part-time firefighter. So, there will be no special presentation and swearing in, we'll have to do that at our first meeting in October.

Mr. Britten moved for approval. Mr. Schaller seconded. All yes. Motion approved.

Approval of meeting minutes:

September 3, 2025: **Mr. Schaller moved for approval. Mr. Britten seconded. All yes. Motion approved.**

Special Presentation

None.

IT:

Resolution 2025-050: Authorize adding hours for vTECHio. The Township uses block time with a company called vTECHio for higher level IT services. This would add 25 hours to the current allocation of block time that we bought last year. Last year we bought 40 of them. We're just under 15 hours left. This gives us a resource that has a broad range of high-level IT skills. As the only IT employee, it gives me a resource to bounce options off them and solutions off them to ensure the viability within the township. And it also provides us with a resource that we can use in emergency situations. This money was budgeted for this. I'm requesting passage of Resolution 2025-050 in the amount of \$7,000 to buy an additional 25 hours of block time. **Mr. Schaller moved for approval. Mr. Britten seconded. All yes. Motion approved.**

Resolution 2025-051: Authorize purchasing DUO multifactor licenses. The second is the township uses a company called Duo. for their law enforcement multi-factor authentication. This is an approved method that ensures our compliance with local and regional law enforcement data systems. I'm requesting passage of resolution 2025-051 in the amount of \$939.60 to buy an additional 30 duo licenses for our police division. **Mr. Schaller moved for approval. Mr. Britten seconded. All yes. Motion approved.**

Maintenance:

Resolution 2025-020: Approve contract with Renewed Outdoors LLC, \$3666.66.

I have Resolution 2025-020 to approve the contract with Renewed Outdoors for \$3,666.66. That will be from solid waste, correct, Bob? Correct.

Mr. Britten: I'll make a motion for approval, and that's back down to the close to the price we started with.

Mr. Schaller: This is the only contract this year so far, or did we do one earlier?

Mr. Conner: We haven't done one earlier because that was about \$4,500, and when I talked to Andrew, they gave us the wrong price after they looked at what the township had taken in there.

Mr. Schaller seconded. All yes. Motion approved.

Mr. Mack: It's probably one of the services that we offer that I get more comments on. People think it's a great resource for us, and fortunately, they like it because people bring their waste to them.

Mr. Britten: Well, I think it's made your guys' job a little easier too because when you cycle through on the brush, they don't have it out. Now they have an option to take it down there.

Mr. Eckel: I'd like to recognize Marv for, he saw that we were being overcharged, noticed that They were billing us for a little bit more than we were taking, and I don't think that was anything on their part that they were trying to pull on the township. But Marv noticed that, went over and talked with Andrew, who was wonderful to work with. He's the owner of Renewed and got our bill reduced. And Marv, I appreciate your diligence in doing that.

Our road projects are winding up, they're almost done. Everything looks really good. That's all I have.

Mr. Mack: I think the roads came out fantastic.

Fire/EMS:

Mr. Eckel: I would like to present the last item for Chief Brice. I believe he sent you all a copy of the extended warranty options for the new ambulance, and I can tell you from experience that we do have trouble with those vehicles, and when we do, it's not cheap. I'm sure Marv will back me on that. Tom would like to put a protection plan on the new vehicle, and that would run for six years, 200,000 miles, and the would the total cost on that was \$9000 and I would certainly endorse that. So, I would ask the trustees for a motion to approve that.

Mr. Britten: Are there mileage limits on that, John?

Mr. Eckel: It goes up to 200,000 miles, 8,000 hours, 200,000 miles, six years.

Mr. Conner: I looked it over with Chief Brice and it's well worth it.

Mr. Britten moved for approval. Mr. Schaller seconded. All yes. Motion approved.

Police:

Resolution 2025-049: Renewal Lexipol subscription, \$8965.22. I am asking for approval of Resolution 2025-049, which is our annual subscription and renewal contract with Lexipol, which is our policy and procedure manual. It sends out automatic daily training bulletins to the officers who must click on those, read the bulletins, read the changes that we may have, or just keep them up to date with the policy procedure that we do already have in place for \$8,965.22. **Mr. Schaller moved for approval. Mr. Britten seconded. All yes. Motion approved.**

The additional thing that I would like to add is a request for permission to continue our contract with P&R Communications for the radio maintenance. This is a yearly contract that we've had with them in the past, and we already have an open subscription PO for that. It's \$6,188, which is due at the end of this month. The current contract is up at the end of next month. Just asking for permission to enter into the same contract that we've had with them in the past. It's for the updates of the portable radios, our mobile radios, any updates that must occur with those. They come out and take care of it and also our console.

Mr. Britten: Is that price the same as last year? Chief Gazarek: I think it's gone up a bit. I don't know exactly how much without looking at the previous year, but with everything else rising costs, it's gone up a few 100 bucks from what I can remember from last year. **Mr. Britten moved for approval. Mr. Schaller seconded. All yes. Motion approved.**

Recreation & Recycling:

At the next meeting I will have the final thing for the grant. I am waiting for one more bid to come in for the playground. On the Renewed, I was out there Saturday and there was a complete line of just people coming in, and I did see four from our township out there, and they did really enjoy using that facility because they can come like Saturday morning, just like you said, Gary, that the brush and leaves, if they miss them, they can haul them out there. So, it's a win-win for the city and a win-win for the township because the city uses the same program as we use.

Mr. Schaller: Do we have a schedule for brush pickup?

Mr. Conner: It starts Monday, north of 795.

Mr. Eckel: It was on the billboard on 20.

Mr. Britten: Do you have any idea on leaves? I know it's jumping ahead of time, but I had a gentleman ask me that yesterday.

Mr. Conner: It's going to be sooner than Fall.

Mr. Britten: Because they started to fall because of the drying, that's why he asked me.

Mr. Conner: Normally, it was a couple weeks after we finished brush.

Zoning:

We do have another zoning application that came in from Greg Feller on behalf of DWS Property Acquisitions. It's for a rezone of 1 parcel from A1 to R5, multiple family, residential district. This amendment would allow for a planned expansion of the Brookfield Place development. We're looking at, well, we'll get, that will be at a site plan review later, but this is on the west side of Simmons Road, directly north of the existing Brookfield Place development. At this time, we're just setting another public hearing for the Board of Trustees. We could do it on October 15 if that works for the board. and then I can advertise.

Mr. Britten motioned to set it for October 15th at 5 p.m. Mr. Schaller seconded. All yes. Motion approved.

Mr. Mack: Do you have any commentary from Wood County on that? Ms. Moore: The county has recommended approval on that one and the zoning commission also recommended approval.

Administrator:

I'm sure many of you noticed they started the new Redwood subdivision at the northwest corner of the city at 795. The entrance is kind of in the wrong spot, so they got to move down a little north, but nonetheless, they've started, so we look forward to that. We hope that we break ground on our new building before the end of the month. There was a little snafu with the right away as it's submitted to the county engineer, and that's getting corrected and we're hoping for good things to come very soon. Other than that, we continue to work with the surrounding communities on various things, and we will do some reports for trustees when there's progress.

Fiscal Officer:

Resolution 2025-047: This is for establishing the tax rate. So, it's a resolution accepting the amounts and ranges determined by the budget commission for necessary tax levies and certifying them to the county auditor. **Mr. Britten motioned for approval. Mr. Schaller seconded. All yes. Motion approved.**

Resolution 2025-048. It's for establishing the assessments for lightings for the neighborhoods. So, it's resolution to authorize assessment to cost collection for 2026. That collection in total is about \$95,000.

Mr. Schaller motioned for approval. Mr. Britten seconded. All yes. Motion approved.

Trustees:

Mr. Britten: A couple of weeks ago we discussed my current board spot on Fort Meigs Cemetery. I asked one of you guys to think about swapping with me. Just looking for comments on that, where you stand.

Mr. Mack: We had a regularly scheduled new Belleville Ridge Cemetery board meeting this past week, and I'm currently the chair, and we've gone through some transition there, and we feel like we really have things working out a lot better with our sexton, Jay Screwett, and I guess I was duly elected there for a current term that's not up, and I'm comfortable there.

Mr. Britten: Joe, what's your thoughts?

Mr. Schaller: Basically, the same here. We've put a lot into that, a lot of effort, and I'm sure everybody has at Fort Meigs as well, but things are going pretty good right there right now. A few minor glitches. From what I understand, Fort Meigs meets on Thursdays, and that really doesn't fit into my schedule.

Mr. Britten: Okay, well, I'm going to bring this forward. The reason you two gentlemen decided to put Lloyd Swanson on the city board was his speech. 32 years of public service, and he's through that cemetery all the time. Mr. Mack, do you have any family at New Belleville Ridge?

Mr. Mack: I do not.

Mr. Britte: Joe, do you have any?

Mr. Schaller: Family at New Belleville Ridge? Yes.

Mr. Britten: Okay. Well, I've got 50 years of public service. My wife is buried at New Belleville Ridge. So I'm constantly out there. So apparently, in you two gentlemen's scenario things, that makes me a perfect candidate for the New Belleville Ridge Cemetery. So, terms mean nothing. I'm in the middle of a term, too. As long as we have a representative, two on that board and one on Fort Meigs, it doesn't matter who it is. Now you guys have made the decision that you thought it needed to be this way. So, my comment to you before is you seem to know better than what more than what Tim and I did so one of you needs to be on the seat on the board. I know Tim is gone so they canceled the meeting for tomorrow, but I'm calling for Jon to get a joint meeting scheduled with the City of Perrysburg for another cemetery joint meeting

and get this resolved. So, you guys have got whatever between now and then to figure out which one of you is going to sit on that board and I'm going to tell you, you can sit there and give me all kinds of speeches about things going on out there. You probably spend 45 minutes a month at New Belleville Ridge. Fort Meigs has been a hands-on thing out there. So, is it because you're so tied into New Belleville Ridge or you don't want to put the time in? You know, I have 20 years on this board and it's time, maybe we do a little trading around. That's all I'm asking. Gosh, it isn't like I'm burning your house down. I mean, we have an obligation to have one on Fort Meigs and two on New Belleville Ridge. It doesn't matter which one of us sits where and if you think by delaying this, it's going to go away, it's not. It sounds like you have just a little bit more time. I'm still obligated because we have to have a board member on that board. So, Jon, I ask that you reach out to the city and figure out when they would like to have one. I know Tim's gone; he's out of town until tomorrow night.

Mr. Eckel: I'll do that Friday

Mr. Schaller: The stone quarry has an open house at Cardinal Aggregate on Route 20 this Saturday. It starts at like 11 o'clock in the morning. They also have a 5K run there and they're going to be presenting a check to our safety services, police, fire, and maintenance to the tune of, they wanted to, they've got a 5K run and through that they collected monies and they were hoping to donate \$15,000, and as of today, they were at \$17,000. So, they exceeded their expectations. So that'll be good.

Chief Gazarek: Phil's done a great job with that. We've got a couple officers running in it, and then they'll be out there, all our officers that are working that day will be down there helping where they can, but it sounds like they've got over 80 participants for the race itself. Pretty good turnout so far.

Mr. Schaller: Yeah, they'll demonstrate a blast where they make a shot and blow the rock out of the wall and that kind of stuff. If you've never seen it, it's something different, but it's something Phil's been wanting to do for quite a while, just to, they try to be good neighbors and put their best foot forward. It's pretty nice when we do this.

Mr. Mack: My observation is they're a great neighbor.

Public Comments:

Mr. Warnimont: Open House. October 11th.

Yes. Like John said, there's a big billboard sign up on 20. It's 11 to 2. It's going to be things for kids to do. There are demonstrations and a lot of vendors will be out here. So, it'll be a good way to meet a lot of the township people.

Mr. Eckel: Should have a banner going up in downtown Perrysburg next week.

Mr. Warnimont: The big race is this weekend, right? Yes.

Chief Gazarek: Garmin Race is coming through as well, yeah. River Road will be restricted from 7 to 11, I believe that's Sunday. River Road all through from Rossford all the way down through to the city. So, it'll be restricted. We'll have it down to one lane through the township and then kind of shift traffic, but we'll have plenty of officers out there handling the traffic along with Rossford and Perrysburg City Police Officers.

Mr. Schaller: Where does it go from there?

Chief Gazarek: I don't know. Lieutenant Molter's been handling most of the traffic route, but the main impact for us is all the way through River Road, all the way out of Rossford, but I'm not exactly sure where it goes to from there.

You want to go through Maumee.

Mr. Mack – we will have a quick recess until 5pm.

5:00pm – PUBLIC HEARING ZLA2025-01(YANT)

Mr. Mack: Good afternoon. We've been on informal recess as we concluded our business in our regular meeting. And we are now here to discuss a zoning change. And I'm going to turn the floor over to Kelly, our zoning administrator, to take over the hearing.

Ms. Moore: All right, thank you. At this time, I'll now open the public public hearing on ZLA 2025-01, a request to change zoning from A1 agricultural and R3 suburban residential to R5 multiple family residential on 2 parcels of land located on the east side of Oregon Road, west of Lime City Road, and south of Lakemont Subdivision in Perrysburg Township. At this time, I would ask all persons who wish to give testimony regarding this matter to stand and raise your right hand. Okay. Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you give before this board will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? At this time, I would ask the applicant to step forward to the podium stating your name and address.

Good afternoon. My name is Robert Thatcher. My wife, Peggy Thatcher, who is the owner of the properties, along with four other people that are heirs to the properties, or three other ships. I appreciate it, and thank you all this afternoon, gentlemen, for allowing us here and ladies. And we'd like to give a short summary, I guess, of how we look at this. My wife, Peggy Ann Thatcher, is heir to the properties for which we are requesting the rezoning. This property was owned by Henry L. Schwartz, a longtime resident of Perrysburg Township, and Henry had purchased this property from his grandparents. So the property has been in the wife's family for over 100 years. Henry died in 1962, and Peggy, along with five other people, were family members who inherited the properties. There are currently 4 heirs of the property still living. One lives in Philadelphia, one lives in Defiance, Ohio, one lives in Napoleon, Ohio, and Peggy and I live in Georgia. None of these heirs live near the property and none have an interest in farming it. Therefore, our interest is in making the properties marketable for its highest and best land use. In the hope of eventually selling it, under the requirements of amending the township zoning resolution, we first had the meeting with the Wood County Planning Commission. The staff report to the commission said that our request was in line with the county's future land use plan. They did mention the floodplain concern but felt that it could be mitigated during the construction phase. The staff recommended, recommendation was to approve, which they did pass. The next step was the Perrysburg Township Zoning Commission. The staff analysis for that committee was that properties are designated as R5, high density, by the future land use plan. And the staff recommendation was for approval. At the meeting, however, there were several residents in attendance that were against the resolution. There were people that objected to the possible loss of privacy if a high-rise apartment building was built right near their property in the subdivision on the north side. A couple of people argued about more traffic that would be created and the person talked about; a person talked about runoff control of the runoff water. And the meeting ended with the commission denying the request. The reason for their denial, as I found out today, was because of inappropriate density. So, whatever that means, I'm not sure, I got my ideas so there are ways to mitigate these concerns when and if they arise, but at the present, there is no interest, to our knowledge, in developing the properties. There was one potential buyer at one time, but his interest was keeping it off the market. So, he had control of it, and he never did anything about moving forward. So, we really believe that rezoning is the proper thing to do, especially because our request is in line with the future plan, the future land use plan for both the township and the county. The property to the north is an existing subdivision, zoned PUDR, PUDR. The property to the south is zoned PUDR and R5, and the residential lands to the west are zoned R3. R2 parcels of land are the only two parcels did not zone this way. Zoning them as such would complete the area plan for that specific area. And they're sort of landlocked in between all these other zoning properties. It seems to us what the best resolution is to complete the plan or modify our request in a way to be acceptable to all parties involved. And we realize that that's a possibility. That could be different. So, with that, that's our... Does anybody have any questions of us? Thank you. Thank you.

Ms. Moore: Okay, are there other persons who wish to speak in favor of the application? So, if you could step to the podium and state your name and address. Okay, hearing none, are there persons who wish to speak in opposition to the application? Please step to the podium and state your name and address.

My name is Melody Stiff, and I live at 7205 Winding Brook Road in Perrysburg in the Lakemont Subdivision. I think after hearing the Swartz's plea, the main thing that stuck out to me is the fact that what they indicated is that none of the heirs live in this area. None of the heirs will be around to see the consequences of these actions. We have 11 apartment buildings within a two-mile radius of our subdivision. That doesn't even include the townhouses that are for rent on Ayers Road, as well as some back in that area as well. We moved, personally, to Perrysburg Township because we liked the atmosphere. We liked the fact that you're close to everything, but you still have that space. You have that

country feeling that and I just foresee this as changing that entire portion of Perrysburg Township. I mean, everybody here, I think we all agree, we like our township. It's quiet, it's peaceful. You can't deny that there will be increased traffic. There are already people from the Perry's Crossing, I believe it is over there, off of Tracy Road, that cut through our subdivision. We have many single-family dwellings with lots of young kids in there that would just increase the traffic for our neighborhood, make it more difficult for us, let alone the fact that the Dry Creek, if you do that, our house just got released from a flood zone A right before we bought it, a couple years before we bought it. If that comes back, what's to say that that's not going to harm our property values as well because we all know who wants to buy a house that you have to pay an additional \$1,000 or \$2,000 a month for flood insurance. We specifically bought this house because it had been taken out of flood zone A. This threatens that right now. So, you're looking at giving all these poor people in this subdivision additional costs, additional hardships because of these people that just, you know, honestly just would like to make the money and leave the area. They're not really giving anything back to our area. If anything, they're taking away from the charm and hominess of our area. And so that's why I would really respectfully ask that you vote no. I appreciate you letting me up here to talk. I have been an insurance underwriter, writing property and casualty for public entities in the state of Ohio for the last 25 years. So I'm kind of familiar with zoning regulations. And so also I just want to let everyone know that if they do indeed vote yes, we still have another remedy. If we get enough names on the petition within 30 days, we can put it on a vote for the general election. That's per ORC 519.12H. Thank you.

Mr. Mack: Everybody's invited to speak, but I also wanted to read an e-mail that we received at the township, which makes it a matter of public record. And so, I'm just going to read it. It's from Alexis Stupendak. I hope I pronounced that right. Her address is 7321 Twin Lakes Road. It was nicely composed, and I would like to incorporate it into the record. Dear Zoning Administrator, unfortunately I'm unable to attend zoning meeting due to work commitments. I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposal to rezone the two parcels of land currently zoned A1 agricultural and R3 suburban residential to R5 multi-family residential. Our community already faces congestion and safety concerns. Both Oregon Road and Tracy Road are single-lane roads that currently struggle to handle existing traffic from nearby neighborhoods, multi-family dwellings, and condos slash townhomes. Adding a high-density residential development would dramatically increase traffic volume, heightening the risk of accidents and making it especially dangerous for children who walk, bike, or play near these roads. In addition to traffic concerns, multi-family developments tend to bring transient populations which can affect neighborhood cohesion, property values, and overall safety. Our current suburban neighborhoods are close-knit communities where families have built long-term homes. Introducing a high-density transient population immediately adjacent to these areas could disrupt the character and stability of the neighborhood and increase demands on local services such as schools, police, fire, and EMS, which are already strained. Rezoning this land away from agricultural and suburban residential use would erode the rural character of our area, setting the precedent for future high-density developments and further reducing green space. The environmental impacts such as stormwater runoff, loss of natural habitat, an additional strain on infrastructure like sewage and water systems must also be considered carefully before making such a drastic change. For these reasons, I strongly urge you to deny the zoning request and preserve the current zoning that supports safety, stability, and the quality of life for residents in this community. Thank you for your time and consideration of the long-term impact this proposal would have on our neighborhood. Sincerely, Alexis Stupendak. And was that our only letter? Others are welcome to speak.

My name's Christina Oliver. I live at 73, sorry, 7432 West Lake Road. I am the secretary of the HOA as well. Last time when we were here, they mentioned if we didn't like it, we could put a fence up. Our HOA does not approve that would bring our HOA dues up if we decided that we want to do it. We would have to go to an attorney at this point. We've already looked into it, looked at our laws. We're not allowed to. We talked to an attorney. It would cost us \$15,000 to \$20,000 to have it rewritten so we could actually put that fence on that side. I don't feel that that's fair to our HOA, like our properties here, to ask us to have to pay extra HOA dues in order to put a fence up to block that. Also, I moved from Vancouver, Washington. I looked at the house that were in. It appealed to us because there was not a bunch of apartments around us. Besides, across the way, we had to build. It's safety for our children to be able to play. The extra traffic

would be terrible. Right now, we have a train track that we have to sit sometimes to even get across 1/2 hour to go around the other side. It just brings more traffic because everybody's going around in a circle to get into it. Having people going through our housing too, we don't know who they are. We have littles, a ton of little kids in our area. The garbage it brings in and why should we suffer because of this? That's all about it. Thanks. Thank you.

Hello, my name is Yvonne Simmons. I live at 7151 Twin Lakes Road. The biggest concern that I had is the safety. We have a very good neighborhood, lots of children. All of a sudden, we have lots of children in this neighborhood. And I had to just the other day stop the Amazon guy because he was flying through our neighborhood. And my husband yelled at him and said, hey guys, slow down there's kids in this neighborhood. These people are not looking, and I've watched this since I've been retired. I have watched this neighborhood grow and I also have watched the amount of children that we have and the amount of traffic that we have since they made the lane on Oregon Road into two lanes, and at that point in time, and the young lady just spoke about how the train, when the train come, I could leave and work, and I lived, I worked at right by the Arby's, and I would have to get up there. I could tell you at 635, when I would get off, we would sit, and we would sit. I would be tired, so I wound up sitting there, but there has been times that I had to go all the way around the neighborhood and about through the neighborhood to get into the neighborhood and that's another 35 minutes away and everything, but it's the safety. That's what we're concerned about most of all, is the safety of our children that are in this neighborhood. And Like I said, I've watched this neighborhood grow. I've been in this neighborhood for over 18 years now, and I tell you that this is the worst that I have seen it as far as traffic flying through our neighborhood. Thank you.

My name is Cindy Chaney. I'm at 7279 Twin Lakes Road. I just want to piggyback off of what everybody said and just clarify a little bit more. There are the flooding concerns, the privacy, the noise, and the traffic, but on top of that, piggyback off of what she said, even if we were allowed the fences, that's not going to help a high rise from looking right down into my house. So that's a concern as well, and on top of that, with all this additional, you're looking at more people, which means more crime and the more that people come through our area, the worse it's going to get so I feel like it's a safe area right now, and we want to keep it that way. So, thank you.

Hi, my name is Susie Kunkel and I live at 7361 Twin Lakes Road. My house ends at the farmer's field. My backyard butts to the farmer's field, and while I appreciate that you really need to sell the property, I don't want an apartment in my backyard. You know, there's all the reasons that everybody else said that you don't need to have them reiterated, but I have a nice backyard, and I'd like to sit out there and I don't want people looking down on me while I'm in there. Thank you. Thank you.

Kristen Farrell, 7391 Twin Lakes Road. I also live right up to the farm field. So, privacy is a huge issue. The traffic is an issue, and safety is also an issue because in certain parts of the subdivision, there are no sidewalks. So, the kids are not able to play on the sidewalk, they are literally riding their bikes in the middle of the street. So that is a very big concern for safety as well. Thank you.

Hi, my name is Ian DeWalt. I live on 2364 Brookview Court. Our house butts up right to the property line. Most of what I have to say has already been kind of like brought up and everything, but just the more people who say stuff, the better. Some of the biggest concerns that there are is the increased traffic. There's already really bad congestion as it is. I've got little kids. It's already really allowed in my backyard. Like previously stated, we're not allowed to have privacy fences in our yard due to HOA laws. And like I said, it would be like 20 grand for us to put it in if our HOA doesn't take care of it. And even if we do pass a law, we'll have to probably put it in ourselves. Like, I don't have 20 grand to go and block Tracy Road and these new apartments, let alone have to have one high enough to block for some privacy of a high-rise apartment building. Another concern is the strain on public infrastructure and the services of schools already that we have. It's already a congested area. That's just going to bring lots of more family, more

children into our area, which is already a concern for safety for kids in our area. The impact on property values. I bought my house primarily because it does back up into a farmland and I have perfect view across the other side of Tracy Road, so I'm basically engulfed in farmland. And so having more apartments for everyone's sake is going to lower our property value significantly. And then the destruction of our neighborhood characteristics, as already stated, like we have a really nice, quiet neighborhood. We all talk to each other on Facebook. paid for our community to let everyone know what's going on, the concerns that people may have. As also brought up, the environmental concerns, just having to deal with more water coming through, more sewage coming through, and we're not really prepared for that as it is, let alone to have a high-rise, dense apartment complex coming in. As stated, the safety and security of our families, it's just like that's going to bring so many more people through. It's going to bring a lot more potential for crime in our area with all these apartments and the lack of community engagement. Many of the residents feel that this project has moved forward without proper notice into our community input. I think it was kind of unfair to have this at 5 o'clock. I know it not that it really matters, but how were we supposed to be able to get here when we all have full-time jobs trying to provide for our families? And so trying to get here was a stretch for me. I had to go get a child's care, so I didn't have my children running through here. So just take all this into consideration while reconsidering the zoning for this.

Hi, I'm Patrick Hohn. I live at 28820 Stargate in the Starbright subdivision. Some people have mentioned the flooding issue, and that would be one of my concerns. There's the new 200,000 square foot warehouse that's going in on Oregon Road. There's been a lot of development, a lot of other housing that's going in there so we're losing those open fields that can collect rainwater, subdivision has already had several instances of flooding over the years. My concern would be taking away that storm water, those fields, and increasing the demand of focusing that water into a smaller area. My fear is that that could affect our neighborhood again. The other issue that, on top of what other people have said, the warehouse and other housing that's going in, The traffic on just Oregon Road, I know through the neighborhood's probably gonna be an issue, but on Oregon Road, it's already down one lane in each direction. There are already people using the turning lane as passing lane. I think it would just get more dangerous, and I would hate to see that change back to four lanes because I do use the bicycle lane. I see a lot of people using the bicycle lane, riding bikes or running or walking on a regular basis, I would hate to return that to four lanes and lose that. The other concern would be losing the 55 mile an hour speed limit. If that gets overly populated in that area, then we're going to go down to 35 mile an hour. Just a personal thing, I guess. And I think everything else I had on here, everybody else had already mentioned. All right, thank you.

Ms. Moore: Would the applicant like an opportunity to address the board at all at this time? Do you want another opportunity to approach?

Yeah, if I could. Again, my name's Robert Thatcher and I understand, and I hear all your complaints and your concerns and every one of them, I'm sure, is important. The thing being, back when my uncle or Peggy's uncle bought that property, your subdivision didn't exist. It wasn't there but because places grow and change, they allowed a housing development to be built and probably before we even had zoning. You know, there's a lot of places didn't have zoning plans and that back in the 60s when I was a kid. But anyhow, there are mitigations that can be taken and you talk about the people driving through your subdivision. Examples like I live in a subdivision in Georgia. Nice subdivision. We have people that speed, but if you have a main thoroughfare that people are using and running right through, put some big speed bumps in it and they'll quit doing it. I mean, that's a minimal cost to you as the people that live there. There are other things we can do, but we're even willing to say, well, why do we need R5? I'm not saying we need R5. But I'm saying, you know, the country's going to continue to grow, it's going to continue to change, and you're going to have to live with some change. And we all do. I mean, where we live, it's a very progressive area that we're growing by leaps and bounds. But our county is doing a lot of things for infrastructure to take care of those problems. You know, maybe that's what you need to do is talk to people about highways. Why don't you make Oregon Road a four lane or a five-lane street? Every street we put in, if it's a four, it's either four lane with a center turn lane and with sidewalks on both sides. I mean, it costs us money, but we do it. And I'm just saying there are mitigations to a lot of these issues other than just saying, no, you can't have more people. And if density was the issue, they certainly didn't tell me about that when I went to the meeting where they refused it because of density issues. But that

never was mentioned once in the meeting other than complaints from people of having high-rise apartments. And if they did leave it R5 like they wanted, or R3, you can go in and ask for a concession to put in high-rise in that same area. According to your planning, I've gone through it all, it says that on R3, you can ask for different things like high-rise and high density and it can be passed. And you can put those on the south side of that property, which is away from your subdivision and put smaller, lower type housing on the other side. Not saying that they're not all good arguments, I'm just saying if you want to live and tell people, no, you can't expand and improve your property because I don't want people around me I want to live in the old country, which I can remember when I lived in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as far as born and raised, and I lived out in the country, and you drive through where I used to live, and it's just like a big city almost now. And that's in 60 years it happens. It's going to happen, it's just a matter of preparing for it, and I think living with what happens. We've got a lot of things that we'd like to do, but sometimes we can't do them because our HOA doesn't allow it either. So, we have to make that decision. Do you stay or do you go? So, we're living with that. And I'd like to remind, I guess, the trustees that we're willing to modify if that's what will resolve some of this issue. We don't, we're not standing here saying we've got to have our time. That's not our point of view. Just a lot of things I think other than just saying, okay, you can't have what you want on your land because we don't want that in our area. We need to look at what we all can do to get along and live, get the job done. Got anything?

Ms. Moore: I am now going to close the testimony and open deliberations of the board.

Mr. Britten: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'd like to go ahead. First of all, I'm going to give everybody a little history. I worked in the maintenance department across the street before I became a trustee in the beginning of 2006. And after I became a trustee, I got solicited by the Wood County Engineer to take the road superintendent's job. Oregon Road and Tracy Road are both counties. We have no say. When I was at the county when the diet is what they called it, of Oregon Road, was reduced from four lanes to two lanes. I argued as well as some of the other people in the office argued with the engineer about that, but he had so many complaints and these people here who live over there know how bad that Oregon Road was because there was joints from here to that wall. And we tried to fix some, didn't do any good, took a mill out, didn't do any good. Well, he got like an 80-20 grant to redo that road, but he had to reduce it to a lane each way with a bike path. And the county engineer at the time hated bikes on the road. But he was so tired of getting complaints about that road, he reduced, he went and accepted the money and they reduced it. So they didn't change, cut any of the pavement away, the only thing they'd do was mark it. If someday, 20 years down the road, they want to take that back to four lanes, they can. Probably not going to happen. As far as speed bumps, I sat in a snowplow truck for 45 years, and a speed bump will not work. A lot of people would like to have them like through their subdivisions and stuff, they just don't work. Now I want to address the water issues. Wright Creek, which runs between their subdivision and where your field is, is under county ditch maintenance. And both at the township level when I was here and when I went to the county, because the county's the one that manages the ditch level maintenance, my phone rang constantly about that ditch. because I've been in those people's backyards where they were flooded. The county finally did do some cleaning and that helped. But we also haven't had the rain like we've had. So that is a legitimate concern. And putting more storm water into that ditch to me isn't something and they say yeah we regulate it with a pond and you know it's only the same as the farm I'm sorry that an engineer can tell you that but it doesn't happen that's my biggest concern is the stormwater issue so I guess that's all I got right now for Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Schaller: Yeah Mr. Chairman I think I think a good resolve here would not be R5, but possibly R3. It would allow these people to do with their property better than leaving it agriculture, but not creating high-rise apartments, which would be a burden on all of you. I think that with the water retention and different things, which is updated more so than, it's more of a concern now than when Lakemont subdivision was built. That was almost unheard of back then, you know, having the water retention and stuff. I also worked in the maintenance department. I've lived here almost 67 years. I'm A lifelong resident of Perrysburg Township. And I want to mention, when you people moved in and your subdivision was built, we had the same concerns. We didn't want more people. We didn't want more traffic. So it all kind of goes hand in hand. Not saying we owe you one, but I'm thinking if we went with an R3, it would be a good compromise.

People could build houses there and it wouldn't necessarily be something real tall. But I would be a proponent of that way.

Mr. Mack: Thank you. I can appreciate the landowners wanting to monetize or exit strategy for a property that really don't have family interest around here and stuff like that, but at the same time. I believe that, what they're asking for with R5 is just a little over ambitious or overzealous. And if they and Kelly, I was asking her the last time we rezoned for some multifamily on Oregon Rd. I went on the record to say, this is no slam dunk, and I'm pretty sure the next time around we need to have some degree of restraint, which is how much density we can put in this corridor. And so I'd like to kind of live by my word from, was it 12 months ago maybe, or I can't remember, and suggest that this is probably just too ambitious of a density level and quite frankly, if we could see something commensurate with what's already there with the Twin Lakes subdivision, that I would think there would be demand for that. People would want to have houses in that area. It's a great area. It's close to a lot of employment opportunities. And you could create a greater sense of community on that side of our township like we have on the west side of I-75 where we're getting some bike paths and some of the subdivisions, different plans connect and there's a real sense of community. It seems like you folks, I was unaware that your homeowner's association was so active and maybe you should be looking at ways that somebody else could come in with aspirations of developing that property commensurately with the way yours is. And I love the water features. So that's probably my opinion.

Mr. Britten: Kelly, can you explain for everybody what can be built on R3 and what can be built on R5.

Ms. Moore: So under R3, I'm just going to give you single, 2, and multi-family. Under the R3, Multifamily is not permitted, single is, single family is permitted, and two family would be conditionally permitted under the R5. Multifamily is permitted, single and two family are conditional uses.

Mr. Mack: But the other thing to keep in mind, the density level, assuming that, and I know part of this is floodplain, so excuse my math, but if you develop the entire 48 acres, I think you could almost squeeze 696 living units on this part, on these two parcels. Is that correct?

Ms. Moore: Based on every, an R5 would require 3,000 square feet per family.

Mr. Mack: Okay, well, 3,000 square feet divided by that amount of acreage is 696.7 units. And I think, like I said before, I think that's pretty heavy in my mind. Any further conversation or comments? Is there a motion?

Mr. Schaller: I would make a motion to approve it at R3 suburban residential district.

Ms. Moore: So you would be for the entire property.

Mr. Mack: They're asking for a lot.

Ms. Moore: The zoning commission has recommended to deny, so you can either adopt their recommendation to deny it, or you can move to reject the recommendation and grant a different zoning, or you can move to modify the, you can adopt the recommendation to deny. Excuse me. You can reject their recommendation and grant the zoning change as requested, or you could move to modify, as Joe is modifying the recommendation.

Mr. Mack: If we adopted to deny, we can do so, suggesting to the property owners to go back to the drawing board and maybe listen to the concerns of the HOA and try and have some buffering. and then come back to the zoning commission through the process again and present a plan that would have a greater likelihood of happy ending for the majority of the people.

Ms. Moore: It would be an option.

Mr. Britten: Joe, are you standing with your motion or do you want to withdraw?

Mr. Schaller: I'll withdraw my motion..

Mr. Britten: I'll make a motion to deny the request as presented.

Mr. Schaller: I'll second that.

Mr. Britton, yes. Mr. Schaller, yes. Mr. Mack, yes.

Mr. Mack: I would encourage the property owners to perhaps consult with an engineer or a planning group from the area, we are going through a comprehensive plan at our township at this time, which makes it opportune to bring your plans or aspirations, perhaps to one of their consultants or somebody, and perhaps revisit this in a different format.

Ms. Thatcher: We don't know who's going to buy this. We don't have the land.

Ms. Thatcher: We just have to develop it.

Mr. Britten: No, but when you sell it to somebody and the zoning goes with the property. So if we give an R5.

Ms. Thatcher: We're not, we would agree to the R3. I'm telling you that right today. We're not, we're not so hard nosed. We understand their concerns. We really do. We live in a subdivision. I lived in Defiance for years and years and years in a subdivision. I understand that. But for us to say we've got a plan, we can't have a plan because we're not going to develop it. I don't understand that far.

Mr. Mack: Kelly, there would be people that they could be referred to try to give them advice on what fits in our plan, right.

Ms. Moore: Yeah, I mean, there's a list of consultants and engineers. The county engineer has a entire list of them as well.

Mr. Mack: So I guess what we're saying is, yes, we denied it, but we're suggesting that you maybe go back to the drawing board with a more less ambitious density, and perhaps it would be more favorable to the commissions and the board of trustees, and it's important that the neighbors, you know, that their voice is heard.

Ms. Thatcher: So, you're saying you don't like R3 either?

Mr. Mack: I did not say that.

Ms. Thatcher: No. What are you saying?

Mr. Mack: I'm saying that we don't, that we deny what you applied for.

Ms. Thatcher: Right. We understand that. But at the same time, you as trustees can amend it. That's my understanding. Is that right, Kelly?

Ms. Moore: They have the ability to modify.

Unknown: But they've already voted to deny. So, what they're saying is you just need to reapply with your new plan and have another hearing. That's all they're saying.

Ms. Thatcher: Do you realize how many times I've come up here?

Unknown: Well, unfortunately, that's not my problem.

Ms. Thatcher: I know you don't care.

Unknown: I didn't say I didn't care.

Unknown: I said it's not my problem. Okay, all right. That's all right.

Mr. Mack: Is there any further business?

Ms. Moore: No, if you're concluded here, this public hearing is over.

Unknown: If they do come back like they want to redo it, is there a way to make the meeting at a better time so that more community members can attend?

Mr. Mack: I will address the time issue.

Unknown: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Mack: We've had this discussion quite a bit. We normally have these zoning hearings at our regularly scheduled trustees' meetings, which are the first and third Wednesday of each month. Maybe during COVID or whatever, we made some adjustments because our employees in the departments had to attend the meetings. And so we said, we'll try and do it during the workday and focus the open public land use hearings at the very end. We've since made it at 5 o'clock, hoping that would be a nice compromise. We're hearing tonight that maybe that's not yet a compromise.

Unknown: I think it's just harder for some people to get there at that.

Mr. Mack: But I remind everybody that the letter I received or that I read from Alexis Stupendak, you know, in a very nicely composed letter, it is part of the official record of this hearing, as is the recording that we're making of everybody and their commentary. So, quite frankly, that's It's nice of you all to come. It's equally nice that Alexis put together this communication to us that's part of our official record, and it speaks for itself very well. And we could certainly consider making it later. I actually have a job during the day as well, so I'm with all of you folks. I'm fine when we used to have our meetings in the evening, but we were trying to be accommodating to our team.

Mr. Britten: And we had this discussion, matter of fact, we kind of beat this horse for three years, meeting times, and we did decide to have two meetings at six o'clock, which used to be the, I think even years ago they used to have the stuff, but at six o'clock start a meeting. We actually had one in, I wanna say July, And the next one we have rescheduled 2 this year is the 15th of October. And I'd kind of forgotten about that. We set a zoning hearing for that day at 5 o'clock, which we could have did it later. But yeah, so I'm in full agreement with you. I'm, I could have them at 8 o'clock in the morning, but that doesn't help the people. And I've heard it from our constituents that same thing you're saying. We want to be able to come to the meeting, but I have a job. And I'd have to leave work early, a lot of them work until 5, and they can't get here. So, I would have no problem if we had all the meetings at 6 o'clock. We did it for our department heads so they wouldn't have to. I mean, Kelly and Jon, they drive 25, 30 miles. So it's for them to hang around a couple extra hours. We understand. Thank you.

Mr. Mack: I'm sorry, you have a question.

Unknown: I was just going to say, like, for them, I think if I think for the homeowners, if it wasn't 695 homes in that area, just because of the congestion and everything else, I think it would probably, if they zoned it a little different for not so many single homes, I think people would be more understanding. But you get 695 homes, like you said, you figure a family, you've got like us, we have two teenagers that drive, then you got two parents that drive, then you add that on top of the traffic there, it's going to be outrageous for two lanes. So I think if you guys came back with a better thing, I think people would be more understanding and be, okay, we all know something's going to go there eventually, but single homes sound appealing, but I think that many is a lot.

Unknown: If I could say something. I understand what everybody's saying, and I agree with a whole bunch of them. But I think we're throwing a whole bunch back at these folks as if they're the developers. They're just trying to get rid of this property. And we keep saying, R5, you got to come back and do this, do that. And I think you know what your path is now, come back as an R3. But even if they do that, it's not going to be up to them to make sure all these other things aren't addressed. It's going to be, I think, I don't know if it's you guys that, whoever they sell it to, that person, that group is going to have to come back to

you and say, here's what we want to do. And at that point, then everybody's got to be here to express your concerns. Like they tried to point out, that it's not them. They aren't developing this thing. Sorry, it's whoever they sell it to. But I think your path is to go R3, come back and unfortunately, it's a long drive, I know. But I think that's the way you've got-- Three trips, isn't it? You'll get a little bit more support and hopefully people understand, okay, you're not the ones that we have to stop. It's whoever tries to come in and do the 695 homes.

Ms. Thatcher: And the Planning Commission, you have to get their approval on runoff water and roads and everything like that. It's not anything that we can do about it, but they have to go through the hoops, like you said. We can't do that, but we know that they have to do that.

Mr. Britten: And I'll just tell you and tell everybody in the crowd, if they come back and rezone this R3 and they sell it, you'll have the buyers in here wanting R5. I guarantee you. because they can make more money at R5 than R3. So, we'll all be doing this again. So, I don't behoove them if they want to come back, but I'm not tonight. I was not ready to say I'm going to modify it because I want to study what we got. So, and I know you guys would be different if you lived down the street, you know, but it sounds like if you do the R3 and we all take a look at it, these people get notification. You might have a happy ending when you leave the next time.

Mr. Schaller: Could we do a straw vote and let us know what you guys want and give them a direction to go? I think that it's only fair for Bob and Peg to have a direction to try to head this thing. But I'd hate to see you go ask for an R3 and have someone complain about it when you came back, right away. And if we had some sort of, nothing, I mean, it's not stone, but if, can you guys live with that?

Mr. Moore: We are updating our comprehensive plan too, and there's a live survey if anybody wants to take it. There's information on the table.

Mr. Britten: Great.

Ms. Moore: Tell your friends.

Mr. Schaller: I don't know if that's, is that permissible to ask that?

Unknown: Well, but it's not up to us. It's up to you three.

Mr. Mack: Yeah, it's outside of standard protocol. I will go back to what I said before, which is if it was a continuation of the density level and what Twin Lakes already is, that's something that I would be very supportive.

Mr. Britten: I agree.

Mr. Mack: Yes, ma'am.

Unknown: If I may make a comment, I think all of us from Lakemont agree that the difference between 60 houses in a development and 600 and some units is a whole big difference. We understand that. Who knows what's going to happen on the other side of the road from us? Amazons down the corner and I can just see, you know, heading down this way. There will be more strange stuff unless we have the whole thing, but we just want a nice peaceable neighborhood that, like you said, our kids don't have to worry about being out in the street while people are cutting through. That's a single family's great. That's R3, if I understand that right.

Mr. Mack: Yes, sir.

Unknown: I'm new to the area, and I'm in my first zoning meeting, so I don't know what I'm talking about. But is R3 just R3, or can you put, like, other things on it? Like, it's R3, but we have to, we can limit it to so many units. and we have to put a road through that development, which would ease traffic in our development and so on, the flooding, all that. Can that be included? Or R3 is just R3 and that's what it is, whatever that means.

Ms. Thatcher: The Planning Commission is who helps develop it. You have to go through them. They tell you about the runoff, they tell you if you need any retaining ponds, about the ditch. There's also a pipeline through there too. So, they can't build on that either.

Mr. Mack: If you go to our website and under the planning zoning section, it's very clear what are permitted uses and what are conditional uses. Conditional uses mean they need to have approval. Permitted uses mean they comply. They are generally good to go. But they still have runoff and other things to deal with Wood County.

Mr. Mack: Thank you all for your participation. Thank you, Kelly, for your leadership. And I hope this has been informative. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Schaller moved for approval to adjourn. Mr. Britten seconded. All yes. Motion approved.

Meeting adjourned at 17:23

Gretchen Welch – Fiscal Officer

Robert Mack -Chairman