CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL

MEETING MINUTES

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

1. Resolution PC 15-08 A request to amend the development plan for the Swift Run Lake R-PUD subdivision to include an advertising sign, said sign to be located along SR 66.

2. Resolution PC 16-08 A request to reconstruct and enlarge a nonstandard driveway use, said use located at 410 Gordon Street.

3. Resolution PC 17-08 A request to change the zoning designation of a 9.28 acre tract of land also known as OUTLOT 180, from R-1 One-family Residential to OS Open Space.

4. Resolution PC 18-08 A request to permit an auto repair and vehicle sales special use, said use to be located at 8750 N CR 25-A.

5. Resolution PC 19-08 A request to reconstruct an existing nonstandard use, said use located at 608 Gill Street.

6. Resolution PC 20-08 A request to enlarge an existing nonconforming light manufacturing use, said use located at 1311 South Street.

7. Resolution PC 21-08 A resolution of support encouraging the State of Ohio to give favorable consideration to the request by the Ohio Historical Society for capital funding for the preservation of the Miami & Erie Canal Locks located at Lockington, Ohio.

OTHER BUSINESS


ADJOURNMENT Adjourn regular session
CALL TO ORDER

6:00 P.M. – Chairman Spoltman called the meeting to order. Mr. Spoltman noted for the record the hearing of each item would be conducted according to a modified Roberts Rules of Order, more specifically as follows:

A. Clerk to State the Agenda Item
B. Staff Comments
C. Applicant/Agent Comments
D. Other Affected Parties Comments
E. Board Member Comments and Questions
F. Board To Take Action On The Item

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Mark Spoltman, Jim Oda, Jean Franz, Brad Bubp
Members Absent: Mike Taylor
Staff Members: Chris Schmiesing
Attendees: Janet Hartley, Deanne Whitney, Michael Harwood, Jamie Rowley, Bill Vogt, John Martin

Mr. Bubp was welcomed to the board.

Mr. Spoltman made a motion to excuse Mr. Taylor from the meeting and Mr. Oda seconded the motion. A voice vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in support of the motion.

MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Spoltman asked if there were additions, deletions or corrections to be made to the March 4, 2008 meeting minutes included in the agenda packet. Hearing none, Chairman Spoltman asked for a motion to accept the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Oda motioned to approve the March 4, 2008 meeting minutes as submitted and Commissioner Franz seconded the motion. A voice vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in supporting the motion to approve the meeting minutes as submitted.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

1. PC 13-08

A request to permit a special neighborhood business use of a structure with nonstandard use conditions, said structure located at 827 W. North Street.
Mr. Schmiesing described the existing nonstandard parking and setback conditions found at this location. Mr. Schmiesing indicated the most recent use of the property was a personal services neighborhood business on the first floor that has not been in existence for over 12 months, and a dwelling unit use on the second floor. Mr. Schmiesing pointed out that the primary difference between what previously existed at this location and what is being proposed is that the applicant has indicated that he may add massage and tattoo services to the beauty salon personal services use of the first floor.

In response to a question from Mr. Oda, Mr. Schmiesing indicated that the information provided on the application suggest that the previous personal services use had been in existence for the past 20 years or so.

Jamie Rowley of 4239 Piqua-Troy Road approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Rowley provided a proposed floor plan to the Planning Commission for their review and to be introduced into the record, and described his renovation plans for the property. Mr. Rowley stated that he intends to rent out the four stations for approximately $150 a month and that there is a possibility he would rent one of the stations out to a tattoo artist who currently resides in the upstairs dwelling unit. Mr. Rowley also pointed out that the tattoo services would be subject to all applicable health inspections and license just the same as the massage and salon services would be subject to certain inspections and licenses.

Mrs. Franz expressed disapproval of tattoo services being provided in the same place of business as salon services.

Mr. Bubp commented on the proposed improvements, the applicability of the building code, and the inspection requirements; Mr. Oda commented on the lack of off-street parking and asked about the proposed management plan for the operation; and, Mr. Spoltman asked about the proposed business hours.

Mr. Rowley responded stating that all applicable code and licensure requirements would be followed; he noted that the parcel is a corner lot and with the available on street parking on the two street frontages he didn’t believe the parking would be a problem, adding that he envisions only 3 to 5 employees present at any one time; he stated that he intends for the on site station tenants to provide the basic management of the operation; and, that the business hours would be 10 am until 8 or 9 pm daily Monday thru Saturday with no Sunday hours.

Janet Hartley of 819 W. North Street approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Ms. Hartley commented on the use history of this location and noted that parking at this location has in past been a problem for the neighborhood. Ms. Hartley objected to the tattoo service use citing the tattoo services as being incompatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood.
Bill Vogt of 928 Young Street approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Vogt commented on the city of Piqua licensure requirements for tattoo services.

There was a brief discussion about what leeway the board has in attaching conditions to approvals. Ultimately it was decided that no conditions need be imposed.

Noting that the definition of personal services does not specifically mentioned tattoo services, and calling for a strict interpretation of the personal services definition, Mr. Oda moved to approve the special use permit request. Mrs. Franz seconded the motion. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in supporting the motion to approve the special use permit.

2. PC 14-08

A request to permit an enlargement of a dwelling unit structure with nonstandard use conditions, said structure located at 602 Riverside Drive.

Mr. Schmiesing described the existing nonstandard setback conditions and the development characteristics typical to the surrounding lots and the neighborhood in general.

Michael Harwood of 604 Broadway approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Harwood identified himself as a business partner of the applicant and also a neighbor to the subject parcel. Mr. Harwood described the purpose for the proposed addition and the nature of the improvements to be made.

Several board members commented on the consistency of the proposed addition with what is already found in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Franz moved to approve the special use permit request. Mr. Bubp seconded the motion. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in supporting the motion to approve the special use permit.

PRESENTATIONS

3. Great Miami River Recreational Trail Study

Mr. Schmiesing provided an overview of the proposed bike trail improvements, highlighting the proposed alignment, project amenities, future extensions/neighborhood connectors, and the project funding.

Mr. Spoltman moved to approve the study as presented and Mrs. Franz seconded the motion. A voice vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in support of the study.

OTHER BUSINESS

4. Making Motions and Creating a Record

Mr. Schmiesing reviewed the Commissioner article included in the monthly packet and reminded the commission of the importance of
properly motioning on an item and creating a record of the actions taken.

5. Monthly Report

Mr. Schmiesing provided an update to the Planning Commission on legislative items, planning activities, permit issuances and other items of interest to the Planning Commission that occurred over the previous month.

6. Lock 10

Mr. Oda announced the Ohio Historical Society's intentions to request funding from the State of Ohio for the restoration of Lock 10 in Lockington Ohio. Noting the benefits to the Piqua community that will come from the restoration of the lock, Mr. Oda moved that the City of Piqua Planning Commission send a letter of support encouraging the State of Ohio to give favorable consideration to the request by the Ohio Historical Society for capital funding for the preservation of the Miami & Erie Canal Locks located at Lockington, Ohio. Mrs. Franz seconded the motion. A voice vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in support of the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to conduct it was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned. With all those present in favor the meeting adjourned at 7:24p.m.
RESOLUTION No. PC 15-08

WHEREAS, Ed Fry, agent of the Swift Run Lakes R-PUD subdivision development, has submitted a request to amend the development plan for the Swift Run Lake R-PUD subdivision to include an advertising sign, said sign to be located along SR 66; and,

WHEREAS, the 32 square foot "V" sign will be located approximately 20 feet back from the front lot line and approximately 1,250 feet north of the south lot line and be in compliance with sections 154.095 through 154.107 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances; and,

WHEREAS, a development plan for the Swift Run Lake R-PUD subdivision was previously approved in accordance with section 154.044 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has studied the request, conducted a public hearing on the matter, and has established as fact that the proposed amendment to the development plan will be in compliance with section 154.045 and 154.046 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, board member _________ hereby moves to _________ the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, the motion is seconded by board member _________, and the voting record on this motion is hereby recorded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Oda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bubp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Spoltman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

Date: April 18, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 15-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Ed Fry
Owner: Ed Fry, etal
Location: Swift Run Lake subdivision
Zoning: R-PUD
Land Use
  Existing: Agriculture
  Proposed: One-family detached dwelling units and one-family attached dwelling units.
Request: To amend the development plan for the Swift Run Lake R-PUD subdivision to include advertising sign to be located along SR 66.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

Section 154.044 of the zoning code outlines the requirements for a PUD development plan and states that all structures are to be shown on the approved drawings. The proposed 32 square foot “V” sign is in compliance with all provisions of the zoning code, including the sign standards, less the fact that it was not originally shown on the development plan.

CONCLUSION

The addition of the sign to the development plan is necessary to allow the issuance of permits for this item. The proposed sign is consistent and compatible with the concept plan previously approved by the City Commission and does not significantly alter the development plan previously approved for this project.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the requested amendment.
Swift Run Lakes Development

4' x 8'
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RESOLUTION No. PC 16-08

WHEREAS, William Weber, the owner of 410 Gordon Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit the reconstruction and enlargement of a nonstandard driveway use, said driveway being located in a front yard and constructed of aggregate materials; and,

WHEREAS, the existing nonstandard driveway use located in the front yard of this location was originally constructed of aggregate materials and section 154.081 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances require that a driveway use located in a front or side yard be constructed of an bituminous or Portland cement concrete pavement; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.066 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for allowing the reconstruction and enlargement of a nonstandard use with approval of a special use permit request; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has studied the request, conducted a public hearing on the matter, and has established as fact that the proposed use:

- Will be compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district.
- Will not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties, and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected.
- Is compatible with the general economic development policies of the City.
- Conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, board member ____________ hereby moves to ____________ the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, the motion is seconded by board member ____________, and the voting record on this motion is hereby recorded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Oda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Spoltman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name: WILLIAM WEBER Phone: 773-1690
   Applicant's Address: 512 BEAR RUN PIQUA

2. Owner's Name: SAME AS ABOVE Phone: 
   Owner's Address: SAME

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: OWNER

4. Location of Special Use Permit request
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description): PART INLOT 1425
   B. Address: 410 GORDON STREET PIQUA

5. Existing zoning:

6. Existing usage:

7. Proposed usage:

8. Proposed special usage: RE-ESTABLISH GRAVEL DRIVEWAY OVERGROWN BY GRASS

9. No. of plot plans submitted (16 required UNLESS waived): N/A

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    RE-ESTABLISH GRAVEL DRIVEWAY OVERGROWN BY GRASS

I hereby certify that the proposed request is authorized by the "Owner of Record" and agree to conform to all applicable laws of the City of Piqua, Ohio.

Signature of Applicant: [Signature] Date: [Date]
Signature of Owner: [Signature] Date: 4-9-08

Note: Both the owner and the applicant shall sign when application is made by someone other than the owner.

*************** OFFICE USE ONLY ***************

$100.00 Fee Paid: 100.00 Date Fee Paid: 4-9-08
Receipt No. 180288 P.C. Res. No.
STAFF REPORT

Date: April 18, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 16-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: William Weber
Owner: William Weber
Location: 410 Gordon Street
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential

Land Use
Existing: One-family detached dwelling unit; detached private garage; aggregate driveway.
Proposed: One-family detached dwelling unit; detached private garage; aggregate driveway.

Request: To permit the reconstruction and enlargement of a nonstandard driveway use.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

Section 154.066 of the zoning code provides the applicant with the opportunity to reconstruct and enlarge a nonstandard driveway use. The existing nonstandard drive to be reconstructed is located in a front yard and has an aggregate surface that was allowed to become overgrown with grass. The enlargement of the driveway would extend the driveway into a side yard. Both the reconstruction and enlargement portions of the proposed driveway use would include an aggregate surface material. Section 154.081 of the zoning code requires driveways in a front or side yard to be constructed with a bituminous or Portland cement concrete pavement. Driveways located in a rear yard are also permitted to be constructed with an aggregate surface material provided a landscape timber or similar physical barrier is provided at the boundaries of the driveway.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a permit to allow the enlargement, extension, conversion, reconstruction, or structural alteration of any building, structure, or premises which constitutes a nonstandard use. Such consideration comes by way of the special use provisions, which also include certain criteria to be considered. The following highlights each of the criteria described in those sections and provides staff's analysis of how this request measures up to those standards.
Effects on adjacent property, traffic, and city utility service needs?

Staff Analysis: This project will likely have little or no impact on existing traffic patterns or utility services.

Density of land use zoning for the subject property and adjacent property?

Staff Analysis: While the proposed improvement will occupy space and increase the density of the lot development, being that it is a surface treatment only, it will have very little affect on the impact of the development density.

Degree of hardship upon the applicant which would be caused by failure to grant a permit?

Staff Analysis: Denying this request will not preclude the owner of this property from installing a driveway. It would simply result in any driveway improvement to be made to be in full compliance with the adopted community standards.

The proposed special use is compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district?

Staff Analysis: A driveway commonly exist as a feature incidental to the principal permitted use types found in this district.

The proposed special use does not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected?

Staff Analysis: The proposed improvements fail to comply with the adopted community standards regarding the surface material permissible for driveways located in a front or side yard. By lessening the standards the improvements effectively reduce the standards of the entire neighborhood. Migrant dust from an aggregate driveway can be a nuisance for adjacent property owners. The reduction in the community standards and the migrant dust issue both negatively impact the general health safety and welfare and property values of the surrounding properties.

The proposed special use is compatible with the general economic development policies of the city?

Staff Analysis: The development of platted building lots with productive use activities that contribute positively to the community is consistent with the general economic development polices of the city. It is difficult to categorize this request as contributing positively to the community.

The proposed special use conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city?

Staff Analysis: Aside from the nonstandard aggregate surface material proposed, the information presented conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Throughout the Comprehensive Plan document there is a focus on the built environment and the significance it has on the overall aesthetics of the community. The plan strategies suggest that the community standards should be strengthened to improve the aesthetical value of constructed improvements.

CONCLUSION

This driveway was allowed to become overgrown with vegetation and essential cease to exist. Thus, the proposed driveway improvements could be described as a new improvement to the lot and not a reconstruction of an existing condition. The code requirements for a new driveway improvement to be located in a front or side yard clearly state that the surface is to be bituminous or Portland cement concrete pavement.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission deny the request.
WEDE
410 GORDON ST.
PIGUA
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EXTENSION OF DRIVE, OVER PREVIOUS GARAGE SITE

PROPOSED RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF GRAVEL DRIVE OVERGROWN BY GRASS
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GORDON STREET
Mortgage Certification Survey

I certify that the drawing herein is representative of a true and accurate survey made by the undersigned surveyor, established by actual field measurements; that all properties are within the perimeters therein, and the right of way lines for all streets are completely contiguous to the premises. I further certify that there are no buildings, permanent structures, or encroachments other than those shown herein.

This survey was made for mortgage purposes only. No property line survey was made and no property corner stakes were set.

THOMAS R. ZECHMAN
OHIO REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR #7077
RESOLUTION No. PC 17-08

WHEREAS, James A. Hiegel, owner of a 9.28 acre tract of land also known as OUTLOT 180, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to change the zoning designation of the parcel from R-1 (One-family Residential) to OS (Open Space); and,

WHEREAS, section 154.018 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states the principal permitted and special uses permissible in the OS Open Space zoning district, and the current agriculture use of the land is listed as a principal use; and,

WHEREAS, sections 154.141 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for considering an amendment to the zoning map; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has studied the request and conducted a public hearing on the matter;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, board member _____________ hereby moves to _____________ the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, the motion is seconded by board member _____________, and the voting record on this motion is hereby recorded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Oda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bubp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Spoltman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

Date: April 18, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 17-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: James A. Hiegel
Owner: James A. Hiegel
Location: Outlot 180
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential
Land Use
  Existing: Agriculture
  Proposed: Agriculture
Request: To change the zoning designation of the parcel to OS - Open Space.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The earliest zoning map record available, the 1971 zoning map, shows the subject parcel zoned as A-1 Agricultural District. The intent of this district, as described in the 1971 edition of the zoning code, was as follows:

"This district is comprised of certain land being used for agriculture activities, open recreational use, and other open land uses, and is primarily located near the periphery of the urban area."

In 1982 the zoning map was updated to reflect comprehensive update of the zoning code. On the 1982 adopted zoning map the subject parcel is zoned R-1 One-family Residential. Among other changes, the 1982 amendments to the zoning code resulted in the discontinuance of the A-1 zoning designation and the establishment of an OS-Open Space designation. While it is assumed the discontinuance of the A-1 designation was the impetus for the change in the zoning designation, it is unclear as to exactly why this parcel was zoned residential versus open space. With the residential zoning and development of the contiguous land to the north it is suspected that the R-1 zoning designation seemed logical at the time. The R-1 zoning designation of this parcel continues to the present date.

As in the past, the present use of the land is entirely agriculture in nature. It should also be noted that the tract of land remains one large parcel and has never been platted into individual building lots.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The subject parcel is identified in the Plan as a strategic growth area suitable for expansion of the surrounding residential neighborhoods. The plan also places an emphasis on conserving future strategic growth areas by fully developing, and in some cases redeveloping, established land use areas before growing outward.

CONCLUSION

This land has been in agriculture use for many years and will likely continue as such into the foreseeable future. While the residential zoning designation may have seemed logical at the time it was applied, it has proven to be an inaccurate designation of the actual use of this parcel. Until such time the community needs or the land owner's preferences predicate a zoning designation other than one that reflects the current use of the land, a zoning designation suitable for the agricultural use of the parcel (the OS Open Space designation) is the best zoning designation for this parcel.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request.
RESOLUTION No. PC 18-08

WHEREAS, Finkes Building Company Ltd., on behalf of the owner of 8750 N CR 25-A, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit an auto repair and vehicle sales special use, said use located in a B General Business zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.025 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states the principal permitted and special uses permissible in the B General Business zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, sections 154.140 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for considering a special use permit request; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has studied the request, conducted a public hearing on the matter, and has established as fact that the proposed use:

☐ Will be compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district.

☐ Will not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties, and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected.

☐ Is compatible with the general economic development policies of the City.

☐ Conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, board member __________ moves to __________ the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, the motion is seconded by board member __________, and the voting record on this motion is hereby recorded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Oda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bubp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Spoltman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name FINKES BUILDING CO. LTD Phone 937-778-3721
   Applicant's Address 8761 Sherry Drive Piqua, Ohio 45356

2. Owner's Name KFLP PROPERTIES, LLC Phone 937-418-7815
   Owner's Address 1190 S. Rt. 25A Troy, Ohio

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant GENERAL CONTRACTOR

4. Location of Special Use Permit request
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description) INLOT # B92B
   B. Address 8750 N. County Rd. 25-A Piqua, Ohio

5. Existing zoning B-1

6. Existing usage NONE - UNDER CONSTRUCTION

7. Proposed usage Company Business offices, Auto Sales, Auto Repair

8. Proposed special usage Auto Repair and Auto Sales, Business Offices

9. No. of plot plans submitted (10 required UNLESS waived)

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    To Operate a Auto Repair & Auto Sales Business

I hereby certify that the proposed request is authorized by the "Owner of Record" and agree to conform to all applicable laws of the City of Piqua, Ohio.

Signature of Applicant LEE HEARNE Date 4/8/08

Signature of Owner RECEIVED Date 9/9/08

Note: Both the owner and the applicant shall sign when application is made by someone other than the owner.

*************** OFFICE USE ONLY ***************

$100.00 Fee Paid 100.00 Date Fee Paid 4-15-08

Receipt No. 00293 P.C. Res. No. 
STAFF REPORT

Date: April 18, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 18-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Finkes Building Company Ltd.
Owner: KFLP Properties LLC
Location: 8750 N CR 25-A
Zoning: B General Business
Land Use
   Existing: Business Office; Auto Detailing
   Proposed: Auto Repair; Vehicle Sales
Request: To permit a special use of the premises to allow the auto repair and vehicle sales use activity.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

Past improvements to this site were recently destroyed by fire and demolished. More recently the larger tract of land was replatted into two smaller lots a zoning permit was issued authorizing a Business Office use to be constructed on the parcel to the north. During the course of construction the tenant’s business plan changed and the land was replatted back into its original larger configuration to accommodate a proposed expanded auto repair and vehicle sales special use of the premise. The previously approved improvements will be adapted to accept the proposed use activity should it be authorized.

As currently approved the site improvements include a parking facility that will be connected to a neighboring parking facility resulting in a shared use facility. This shared use parking facility is permissible; however, as it is currently shown the center row of parking stalls are two stalls deep on the property to the north and only one stall deep on the subject lot. This creates an offset in the maneuvering lane connecting the two lots. It has also been discussed that the proposed improvements to the southern portion of the lot will include an expansion of the parking facility for exterior display of vehicles and an advertising sign. As of this date the plans for these improvements have not been submitted for approval.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize a special use. The following highlights each of the criteria described in those sections and provides staff’s analysis of how this request measures up to those standards.
The proposed special use is compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district?

Staff Analysis: The proposed uses are consistent with the description of the use definitions for these activities. There is nothing unique or peculiar about either use type that would cause it to be unsuitable as a special use in the subject zoning district.

The proposed special use does not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected?

Staff Analysis: The proposed improvements will result in the development of vacant land that currently has no productive use.

The proposed special use is compatible with the general economic development policies of the city?

Staff Analysis: The development of platted building lots with productive use activities that contribute positively to the community is consistent with the general economic development policies of the city.

The proposed special use conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city?

Staff Analysis: All submittals presented conform or will be amended to conform to all applicable codes and regulations of the city.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
The subject parcel is conducive to road service type use activities, which is reflected by the projected land use for this area identified by the Comprehensive Plan Conservation and Development Map. The Plan promotes the concept of shared use parking facilities.

CONCLUSION
The proposed use is compatible and consistent with the surrounding fraternal club, light manufacturing, vehicle sales, and automobile service station uses found in this area. The new construction will result in improvements to the property that will contribute positively to the appearance of the area and the economic development of the community. The maneuvering lane alignment issue must be satisfactorily addressed before a zoning permit will be issued. Likewise, future plans for the southern portion of the subject lot need to be clarified and an interim boundary control may be required.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve this request.
RESOLUTION No. PC 19-08

WHEREAS, John David McCoy Jr., the owner of 608 Gill Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit the reconstruction of a nonstandard private garage use, said use is located in a R-1 One-family Residential zoning district, is attached to and a part of the principal structure, and lacks the required front, side, and rear yard setbacks; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.022 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances requires that the principal structure be situated not less than 6 feet from a side lot line and 30 feet (or 20% of the lot depth) from a rear lot line; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.066 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for allowing the reconstruction of a nonstandard use with approval of a special use permit request; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has studied the request, conducted a public hearing on the matter, and has established as fact that the proposed use:

☐ Will be compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district.
☐ Will not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties, and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected.
☐ Is compatible with the general economic development policies of the City.
☐ Conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, board member _____________ hereby moves to _____________ the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, the motion is seconded by board member _____________, and the voting record on this motion is herby recorded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Oda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bubp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Spoltman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name John David McCoy Jr. Phone 773-3374
   Applicant's Address 608 1/2 Gill St Piqua

2. Owner's Name Owners Phone
   Owner's Address

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant owner

4. Location of Special Use Permit request
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description)
   B. Address 608 1/2 Gill St.

5. Existing zoning

6. Existing usage storage

7. Proposed usage garage - storage - work area

8. Proposed special usage small truck garage

9. No. of plot plans submitted (16 required UNLESS waived)

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    TO KEEP VEHICLES OFF THE STREET

I hereby certify that the proposed request is authorized by the "Owner of Record" and agree to conform to all applicable laws of the City of Piqua, Ohio.

Signature of Applicant John D. McCoy Sr. Date 4-16-08

Signature of Owner for John D. McCoy Sr. Date

Note: Both the owner and the applicant shall sign when application is made by someone other than the owner.

************************** OFFICE USE ONLY **************************

$100.00 Fee Paid 100.00 Date Fee Paid 4-16-08

Receipt No. 180293 P.C. Res. No. 
STAFF REPORT

Date: April 18, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 19-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: John David McCoy, Jr.
Owner: John David McCoy, Jr.
Location: 608 Gill Street
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential
Land Use
   Existing: Two-family dwelling unit; attached private garage
   Proposed: Two-family dwelling unit; attached private garage
Request: To permit the reconstruction of a nonstandard use.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing portion of the improvements encompassing the private garage area is two stories high with dwelling space improvements above. This area is to be demolished and the private garage reconstructed as a single story improvement with no dwelling space above. As it currently exist the private garage area of the structure includes nonstandard side and rear yard setbacks and does not provide the four off-street parking spaces required for the two dwelling units (2 each). The foot print of the proposed improvements will be virtually the same as the existing improvements found at this location although the structure will be configured as a four car garage.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a permit to allow the enlargement, extension, conversion, reconstruction, or structural alteration of any building, structure, or premises which constitutes a nonstandard use. Such consideration comes by way of the special use provisions, which also include certain criteria to be considered. The following highlights each of the criteria described in those sections and provides staff’s analysis of how this request measures up to those standards.

Effects on adjacent property, traffic, and city utility service needs?

Staff Analysis: This project will likely have little or no impact on existing traffic patterns or utility services. It may reduce the dependency on on-street parking spaces to provide for the parking needs of the dwelling units at this location.
Density of land use zoning for the subject property and adjacent property?

   Staff Analysis: The lot as it currently exists is more densely developed than the intent of the district states as being desirable. Nonstandard front, side, and rear yard setbacks can also be found on the surrounding developed lots.

Degree of hardship upon the applicant which would be caused by failure to grant a permit?

   Staff Analysis: If this request were denied the current structure could be maintained as it currently exists; or, the existing structure could be demolished and a new improvement could be built in accordance with the code requirements. The latter scenario would produce an attached garage that would be approximately 20 feet wide by 24 feet deep (see Illustration A) – or – a detached garage that would be approximately 26 feet wide by 24 feet deep (see Illustration B).

The proposed special use is compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district?

   Staff Analysis: An attached private garage use is permissible incidental to the principal permitted use types found in this district and a detached private garage is permissible in this district as an accessory use.

The proposed special use does not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected?

   Staff Analysis: The proposed improvements would lessen the intensity of the development found on this lot and in all likelihood enhance the general health safety and welfare of the surrounding properties and not negatively affect the property values in the area.

The proposed special use is compatible with the general economic development policies of the city?

   Staff Analysis: The development of platted building lots with productive use activities that contribute positively to the community is consistent with the general economic development polices of the city.

The proposed special use conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city?

   Staff Analysis: Aside from the existing and proposed nonstandard use conditions this development includes, the information presented conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The Housing chapter of the Comprehensive Plan promotes enhancing and redeveloping existing neighborhoods.
CONCLUSION

The proposed improvements will not eliminate the nonstandard use conditions found at this location. The improvements will result in a reduction in the scale of the building with the nonstandard use conditions and produce a building that is more in scale with its surroundings. Similar improvements could be constructed to smaller dimensions to eliminate the nonstandard setback conditions and still produce a functional building. However, doing so will result in a 54 to 64 percent decrease in available floor area as compared to the existing dimensions of the structure. On the other hand allowing the structure to be constructed to the proposed dimensions will produce a four car garage. This would satisfy the parking requirement that there be two off-street parking spaces provided for each of dwelling unit. The question then becomes, what is the applicant’s intention with regards to the use of this space?

While it is possible to reduce the size of the proposed structure and comply with the applicable setbacks, this would result in a nonstandard number of off-street parking spaces being provided for the two dwelling units. Allowing the structure to be reconstructed at the proposed dimensions will still result in an overall reduction in the height of the building and in turn reduce the volume and scale of the structure to be more compatible with the surrounding development.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve this request.
Illustration A
Attached 20 ft by 24 ft Private Garage
(Principal Structure Setback Requirements Applied)
- Rear Yard = 17.8 ft (20% of lot depth)
- Side Yard = 6 ft (10 ft on side entering garage from alley).

Illustration B
Detached 26 ft by 24 ft Private Garage
(Accessory Structure Setback Requirements Applied)
- Rear Yard = 3 ft
- Side Yard = 3 ft (10 ft on side entering garage from alley).
- Minimum Separation from Principal Structure = 10 ft
RESOLUTION No. PC 20-08

WHEREAS, Ryan L. Filburn, the owner of 1311 South Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to enlarge an existing nonconforming light manufacturing use, said use located in a B General Business zoning district and occupying the principal structure; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.025 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states the principal permitted uses and minimum setback requirements for a principal structure situated in the B General Business zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, sections 154.063 and 154.064 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for allowing the enlargement of a nonconforming use with the approval of a special use permit request; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has studied the request, conducted a public hearing on the matter, and has established as fact that the proposed use:

☐ Will be compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district.
☐ Will not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties, and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected.
☐ Is compatible with the general economic development policies of the City.
☐ Conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, board member ____________ hereby moves to ____________ the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, the motion is seconded by board member ____________, and the voting record on this motion is hereby recorded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Oda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bubp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Taylor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Franz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Spoltman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name: Ryan L. Filbrun Phone: 937-773-5127
   Applicant's Address: 1311 South St, Piqua, Ohio 45356

2. Owner's Name: Same
   Owner's Address: _________________________________

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: Owner

4. Location of Special Use Permit request:
   A. Legal description (Lot No. or attach legal description): 6200 McKinley Ave & South Street
   B. Address: 1311 South Street

5. Existing zoning: ________________________________

6. Existing usage: Vintage Auto Parts Restoration and Plating

7. Proposed usage: Same (Storage Area)

8. Proposed special usage: ________________________________

9. No. of plot plans submitted (16 required UNLESS waived): ________________________________

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    For More Room For Storage To Be Completed July 31, 2008

I hereby certify that the proposed request is authorized by the "Owner of Record" and agree to conform to all applicable laws of the City of Piqua, Ohio.

Signature of Applicant: __________________ Date: 04-16-08

Signature of Owner: __________________ Date: 04-16-08

Note: Both the owner and the applicant shall sign when application is made by someone other than the owner.

$100.00 Fee Paid: 100.00 Date Fee Paid: 4-17-08

Receipt No.: 160295 P.C. Res. No. __________________

RECEIVED
APR 17 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
STAFF REPORT

Date: April 18, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 20-08

GENERAL INFORMATION
Applicant: Ryan L. Filburn
Owner: Ryan L. Filburn
Location: 1311 South Street
Zoning: B General Business
Land Use
  Existing: Light Manufacturing; parking lot
  Proposed: Light Manufacturing; parking lot
Request: To permit the enlargement of a nonconforming use.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS
The existing light manufacturing use of the premises is a nonconforming use. The proposed addition will allow for the relocation of certain materials and equipment that will free up space in the existing manufacturing area. One off-street parking space would be lost as part of the proposed improvements to the site reducing the total off-street parking spaces available to thirteen. The code requirement for off-street parking for this type of use is one space for each employee on the largest work shift plus one space for every 10,000 square feet of floor area. With 12 employees on the largest shift and approximately 4,400 square feet of building this works out to 13 off-street spaces being required.

Conditions related to the nonstandard parking lot maneuvering lanes and setbacks and the loading/unloading area located in the front yard of the structure will not be addressed by the project improvements as they are currently proposed. Nor is the lack of screening between this business and the residential use to the south.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a permit to allow the enlargement, extension, conversion, reconstruction, or structural alteration of any building, structure, or premises which constitutes a nonconforming use. Such consideration comes by way of the special use provisions, which also include certain criteria to be considered. The following highlights each of the criteria described in those sections and provides staff’s analysis of how this request measures up to those standards.
Effects on adjacent property, traffic, and city utility service needs?

Staff Analysis: This project will likely have little or no impact on existing traffic patterns or utility services. See the following items for possible effects on adjacent property.

Density of land use zoning for the subject property and adjacent property?

Staff Analysis: The nonstandard front, side, and rear yard setbacks cause this lot to already be more densely developed than the intent of the district states as being desirable. The extension of the existing building towards the residential use to the south will increase the density of the lot development parallel to the alley south.

Degree of hardship upon the applicant which would be caused by failure to grant a permit?

Staff Analysis: The existing development of this site within the physical constraints of the lot boundaries limits the applicant’s opportunity to expand at this location.

The proposed special use is compatible with the stated intent of the zoning district?

Staff Analysis: The uses permitted in this district are typically more retail in nature than they are industrial. Even so, while light manufacturing is not one of them, there are a number of light industrial special uses that may be permitted in this district.

The proposed special use does not threaten the general health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties and the adjacent property values will not be negatively affected?

Staff Analysis: The subject premise is maintained in a very clean and orderly fashion. It is not anticipated that the proposed addition or its use will cause an increase in the noise or orders coming from this establishment. The encroachment of the building structure into the minimum rear yard setback, causing the building to be situated even closer to the residential use to the south could potentially have a negative affect on the value of the adjacent residential property.

The proposed special use is compatible with the general economic development policies of the city?

Staff Analysis: The development of platted building lots with productive use activities that contribute positively to the community is consistent with the general economic development policies of the city.

The proposed special use conforms to all other applicable codes and regulations of the city?

Staff Analysis: Aside from the existing and proposed nonstandard use conditions all submittals presented conform or will be amended to conform to all applicable codes and regulations of the city.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Land Use and Economic Development chapters of the Comprehensive Plan put forth principles that advocate leveraging/maximizing the utilization of existing infrastructure investment in a responsible manner.

CONCLUSION

The proposed improvements will not eliminate the nonstandard use conditions found at this location. Nor will the proposed construction place the improvements any more out of compliance. In actuality the construction of the proposed addition may reduce noise levels affecting the surrounding properties in a positive manner.

The loss of the one off-street parking space will not place the off-street parking out of compliance. While the scope of the work can not be expanded to remedy the nonstandard parking lot maneuvering lane and setback conditions without adding significant cost to the project, a small amount of landscaping could easily be added to the project scope at a reasonable cost and be planted along the south lot line to soften the transition between the adjacent industrial and residential uses.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve this request with the following proposed condition:

The pavement area south of the proposed building addition and south of the southernmost parking stall shall be removed to the north alley right of line and a planting bed with topsoil, mulch, and a minimum of 3 trees and other vegetative plantings shall be installed in this area.
To whom it may concern,

We at D&D Classic Bright Works Inc., located at the S.E. corner of South St. and McKinley Ave., propose to add a 20'x24' addition on the south end of our facility. This addition would be on the south west corner of our facility (see enclosed overview).

Our company restores and re-plates (chrome, nickel, copper, brass, and silver) vintage automobile parts. The large majority of our work comes from the east and west coast and some international. We are obtaining more and more new customers and are outgrowing our facility. We would like to add the proposed addition to allow more storage area for supplies.

The addition of this area would allow us to have more room for our restoration and plating process, by allowing us to use our existing area exclusively for production. This is important to us so that we can better serve our employees and customers.

The proposed addition would not impact our neighboring residential area since we our not adding manufacturing area. The proposed addition would set back 10 feet from the alley unless otherwise directed.

Enclosed are a few pictures of cars that our facility has had the pleasure of working on.

Sincerely,

Ryan L. Filbrun President
RESOLUTION No. PC 21-08

WHEREAS, the Ohio Historical Society desires to secure capital funding from the State of Ohio for the preservation of the Miami & Erie Canal Locks located at Lockington, Ohio; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Piqua Comprehensive Plan identifies the preservation of local and regional historical and culturally significant attractions as being important to the economic vitality and quality of life afforded to local residents and visitors to the community;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City of Piqua, Miami County, Ohio Planning Commission, the majority of all members appointed thereto concurring that:

The City of Piqua Planning Commission hereby expresses its support of the Ohio Historical Society’s request to the State of Ohio for capital funding for the preservation of the Miami & Erie Canal Locks located at Lockington, Ohio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Oda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bubp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Spoltman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING AND ZONING

Christopher W. Schmiesing – City Planner
201 West Water Street • Piqua, Ohio 45356
(937) 778-2049 • FAX (937) 778-5165
E-Mail: cschmiesing@piquaoh.org

April 25, 2008

*** MEETING NOTICE ***

Please be advised that the City of Piqua Planning Commission will conduct a
meeting at the time and location stated below.

TIME: 6:00 P.M.
DATE: Tuesday, May 6, 2008
LOCATION: Commission Chambers, Municipal Government Complex
201 W. Water Street

It has been determined by this office that you may have an interest in an
agenda item that will be discussed at this meeting (see enclosed meeting
agenda). To view the Planning Commission packet in its entirety, visit
http://www.piquaoh.org/agenda_plan_comm.htm or visit this office.

This is your opportunity to speak in favor of, or object to, the item requested. If
you desire to state your opinion concerning this matter and will be unable to
attend the meeting, please submit your statement in writing to this office prior to
5pm on the date of the meeting.

Please contact this office if you have any questions pertaining to this notice.

Chris Schmiesing

Christopher W. Schmiesing
City Planner
Enc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOLUTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY STATE ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC 15-08</td>
<td>FRY ED</td>
<td>1335 STRATFORD DR</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 16-08</td>
<td>ROWLEY RACHEL</td>
<td>501 BROADWAY</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 16-08</td>
<td>CHARLES HAROLD DALE (TR) &amp; BONNIE J (TR)</td>
<td>649 W NORTH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 16-08</td>
<td>WEBER WILLIAM M &amp; LISA A</td>
<td>517 BEAR RUN</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 16-08</td>
<td>LEVAN LINDA D &amp; RUTH ANN BILLING</td>
<td>428 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 16-08</td>
<td>MILLER RONALD M &amp; TINA L</td>
<td>604 W GREENE ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 16-08</td>
<td>MCCRARY RUTH I TRUSTEE OF RUTH I MCCRAI 423 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 16-08</td>
<td>HECHT THOMAS L</td>
<td>4209 W ST RT 55</td>
<td>TROY OH 46373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>TUCKER BRENDA C</td>
<td>910 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>RAMELMEYER MARTHA R</td>
<td>914 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>KOLKER BILL JR</td>
<td>1010 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>FINLEY JERRY L &amp; BARBARA E</td>
<td>6333 NEWBERRY WASH RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WAGNER TAMALA K</td>
<td>1014 MANIER AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>STAMPER TERRY D &amp; TONY D</td>
<td>PO BOX 339</td>
<td>NORTH HAMPTON OH 45349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>HUELSKAMP JOAN M</td>
<td>928 COTTAGE AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>RYAN MARY ANN</td>
<td>940 COTTAGE AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>SULLENBERGER PROPERTIES</td>
<td>9629 N SPIKER RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WARD KENNETH L &amp; LYONNE M</td>
<td>913 BOAL AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>BALLINGER THELM C</td>
<td>911 BOAL AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>RUINKLE JIMMY &amp; BABETTE</td>
<td>990 BOAL AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>BATTEN DONNA</td>
<td>910 BOAL AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>BUROKER STANLEY A &amp; SHRILY</td>
<td>909 BRICE AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WIEGMAN PATRICIA L</td>
<td>913 BRICE AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>MAYSE JAMES C &amp; KATHY A</td>
<td>10980 ST RT 66</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WATREN NELSON</td>
<td>1309 BROOK ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>MOORE JASON M</td>
<td>809 MCKINLEY AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>GARBIG ROBERT L &amp; JULIA M</td>
<td>811 MCKINLEY AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>TAYLOR HELEN MARIE</td>
<td>1620 MANIER</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>RAY MICHAEL LEE &amp; REVA</td>
<td>1600 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>HEARN JUDITH K</td>
<td>910 WILSON AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>QUAFISI PAOLINA T</td>
<td>908 WILSON AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>ROTH WENDY E</td>
<td>935 WILSON AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>GAYNOR JOHN E</td>
<td>937 WILSON AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WILLIAMSON PATRICIA A C/O LAMPE PATRICI</td>
<td>939 WILSON AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>FOGT NORMA J (TOD) @2</td>
<td>1500 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WARD RHONDA F</td>
<td>910 BLAINE AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>TOBE WANDA K</td>
<td>908 BLAINE AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>HOMAN CHRISTIAN J</td>
<td>730 E WALNUT ST</td>
<td>COVINGTON OH 45318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>SHERRY MICHAEL I</td>
<td>1808 CARLYLE DR</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>LORD SAMMY D</td>
<td>1410 MANIER ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>BELL ANTOINETTE L</td>
<td>930 LINDEN</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>HUBER DUSTIN &amp; JENNIFER M CATRON</td>
<td>924 LINDEN AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>NASH ALMEDA</td>
<td>920 LINDEN</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>Veen GORDON D &amp; MARY I</td>
<td>1310 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>TRON DARRELL G &amp; JUDY L</td>
<td>1312 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>SHAWLER RAYMOND F</td>
<td>1314 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>BEISNER ALAN E &amp; KARRY K</td>
<td>1316 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>SCHLATTER TIMOTHY W &amp; ROBIN L</td>
<td>914 MANIER AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>PITTMAN THelia M (LC) %TAMARA OSTENDO 915 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>KISER SHIRLEY M</td>
<td>917 MANIER</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>SHOLLENBERGER MICHAEL &amp; SANDRA</td>
<td>516 W ASH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>MAILING ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WILSON JEANIE L</td>
<td>911 MANIER AV</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>WOODDELL MARK D</td>
<td>904 MCKINLEY AV</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 17-08</td>
<td>HIEGEL JAMES A</td>
<td>1006 S GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 18-08</td>
<td>SCARBROUGH LIMITED PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>PO BOX 605</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 18-08</td>
<td>CHANEY GRAEFT POST #4874 VFW</td>
<td>P O BOX 572</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 18-08</td>
<td>SHERTEL COMPANY</td>
<td>P O BOX 742</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 18-08</td>
<td>FINKES BUILDING COMPANY, LTD</td>
<td>8767 SHERRY DR</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 18-08</td>
<td>KFLP PROPERTIES, INC.</td>
<td>1190 CR 25-A</td>
<td>TROY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 19-08</td>
<td>SULLENBERGER RENTALS LLC</td>
<td>9829 N SPIKER RD</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 19-08</td>
<td>WARD CHRISTINA L @4</td>
<td>1106 SCUDDER ST</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 19-08</td>
<td>ROOT MICHAEL R &amp; CYNTHIA M</td>
<td>1104 SCUDDER ST</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 19-08</td>
<td>MCCOY JOHN D JR</td>
<td>608 GILL ST</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 20-08</td>
<td>ANGLE ANTHONY W KRISTY YVONNE</td>
<td>1309 SOUTH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 20-08</td>
<td>RFC RENTALS LLC</td>
<td>8163 W SUGAR GROVE RD</td>
<td>COVINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 20-08</td>
<td>SEPEL RICKEY L &amp; KAREN L</td>
<td>341 ELLERMAN ST</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 20-08</td>
<td>DAYTON POWER &amp; LIGHT CO %VECTREN ENER ONE VECTREN SQ PO BX 209</td>
<td>EVANSVILLE IN 47702-0209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 20-08</td>
<td>FILBURN RYAN</td>
<td>1311 SOUTH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENTIRE PACKET TO:**

- FRED ENDERLE
- CHRIS SCHMIESING
- PLANNING COMMISSION

**E-MEETING NOTICE TO:**

- AMY WELKER
- CHRIS BOEKE
- CITY COMMISSION
- DEAN BURCH
- DEBBIE STEIN
- FRED ENDERLE
- HARRY BUMGARNER
- LORNA SWISHER
- MARTIN KIM
- STACY WALL
- TOM ZECHMAN
- WAYNE WILLCOX
- PIQUA DAILY CALL
- DAYTON DAILY NEWS
- WPTW
- PIQUA TV5