PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO
6:00 P.M. – TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2008
MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT COMPLEX
COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 201 W. WATER STREET

CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL
MEETING MINUTES May 6, 2008 Meeting Minutes

OLD BUSINESS None

NEW BUSINESS
1. Resolution PC 22-08 A request to permit an Elderly Housing Facility special use, said use to be located at 324 W. Ash Street.
2. Resolution PC 23-08 A request to permit a Building Services special use, said use to be located at 212 Steele Street.
3. Resolution PC 24-08 A request to permit a Used Oil Services special use, said use to be located at 1400 S. Main Street.
4. Resolution PC 25-08 A request to permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction one family dwelling unit principal use structure, said lot being Inlot 2889 on located on Cottage Avenue.
5. Resolution PC 26-08 A request to permit the reconstruction of an accessory structure with nonstandard use conditions, said use located at 1207 Gordon Street.
6. Resolution PC 27-08 A request to permit the enlargement of an existing principal structure with a nonstandard use condition, said use located at 610 S. Downing Street.
7. Resolution PC 28-08 A request to permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction one family dwelling unit principal use structure, said lot being Inlot 3905 on located on Orr Street.
8. Resolution PC 29-08 A request to permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction one family dwelling unit principal use structure, said lot being Inlot 3906 on located on Orr Street.
9. Resolution PC 30-08 A proposal to amend the zoning chapter of the codified ordinances to modify code provisions pertaining to the allowable height, area, and location for an accessory structure.
10. Resolution PC 31-08  A proposal to amend the zoning chapter of the codified ordinances to modify code provisions pertaining to allowable number, area, and type of signs for a special event.

11. Resolution PC 32-08  A proposal to amend the zoning chapter of the codified ordinances to modify the code provisions pertaining to minimum permit requirements and restoration standards for demolition projects.

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, and Brad Bubp
Members Absent: Mike Taylor
Staff Members: Chris Schmiesing, Becky Cool

Mr. Schmiesing welcomed Becky Cool as Planning Commission Clerk.

MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Spoltman asked if there were additions, deletions or corrections to be made to the April 1, 2008 meeting minutes included in the agenda packet. Mr. Oda asked to have the minutes amended to insert "Lockington Locks" where "Lock 10" is stated in two separate places in the minutes. Chairman Spoltman asked for a motion to accept the minutes with the proposed amendment. Commissioner Oda motioned to approve the April 1, 2008 meeting minutes as submitted and amended and Commissioner Franz seconded the motion. Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Spoltman, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in supporting the motion to approve the meeting minutes as submitted and amended.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

1. 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.

Mr. Schmiesing explained that Section 154.044 of the zoning code outlines the requirements for 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 they it was not originally shown on the development plan, thus the need for the resolution.

Mr. Oda moved to approve the request to amend the development plan for Swift Run Lake R-PUD subdivision. Mrs. Franz seconded the motion. Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Spoltman, Aye; and Mr. Oda, Aye; Nay, None. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in supporting the motion to approve the request for the amendment to the development plan.

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

Mr. Schmiesing described the existing nonstandard setback conditions and the development characteristics typical to the surrounding lots and the neighborhood in general, stating said driveway is located in the front yard.

William Weber, 517 Bear Run approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Weber explained that Gordon Street is a very narrow street and he would like to have off street parking. There has been a driveway previously located in the front yard, and I would like to be able to use it again, said Mr. Weber.

Mr. Spoltman stated he has looked at the property, and the majority of the neighbors have paved driveways with only a few having gravel driveways.

Mrs. Franz stated a lot of time has been spent discussing the issue of gravel driveways previously. Mr. Oda stated he had driven by property, and there is a curb cut in the area in question. Mr. Bubp also commented his observations of the existing conditions at this property.

Mr. Bubp moved to deny the request and Mrs. Franz seconded the motion. Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Spoltman, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; and Mr. Bubp, Aye. Nay, None. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote to deny the request.

3. 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.
Mr. Schmiesing explained the reason for the request to change the zoning of the 9.28 acre tract of land to OS Open Space from the R-1 One-Family residential as it is shown on the official zoning map at this time.

Jim Hiegel, 1006 Gordon Street approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Hiegel explained the reason for the request to rezone his property. Mr. Hiegel stated the farm has been in his family since 1928. Mr. Hiegel stated that he believed the change in zoning status was done without the previous owner’s knowledge and he would like to have it changed to OS Open Space.

Norma Fogt, Mainner Avenue approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mrs. Fogt voiced her concern about the proposed OS Open Space zoning designation and asked if cattle would be permitted on the area in question.

Mr. Spoltman stated the use has been agricultural and having cattle is a permitted use even without the zoning change.

Mr. Bubp confirmed that the property in question is located within the city limits and then questioned whether there was an adopted prohibition against the keeping of farm animals inside city limits. Mr. Schmiesing commented that if there is any such prohibition in the City of Piqua Codified Ordinances it is not in the zoning chapter, and therefore would be of minimal relevance in the context of considering the appropriate zoning designation for the lot in question.

Mr. Oda stated pointed out that the boards’ action on the matter at hand will makes no difference on the applicant’s ability to put cattle on this land.

Florence Foster, 902 Blaine Avenue approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mrs. Foster asked what does OS Open Space mean? Mr. Schmiesing explained the principal permitted uses in the OS Open Space. Mr. Schmiesing stated if the OS zoning designation is recommended by the Planning Commission the request would be forwarded to the City Commission for final action.

Mr. Oda moved to recommend approval of the request. Mrs. Franz seconded the motion. Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Spoltman, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Bubp, Aye. Nay, None. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in recommending approval of the request.

4. PC 18-08

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

Mr. Schmiesing described the request citing the consistency of the planned auto repair and vehicles sales use and the intention of the subject parcel and the neighboring parcel owners to establish a shared
use parking facility as part of the improvements to be made with this project. Mr. Schmiesing also pointed out that it is the applicant's intention to expand the vehicle sales use to the south/west at a future date.

Matt Finkes, the applicant approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Finkes explained the building is to be used as office space and sales center at this time.

Mrs. Franz voiced her concern over the misaligned maneuvering lanes shown on the proposed parking plan as it relates to the connection to the VFW parking lot. Mr. Finkes explained they plan on re-striping the VFW parking lot in the near future and that will remedy this issue.

Mr. Schmiesing noted that this is a design standard item stipulated in the zoning code and that the issue must be resolved in the zoning permit application submittals prior to the final approval of the plans.

Mr. Oda inquired as to the size of the existing structure. Mr. Finkes stated the building is 30 feet x 70 feet.

Mrs. Franz moved to recommend approval of the special use request. Mr. Bubp seconded the motion. Mr. Spoltman, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye. Nay, None. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in supporting the motion to approve the special use permit.

5. PC 19-08

A request to reconstruct an existing nonstandard use, said use located at 608 Gill Street.

Mr. Schmiesing explained the existing portion of the garage area is two stories high with dwelling space improvements above. This area is to be demolished and the new garage is to be reconstructed as a single story improvement with no dwelling space. Mr. Schmiesing further stated, as the structure currently exist the private garage area of the structure includes nonstandard side and rear yard setbacks and is encroaching on the neighbors property.

John McCoy, 1106 Scudder Street, applicant, approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Bubp asked if the current structure was residential and if the back part was used for parking? Mr. McCoy stated yes, there are two apartments in the structure and the back part is used for parking 2 cars at this time.

Mr. Schmiesing asked if Mr. McCoy was able to locate the property line boundary pins? Mr. McCoy responded that he had been told the pin was eight to ten inches to the north of the building. Mr. Bubp asked if the property lines on the map were accurate. Mr. Schmiesing explained that they are accurate but that when they are superimposed over ortho-photography the skew of the ariel view can cause the lot lines to look like they are not in the proper location. Mr. Oda stated if it is
sitting over the property line it is just barely over. Mr. Bubp stated he is most concerned about the east side of the property. Mr. McCoy explained how the structure was laid out, stating it has been there since 1926.

Mr. Oda asked if Mr. McCoy demolishes the building would he be required to be sure the new building does not encroach on the other property and conform to the current lot lines? Mr. Schmiesing stated the approval of this board does not authorize an encroachment.

Mr. Bubp stated there are building code issues that need to be looked at, but that is not the responsibility of this board to do so. Mr. Bubp questioned whether the board should go about approving or disapproving the concept of the addition as shown and whether there should be some additional stipulations to address the concern of the encroachment. Mr. Schmiesing explained that an amendment to the proposal would be in order and suggested the structure be allowed to be 26 feet x 36 feet wide with a 3 foot setback along the side and rear lot lines.

Mr. Oda stated he is glad to see that Mr. McCoy is replacing the existing structure in an older neighborhood and Mr. Spoltman commented that it was commendable on Mr. McCoy's part to do so.

Mr. Spoltman asked Mr. MC Coy how he felt about making the changes suggested. Mr. Mc Coy stated it was okay with him to make the suggested changes.

Mr. Oda motioned to amend the resolution to read: "...hereby moves to approve the request 'provided the structure should not be any closer than 3 feet to any lot line'..." The motion was seconded by Mr. Bubp to amend Resolution No. PC 19-08. Voice vote. Ayes 4, Nays 0. Mr. Oda motioned to approve the request as amended. Mrs. Franz seconded the motion to approve the request as amended. Mr. Spoltman, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye. Therefore, the roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in favor of approving the amended resolution.

Mike Root, 1104 Scudder Street approached the lectern and asked for clarification of the resolution that was just passed. Mr. Schmiesing explained the changes that were to be made.

6. PC 20-08

A request to enlarge an existing nonconforming light manufacturing use, said use located at 1311 South Street

Mr. Schmiesing explained the purpose of this request as being to allow a small addition to be added onto the existing nonconforming principal use structure found at this location.

Ryan Filburn, 8163 W. Sugar Grove Road approached the lectern to speak on this issue. Mr. Filburn stated they are outgrowing the original
structure and would like to add the proposed addition to allow for more storage area. Mr. Filburn asked if it would be possible to not have to put up a buffer at this time, but if he has to, could it be on the south side of the alley? Mr. Spoltman asked if the door on the side of the building was used? Mr. Filburn stated yes, we do use the side door. Mrs. Franz asked where the buffer was to be installed? Mr. Schmiesing explained that he has suggested to the applicant that providing a minimal amount of landscaping at the south end of the proposed structure would help soften the transition between the adjacent light industrial and residential uses, and would improve upon an existing nonstandard condition.

Mrs. Franz stated Mr. Filburn does a wonderful job with his business and that landscaping would only add to the visual appeal of the site.

Mr. Filburn stated he is willing to put landscaping in, but it would be hard to maneuver through the alley with bushes and such. Mrs. Franz stated the Plan It Piqua Comprehensive Plan encourages businesses to incorporate landscaping into their sites.

Mr. Filburn said he was not clear on what nonconforming usage is? Mr. Schmiesing explained the term nonconforming use.

Mrs. Franz moved to amend the resolution to insert "...a recommendation of plantings for screening on the South side of building..." Mr. Oda seconded the motion to amend the resolution. A voice vote resulted in a 4-0 vote to amend PC Resolution 20-08. Mrs. Franz moved to approve the request as amended. Mr. Oda seconded the motion. Roll call, Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Spoltman, Aye. Nay, None.

7. 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.

Mr. Schmiesing stated FC Resolution 21-08 is a follow up to the request by Mr. Oda to have 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 in Lockington, Ohio.

Mr. Oda moved to approve the letter of support. Mr. Bubp seconded the motion. Roll call, Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mr. Spoltman, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye; Nay, None. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote to approve the request for a letter of support.

OTHER BUSINESS

8. 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.

Chairman Spoltman stated Jared Spoltman, a student in the Piqua City School system was in the audience observing the Piqua Planning Commission for extra class credit, and thanked him for attending.

Mr. Schmiesing stated he was working on amendments to the code related to private garages and temporary special events signs, and would be forwarding a draft to the Planning Commission in the near future for review and comments.

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 7:26 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

RE: MONTHLY REPORT

The purpose of this material is to report on discussions, activities, and actions related to matters of interest to the Planning Commission.

The format of the report is intended to provide a quick summary of the aforementioned items by highlighting general information, legislation, and special projects that pertain to past, present, or future items of consideration by the Planning Commission.

While, the information presented in the report is intentionally concise and to the point, I would be happy to discuss any of these items in greater detail if the Commission so desires.

Sincerely,

Chris Schmiesing

Christopher W. Schmiesing
City Planner
MONTHLY REPORT

GENERAL INFORMATION

- Completed 2010 Decennial Census Local Update of Census Addresses Program work
- Initiated zoning permit purpose and process internal audit
- Researched and began developing code amendment text for private garage provisions and special event signs
- Presented Great Miami River Recreational Trail project to Southview Neighborhood Association
- Assisted Power System with securing professional services to conduct Power Plant Decommissioning Assessment Project
- Continued work with consultant on development of on-line permitting system via E-Gov software.
- Met with Chalmers and McMaken family representatives to discuss Lake Street right of way issue
- Conducted downtown sound system coordination meeting
- Assisted Power System with coordinating of electrical conduits between Main Street Streetscape and Hotel project
- Excavation next to Paul's Bar backfilled
April 7, 2008 City Commission Meeting

- Ordinance No. 8-08 – An ordinance enacting and adopting a supplement to the Code of Ordinances for the City of Piqua was given a first reading.

- Resolution No. R-45-08 – A Resolution authorizing the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the Miami County Park District for the design-build construction of a 3-mile section of bike trail from Lock 9 Park to Peterson Road was adopted.

- Resolution No. R-53-08 – A Resolution appointing two members to the Civil Citation Appeal Board was approved.

April 21, 2008 City Commission Meeting

- Ordinance No. 8-08 – An Ordinance enacting and adopting a supplement to the Code of Ordinances for the City of Piqua was given a second reading.

- Ordinance No. 12-08 – An Emergency Ordinance amending Section 94.36 of the Piqua Municipal Code defining prohibited acts was adopted.

May 5, 2008 City Commission Meeting

- Ordinance No. 8-08 – An Ordinance enacting and adopting a supplement to the Code of Ordinance for the City of Piqua was adopted.
No new info this month.

To view the final document in its entirety go visit www.planitpiqua.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submittal Date</th>
<th>Permit Intended Use</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Location Address</th>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4/3/2008</td>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>774 Gordon Street</td>
<td>Daniel Ingram</td>
<td>Daniel Ingram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4/7/2008</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>501 First Street</td>
<td>Richard Petty</td>
<td>Richard Petty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4/7/2008</td>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>818 Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Robert Lucky</td>
<td>Robert Lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4/7/2008</td>
<td>Apartment-Fire Damage</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>1433 Covington Ave.</td>
<td>Thomas Manson</td>
<td>Thomas Manson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4/7/2008</td>
<td>Addition to residence</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>602 Riverside Drive</td>
<td>Duane Penrod</td>
<td>Duane Penrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4/9/2008</td>
<td>Rental Business</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>1305 E. Ash Street</td>
<td>Aaron Rents, Inc.</td>
<td>Aaron Rents, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4/9/2008</td>
<td>Utility easement/driveway</td>
<td></td>
<td>4243 W US 36</td>
<td>PSC Crane &amp; Rigging</td>
<td>Choice One Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4/10/2008</td>
<td>Floral Sales in Parking Lot</td>
<td>$9,400</td>
<td>1510 Covington Ave.</td>
<td>Kroger Co (Thoms Jones)</td>
<td>Kroger Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4/15/2008</td>
<td>Cover Front Porch</td>
<td>$4,704</td>
<td>1046 Eleanor</td>
<td>Don Wagstaff</td>
<td>Howell Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4/21/2008</td>
<td>Addition to residence</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>808 McKinley Avenue</td>
<td>Tom Comer</td>
<td>Tom Comer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4/23/2008</td>
<td>Addition to residence</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>306 Glenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Barb Foster</td>
<td>Jim Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4/23/2008</td>
<td>Drainage -Sandel Subdivision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Lane</td>
<td>Dan Dodds</td>
<td>Dan Dodds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4/24/2008</td>
<td>Two-family Unit</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>2001-05 Navajo Trail</td>
<td>Madison Homes</td>
<td>David Zimmerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4/25/2008</td>
<td>Build Shed</td>
<td>$1,199</td>
<td>714 S. Wayne Street</td>
<td>Tracey Bowemaster</td>
<td>Tracey Bowemaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>1509 Amesbury Ct.</td>
<td>Phillip Mong</td>
<td>Phillip Mong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Submittal Date</td>
<td>Permit Intended Use</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Location Address</td>
<td>Owner Name</td>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4/29/2008</td>
<td>Concession Stand</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Street</td>
<td>Bowman Concession</td>
<td>Bowman Concessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5/5/2008</td>
<td>Restroom Renovations</td>
<td>$6,200.00</td>
<td>8801 Career Drive</td>
<td>Upper Valley JVS</td>
<td>Mark Wisemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5/5/2008</td>
<td>Addition to residence</td>
<td>$18,344</td>
<td>203 Maryville Lane</td>
<td>Kelly &amp; Cheryl Brown</td>
<td>Geg Arnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5/5/2008</td>
<td>Extend wrap around porch</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>1435 Covington Ave.</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Jim Wion/Bill Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5/6/2008</td>
<td>Construct ATM Machine</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>1302 E. Ash Street</td>
<td>Murphy Oil U.S.A.</td>
<td>One Point Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>5/6/2008</td>
<td>New SSA Office</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>Looney Road</td>
<td>Piqua SSA LLC</td>
<td>Piqua SSA LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5/6/2008</td>
<td>Upper/Lower Porch and door</td>
<td>$1,399</td>
<td>228 Gordon Street</td>
<td>Robert Price</td>
<td>Jim Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Submittal Date</td>
<td>Sign Type(s)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address: 1235</td>
<td>Owner Name: 1235</td>
<td>Applicant Name: 1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/8/2008</td>
<td>2 Wall Signs &amp; 2 Free Standing Signs</td>
<td>W. Water Street</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>O'Reilly Auto Parts</td>
<td>United Maier Signs Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/31/2008</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Staunton Street</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Chet &amp; Barbara Osbore</td>
<td>Crane Pumps &amp; Systems Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/5/2008</td>
<td>Wall Signs</td>
<td>East Ash Street</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>Aaron Rents Inc.</td>
<td>I.D&gt; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/19/2008</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>E... Ash Street</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Miami Valley Crossing</td>
<td>H &amp; R Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/20/2008</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>W. Ash Street</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Thrivent Financial</td>
<td>Quint Custom Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/20/2008</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Fox Drive</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Dan-Loc Express</td>
<td>Gerald Jawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/22/2008</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>N. Sunset Drive</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Domino's Pizza</td>
<td>Domino's Pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/13/2008</td>
<td>1 Wall &amp; 1 Freestanding Sign</td>
<td>W. Ash Street</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>LA TAN</td>
<td>Wilson Sign Co. Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/3/2008</td>
<td>Freestanding Sign</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>Lydia Koverman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/16/2008</td>
<td>1 Ground 2 wall, 2 Directional Signs</td>
<td>E. Ash Street</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>Sonic Drive In</td>
<td>Victory Signs &amp; Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/5/2008</td>
<td>Wall-Window Sign</td>
<td>N. Main Street</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Jostens</td>
<td>Quint Custom Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/5/2008</td>
<td>Wall-Window Sign</td>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Ken Henkaline</td>
<td>Quint Custom Signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MONTHLY REPORT
### DEMOLITION PERMITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submittal Date</th>
<th>Property being Demolished</th>
<th>Location Address</th>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/14/2008</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>823 Broadway</td>
<td>Robert Basye</td>
<td>Dave Crumpler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/18/2008</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>535 S. Main Street</td>
<td>Virginia Lawrence</td>
<td>John Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/14/2008</td>
<td>Remains of house that exploded</td>
<td>1007 Maple Street</td>
<td>Larissa Reaves</td>
<td>Angler Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/2/2008</td>
<td>Tear down garage</td>
<td>501 First Street</td>
<td>Richard Petty</td>
<td>Richard Petty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-16-208</td>
<td>Tear down garage</td>
<td>333 W. High Street</td>
<td>Jamieson &amp; Yannucci</td>
<td>Maplewood Excavating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/22/2008</td>
<td>Tear down garage</td>
<td>630 W. Water Street</td>
<td>Doug Henderson</td>
<td>Dick Crumpler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Remove building</td>
<td>107 S. Main Street Rear</td>
<td>Steve Watson</td>
<td>Dick Crumpler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION No. PC 22-08

WHEREAS, Russ and Melody Lawson, owners of 324 W. Ash Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit an Elderly Housing Facility special use, said use being located in an R-2 Two-family residential zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.023 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that a Elderly Housing Facility may be considered as a special use in the R-2 Two-family residential 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 ____________ 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>
May 7, 2008

Planning and Zoning
201 West Water St.
Piqua, OH 45356

ATT: Christopher W. Schmiesing

Dear Mr. Schmiesing,

Thank you for your response to our inquiry regarding a change to a special use of our residence under the present zoning.

Our goal is to use our home as a Non-Medical Elderly Housing Facility, or as defined under the Ohio code, an Adult Care Facility. The state of Ohio licenses and monitors these facilities. They define the facility in this way: "An adult care facility is a residence licensed or certified to provide a supervised living environment for unrelated adults, residents are not related to caregiver, eighteen years or older who have difficulty living independently but do not require 24-hour care."

Under the State of Ohio issued license the home may house 3 to 16 residents. Our plans at this time are to use 6 of the 7 bedrooms in the house for elderly residents, while retaining one for our personal use as we intend to continue living in the house also.

We can foresee no changes in the facility at the present and feel the change will make no change in the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,
Russ & Melody Lawson, Owners

[Signature]

RECEIVED
MAY 08 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name Leslie Melody Lawson Phone 615-7577
   Applicant's Address 324 W. Ash St, Piqua

2. Owner's Name Same 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) Parcel ID 74-006930
   B. Address 324 W. Ash St, Piqua

5. Existing zoning R2

6. Existing usage Residential + Bed & Breakfast

7. Proposed usage Non-medical Senior Adult Family Home

8. Proposed special usage Non-medical Senior Adult Family Home

9. No. of plot plans submitted (16 required UNLESS waived) No change in present facility or plot.

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    To allow us to use our residence as a non-medical senior adult boarding home for seniors who can no longer stay in their own homes

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 Leslie Lawson Date 5-7-08

Signature of Owner Melody G. Lawson Date 5-7-08

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 1/00,00 Date Fee Paid May 8, 2008

Receipt No. 10516 P.C. Res. No.

RECEIVED
MAY 8, 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 22-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Russ and Melody Lawson
Owner: Russ and Melody Lawson
Location: 324 W. Ash Street
Zoning: R-2 Two-family residential
Land Use
   Existing: Dwelling unit
   Proposed: Elderly Housing Facility; off-street parking
Request: To convert the use of the structure to a Non-Medical Elderly Housing Facility in accordance with State of Ohio Adult Care Facility requirements found in section 3722 of the Ohio Revised Code.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing dwelling unit use of the premises is a principal permitted use. The proposed Elderly Housing Facility is a special use in the R-2 district. The premise has previously been used for similar use activities. While it is not anticipated the proposed use will generate a significant volume of traffic or off-street demand, the property is situated on a corner lot with on-street parking available along both frontages and has some off-street parking available at the rear of the lot. The proposed use activity is described as being a “Non-Medical” facility, meaning skilled nursing services will not be provided and residents will be able to care for themselves with little or no assistance.

Before the can be converted the applicant will be required to have the building inspector inspect the premises to determine if any life safety issues (exit lights, means of egress, smoke detectors/fire suppression systems, etc...) need to be addressed prior to occupancy of the structure with the proposed use. This inspection is in addition to the State inspection requirements that occur as part of the Adult Care Facility licensing process.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a special use permit. The following highlights each of the criteria 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 intent of the R-2 district “...is to provide a sound housing mix...” and to include “…a maximum density of ten dwelling units per acre...” and recognize “...development other than single-family dwelling units.” This request is consistent with the stated intent of the R-2 zoning designation.

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 use will cause an increase in traffic, noise, odors, or any other objectionable conditions that could be detrimental to the neighborhood.

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

Staff Analysis: The proposed use represents a higher and more intense use of the property likely to produce an increase in property taxes and the like, and serves to diversify the housing stock within the neighborhood and the community as a whole. Both result in positive contributions to the local economy.

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

Staff Analysis: Aside from a small deficiency in the off-street parking provisions, this submittal conforms or will be required to conform to all applicable codes and regulations of the city.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This proposal is consistent with the strategies described in the Redevelopment and Housing chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, the adaptive reuse of a residential property, and the diversification of the housing stock and expansion of move down housing options are in concert with the strategies put forth in the Plan.

CONCLUSION

The proposed use will not alter the architecture or character of the existing improvements, nor will it affect any existing nonstandard use conditions found at this location.

The property is situated in a transitional area located between the more densely developed downtown urban core and neighborhoods with single, two, and multi family structures developed at a moderate density. Thus, the proposed increase in the intensity of the use at this location will be compatible the surrounding use development types.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve this request as submitted.
January 8, 2008

Leslie Lawson  
Ash Street Bed & Breakfast  
324 W. Ash Street  
Piqua, OH  45356

Re: Parcel N44-006930  
324 W. Ash Street

Dear Leslie:

In response to your inquiry concerning the proposed non-medical Senior Adult Family Home use of the above referenced property, I offer the following information from the City of Piqua zoning code for your reference.

The zoning designation of the subject parcel is R-2 Two-Family Residential. Within this zoning designation the zoning code definition of Elderly Housing Facilities - Residential developments specially designed to house retired and elderly persons... - is listed as a special use. This means that the necessary zoning and building permits to change the use of this property to an Elderly Housing Facility (non-medical Senior Adult Family Home) use may be issued subsequent to the Planning Commission authorizing the proposed special use.

To secure Planning Commission authorization of the proposed special use, complete and return the enclosed application form to this office with the applicable application fee, and include drawings that clearly and accurately depict the existing and proposed site and floor plan improvements. The submittals will then be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration at their next regularly scheduled meeting. Prior to the meeting the applicant and all adjacent property owners will be notified of the meeting time, date, and location, and advised of this opportunity to voice their concerns, support, or opposition regarding the request being made. Subsequent to the special use of the premises being authorized by the Planning Commission, the zoning and building permits necessary to allow the conversion of the premises in accordance with the authorized special use permit, may be secured.

Please do hesitate to contact if you have any questions concerning this communication.

Sincerely,

Christopher W. Schmiesing  
City Planner

Enc.
RESOLUTION No. PC 23-08

WHEREAS, Rick Rouse, on behalf of Daniel P. French, the owner of 212 Steele Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit a Building Services special use, said use being located in an B General Business zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.025 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that Building Services may be considered as a special use 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 [Name] 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 [Name], and the voting record on this motion is hereby recorded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Jim Oda</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Bupp</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: RR DESIGN INC dba Richard Rouse
   Applicant's Address: 405 Fox Dr
   Phone: 615-9530

2. Owner's Name: Daniel P French
   Owner's Address: 1127 N. Sunset Dr., Piqua
   Phone: 773-3420 ext 272

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: Lessee

4. Location of Special Use Permit request
   A. Legal description (lot No. or attach legal description)
   B. Address: 212 Steele Street

5. Existing zoning: B

6. Existing usage: WAREHOUSE

7. Proposed usage: 

8. Proposed special usage: BUILDING SERVICES

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

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    DOWN SIZING NEED LESS SPACE

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: Richard Rouse Date: 4/2/08
Signature of Owner: Daniel P French Date: 2 May 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 Paid: 5-5-08
Receipt No. 1803040       P.C. Res. No.

RECEIVED
MAY 05 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 23-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Rick Rouse
Owner: Daniel P. French
Location: 212 Steele Street
Zoning: B General Business
Land Use
   Existing: Warehouse; vacant lot
   Proposed: Building services (other similar use); off-street parking
Request: To use the building for a mold fabrication shop - a use similar to those listed as principal permitted uses in the subject zoning district - and to use the adjacent gravel vacant lot for off-street parking.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing warehouse use of the premises is a nonconforming use. The proposed fabrication shop use is one that is similar to the principal uses permitted in the B zoning district, in particular the Building Services use. It is not anticipated the proposed use will generate a significant volume of traffic, off-street parking demands, noise, odors, or any other objectionable conditions.

Before the building can be converted the applicant will be required to have the building inspector inspect the premises to determine if any life safety issues (exit lights, means of egress, smoke detectors/fire suppression systems, etc...) need to be addressed prior to occupancy of the structure with the proposed use.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a special use permit. The following highlights each of the criteria 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 intent of the B district “...is to provide an integrated collection of structures and uses designed to supply the majority of the daily needs of city residents.” While this use will not directly supply the residents of the community, it will supply businesses within the community with a product and service essential to their operations.

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 use will cause an increase in traffic, noise, odors, or any other objectionable conditions that could be detrimental to the neighborhood.

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

_Staff Analysis:_ The proposed use represents a higher and more intense use of the property likely to produce an increase in property and income taxes and the like, resulting in a positive contribution to the local economy.

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

_Staff Analysis:_ Aside from the non standard gravel parking surface, this submittal conforms or will be required to conform to all applicable codes and regulations of the city.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

This proposal is consistent with the goal and objectives and strategies described in the Redevelopment and Economic Development chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, the adaptive reuse of this building and the supporting of local business development are in concert with the Plan.

**CONCLUSION**

The proposed use will not negatively affect the surrounding properties.

The property is situated in a transitional area and is surrounded by commercial, industrial and residential use types. Thus, the intensity of the proposed use will be compatible the surrounding use development types.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission _approve_ this request as submitted.
RESOLUTION No. PC 24-08

WHEREAS, William Kennedy, on behalf of Carol Gaston, the owner of 1400 S. Main Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit a Used Oil Services special use, said use being located in an I-1 Light Industrial and I-2 Heavy Industrial zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.027 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that other uses similar to the principal permitted uses in the Light Industrial zoning district may be considered as a special use in the I-1 Light Industrial zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.028 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that Heavy Industry is permitted as a principal use in the I-2 Light Industrial 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 __________ 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>
May 7, 2008

City of Piqua
201 West Water Street
Piqua, OH 45356
Attn: Christopher Schmiesing

Re: Special Use Permit 1400 S. Main Street

Mr. Schmiesing,

Enclosed, please find a completed application for a Special Use Permit for 1400 S. Main Street in addition to a check for $100.00 to cover the cost of reviewing the application.

I would like to introduce RS Used Oil Services, Inc to your department by briefly describing our company operations.

RS has been in business for over 28 years with 13 current locations from Illinois to Texas, Nebraska to Ohio, collecting and recycling used motor oils from a vast customer base such as Jiffy Lube, JB Hunt, Union Pacific Railroad, etc. Our collection trucks leave out each morning making collections from our customers. These trucks arrive back at our facility and transfer the oil into storage tanks located inside secondary containment capable of holding over 110% of the largest tank volume. Once these storage tanks are filled, transport tankers remove the product for distribution to an end user. All of our operations comply with State, Federal, and Local Environmental regulations.

I trust this information will be helpful to the City of Piqua in making a decision in favor of our application.

I will be travelling out of the country from May 10, 2008 until May 19, 2008. If you need any additional information regarding this application, please contact Pam Harvey in our corporate office at 708-534-9300.

Sincerely,

William J. Kennedy
Director, Safety & Regulatory Compliance
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name: RS Used Oil Services
   Phone: 768-534-9300
   Applicant's Address: 25903 S. Riegelwood Road, IL 60449

2. Owner's Name: Carol Gaston
   Phone: 937-773-2585
   Owner's Address: 102 Fox, Piqua, OH

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: Renter

4. Location of Special Use Permit request:
   A. Legal description (Lot No. or attach legal description):
   B. Address: 1400 S. Main St.

5. Existing zoning: Industrial

6. Existing usage: Vacant

7. Proposed usage: Transportation/Storage of Used Oils

8. Proposed special usage: Used Oil Storage

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

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    To Install 3 - 20,000 Gallon Above-Ground
    Storage Tank Within Secondary Containment

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: 5/7/2008

Signature of Owner: [Signature] Date: 5/12/08

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: 5/13/08
Receipt No: 180322 P.C. Res. No: 

RECEIVED
MAY 13 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 24-08

GENERAL INFORMATION
Applicant: Carol Gaston
Owner: William Kennedy
Location: 1400 S. Main Street
Zoning: I-1 Light Industrial and I-2 Heavy Industrial
Land Use
   Existing: Contractor Office/Shop; Off-Street Parking Facility; Accessory Building
   Proposed: Transportation Terminal (other similar use); Off-Street Parking Facility; Accessory Building
Request: To use the premises for used oil storage and distribution - a use similar to those listed as principal permitted uses in the subject zoning district.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS
The existing contractor office/shop use of the premises is a principal permitted use. The proposed used oil storage and distribution use is one that is similar to the principal uses permitted in the I-1 and I-2 zoning districts, in particular the Transportation Terminal use. The premise has previously been used for similar use activities. It is not anticipated the proposed use will generate a significant volume of traffic, off-street parking demands, noise, odors, or any other objectionable conditions. Proposed improvements to the site include the installation of 3 - 20,000 gallon storage tanks complete with secondary containment provisions.

Before the tanks can be installed or the use of the premises converted, the applicant will be required to secure zoning and building permits to ensure planned improvements and existing conditions affecting life safety issues (exit lights, means of egress, smoke detectors/fire suppression systems, etc...) will be properly addressed. In addition, the nature of the use operation will be subject to certain State inspection and permitting/licensing requirements.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a special use permit. The following highlights each of the criteria 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 intent of the I-1 district “...is to provide for industrial uses with limited objectionable external effects in areas that are suitable for industrial development...” The intent of the I-2 district is much the same only recognizing to keep certain use activities “…isolated from residential uses.” The proposed use is consistent with the intent of each of these zoning districts.

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 surrounded by other industrial use types and will not negatively affect the adjacent property values, although the location of the property being on a primary entrance into the community may cause the appearance of the tanks and general cleanliness of the site to become an issue if these concerns are not addressed in a proactive manner.

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

Staff Analysis: The proposed use represents a higher and more intense use of the property likely to produce an increase in property and income taxes and the like, resulting in a positive contribution to the local economy.

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

Staff Analysis: Existing parking surface and maneuvering lane conditions are nonstandard and will continue as such. Otherwise, this submittal conforms or will be required to conform to all applicable codes and regulations of the city.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This proposal is consistent with the goal and objectives and strategies described in the Redevelopment and Economic Development chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, the adaptive reuse of this building and the reuse and or redevelopment of the existing industrial site are in concert with the Plan.

CONCLUSION

The proposed use will not negatively affect the surrounding properties. However, the obtrusiveness of the 20,000 gallon storage tanks may contribute negatively to the appearance of the landscape along this entrance into the community. Likewise, there is some concern regarding the possibility of the use operations resulting in a dirty film over the site and what the general cleanliness of the site will be like after a period of operation, and the proximity of the site to the Great Miami River should there ever be a tank failure.

Less the concerns raised above, the property is well sited for use activity proposed.
RECOMMENDATION

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

- A landscape plan prepared by a landscape architect licensed by the State of Ohio shall be provided as part of the submittals provided for the zoning permit. The plan shall provide a variety of plantings and other landscape improvements along the front and side lot lines of the property, said planting and landscape improvements designed and installed to partially screen the use of the site from view, and to enhance the overall appearance of the subject property and entrance corridor into the city.
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RESOLUTION No. PC 25-08

WHEREAS, Dale Sink, the owner of Inlot 2889 located on Cottage Avenue, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction one family dwelling unit principal use structure, said lot being located in an R-1 One-family residential zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.066 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that a special use permit may issued to allow the issuance of a building permit to permit the structural alteration of a premises which constitutes a nonstandard use and describes three criteria in addition to the special use criteria that shall be considered; 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 _____ 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: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 25-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Dale Sink
Owner: Dale Sink
Location: Inlot 2889
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential
Land Use
  Existing: Vacant Lot
  Proposed: One-family dwelling unit; private garage; gravel driveway
Request: To permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction of a one-family dwelling unit.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing platted lot is generally equal in depth and width to the dimensions of the lots found in this area. The front entrance to the proposed dwelling unit will be oriented towards the Manier Avenue frontage with the attached garage to be entered from the alley located along the west lot line.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a permit to allow the alteration of nonstandard lot. 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: The size and orientation of the proposed improvements will result in a very narrow 5 foot wide rear yard. Also, the orientation of the structure towards Manier Avenue results in the rear yard that faces the side of the neighboring house. While the overall footprint of the improvements will not result in a development
density all that different than what is typically found in the neighborhood, the size and positioning of the singular structure leaves little room for outdoor private space typically found in the rear yard of residential properties found in this neighborhood. While this outdoor space is not customarily considered when discussing the density of a development, the value of such a space is a factor that should be considered when contemplating what constitutes appropriate development of a nonstandard lot.

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

Staff Analysis: If the opportunity to develop this lot were refused one might argue that a hardship has been created. However, rejecting the request as submitted and requesting the re-submittal of a development plan that includes a house and garage and rear yard more consistent with what is typically found in this neighborhood would not be a hardship.

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

Staff Analysis: A one-family dwelling unit use is permissible as a principal permitted use in this district and an attached private garage and a driveway use are permissible in this district as accessory uses.

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, as currently proposed, may threaten the privacy afforded the rear yard space of the dwelling located immediately to the north. Likewise, the privacy of the occupants of the proposed structure may to a certain extent be sacrificed if the proposed improvements are developed with the rear of the house oriented towards and placed as close to the neighboring lot line as it is currently shown.

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: The proposed development includes a gravel driveway in a side yard. gravel driveways are only permitted in a rear yard. The proposed front and rear yard setbacks do not comply with the established code minimums.
Data For Parcel N44036290

Land Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel:</th>
<th>N44036290</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>RYAN MARY ANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>940 COTTAGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Actual Frontage</th>
<th>Effective Frontage</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Lot</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>6186</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$12,460.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Totals

- **Total Acres:** 0.142
- **Total Value:** $12,500.00

Copyright ©2007 Digital Data Technologies, Inc.
WHEREAS, Pat Kiser, on behalf of the owner of 1207 Gordon Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit to the reconstruction of an accessory structure with nonstandard use conditions, said lot being located in an R-1 One-family residential zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.066 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that a special use permit may issued to allow the issuance of a building permit to permit the structural alteration of a premises which constitutes a nonstandard use and describes three criteria in addition to the special use criteria that shall be considered; 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 ______________ 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>
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name: PAT KAISER  Phone: 937-216-9332
   Applicant's Address: P.O. Box 248 Cov, OH 45318

2. Owner's Name: CATHY LARGE  Phone: 273-4377
   Owner's Address: 1207 Gordon St

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: NONE

4. Location of Special Use Permit request
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description)
   B. Address: 1207 Gordon St

5. Existing zoning: S10 Single Family DwL Plat Lot

6. Existing usage: Single Family DwL Plat

7. Proposed usage: Single Family DwL

8. Proposed special usage: NON CONFORMING USE

9. No. of plot plans submitted (16 required UNLESS waived): 3

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:

    Lot is only 40' wide, lane to garage runs along house straight
    into old garage, lot is not wide enough to move garage elsewhere.

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: PAT KAISER  Date: MAY 20-08

Signature of Owner: CATHY LARGE  Date: MAY 20-08

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: 5-20-08

Receipt No. 180328  P.C. Res. No.

RECEIVED
MAY 20 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 26-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Pat Kiser
Owner: Cathy Large
Location: 1207 Gordon Street
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential
Land Use
  Existing: One-family dwelling unit; gravel driveway
  Proposed: One-family dwelling unit; detached private garage; gravel driveway
Request: To permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow for the construction of a detached private garage.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing lot is nonstandard. The proposed 24 foot by 16 foot will have a side yard setback of less than the three feet code would require to the south side lot line. The current gravel driveway is zero feet from the same side lot line. In fact, it extends beyond the lot line and appears to be shared with the neighboring property. The existing principal structure improvement is setback 12 feet from the south side lot line. The rear yard setback for the proposed structure is +/- 190 feet. The applicant states that there is not enough room to slide the garage to the north to maintain the required 3 foot side yard setback.

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: The proposed improvement will not cause the lot to become more developed than what is intended for this zoning district.

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

Staff Analysis: The use of the lot is not adversely affected by this request being denied.

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

Staff Analysis: A detached private garage use 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 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 policies of the city.

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

Staff Analysis: The existing and proposed nonstandard use conditions this development fail to conform to the applicable codes and regulations of the city.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

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

CONCLUSION

The depth of the lot affords the applicant ample opportunity to slide the proposed structure back and shift it away from the side lot line to maintain the 3 foot side yard setback requirement and still have sufficient maneuvering room to enter and exit the private garage.

RECOMMENDATION

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

- The detached private garage may be constructed provided the minimum applicable setbacks are maintained.
WHEREAS, Lavy Concrete Construction, on behalf of the owner of 610 S. Downing Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit the enlargement of an existing principal structure with a nonstandard use condition, said lot being located in an R-1 One-family residential zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.066 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that a special use permit may issued to allow the issuance of a building permit to permit the structural alteration of a premises which constitutes a nonstandard use and describes three criteria in addition to the special use criteria that shall be considered; 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 _________ 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: Land Concrete Co. Inc. Phone: 773-3863
   Applicant's Address: 1700 Commerce Dr., Piqua, OH

2. Owner's Name: Teena Crossner Phone: ____________
   Owner's Address: 952 New Haven Rd.

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: Contractor

4. Location of Special Use Permit request
   A. Legal description (Inplot No. or attach legal description): Lot 10, S. Downing
   B. Address: 10 S. Downing

5. Existing zoning: Front Porch

6. Existing usage: Front Porch

7. Proposed usage: New Front Porch

8. Proposed special usage: Because of Regulations

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

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    I do not have the required 6 ft. side yard for the zoning district

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: 5-20-08

Signature of Owner: Teena Crossner Date: 5/20/08

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 5-20-08

Receipt No. 180 329 P.C. Res. No. ____________
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 27-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Lavy Concrete
Owner: Teena Cissner
Location: 610 S. Downing Street
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential
Land Use
   Existing: One-family dwelling unit
   Proposed: One-family dwelling unit
Request: To permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow for the construction of an attached front porch.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing lot is nonstandard. The proposed 6 foot by 17 foot 3 inch porch will have side yard setbacks of less than the six feet the code requires.

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: The proposed improvement will not cause the lot to become more developed than what is intended for this zoning district.

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

Staff Analysis: The use of the lot is not adversely affected by this request being denied.

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

Staff Analysis: A front porch is permissible as an incidental use to the dwelling unit principal use of this lot.

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 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 policies of the city.

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

Staff Analysis: The existing and proposed nonstandard use conditions this development includes fail to conform to the 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 porch will not be a detriment to the neighborhood and, less the nonstandard side yard setbacks, is allowable.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve this request as submitted.
Lot Size
150' x 22.63'

17'3"
6'0"

13'4"
4'

1/8" = 1'0"
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name  Dale Sink  Phone 773-9581  call 313-2034
   Applicant's Address  6510 N. Rakestraw Rd  Covington, Ohio 45318

2. Owner's Name   Dale Sink  Phone 773-9581  call 313-2034
   Owner's Address  6510 N. Rakestraw Rd  Covington, Ohio 45318

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)  Unit 2889  Parcel 44-036-290
      Address
   B. Address

5. Existing zoning  Residential R1

6. Existing usage  Residential R1

7. Proposed usage  Residential Single Family Home

8. Proposed special usage  Variance for set back for new home

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

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:

     Request variance on set back from lot lines to accommodate new
     home on lot

I hereby certify that the proposed request is authorized by the "Owner of Record" and agree

Signature of Applicant  Dale Sink  Date 5-22-08

Signature of Owner  Dale Sink  Date 5-22-08

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%  Date Fec Paid  5-22-08

Receipt No. 180331  P.C. Rcs. No.

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
RESOLUTION No. PC 28-08

WHEREAS, Habitat For Humanity, on behalf of the owner of Inlot 3905 on Orr Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction of a family dwelling unit principal use structure, said lot being located in an R-1 One-family residential zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.066 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that a special use permit may be issued to allow the issuance of a building permit to permit the structural alteration of a premises which constitutes a nonstandard use and describes three criteria in addition to the special use criteria that shall be considered; 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 ________ 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>
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name: Habitat for Humanity of Miami County
   Phone: 931-332-3763
   Applicant's Address: 150 E. Race St, Toy, Ohio 45373

2. Owner's Name: Creekside Investments
   Phone: 937-778-0830
   Owner's Address: 8645 N County Rd 25A, Piqua, OH 45356

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: Purchase interest

4. Location of Special Use Permit request
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description): Lot 3906 in lot 3906 50
   B. Address: Orr Street, Piqua, Ohio

5. Existing zoning: Residential Lot

6. Existing usage: Residential Lot

7. Proposed usage: Residential Lot

8. Proposed special usage: Residential Lot

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

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    Build three bedroom house. Reduce setback on Grant Street to 35 feet. To be completed by 08/31/2008.

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: Queen Glasgow Date: 5/23/2008

Signature of Owner: Melissa Sly Date: 5/23/08

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 5-23-08

Receipt No. 180 3 32 P.C. Res. No.

RECEIVED
MAY 23' 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 28-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Habitat For Humanity
Owner: Habitat For Humanity
Location: Inlot 3905
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential

Land Use
   Existing: Vacant Lot
   Proposed: One-family dwelling unit; private garage; driveway
Request: To permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction of a one-family dwelling unit.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing platted lot is generally equal in depth and width to the dimensions of the lots found in this area. The front entrance to the proposed dwelling unit will be oriented towards the Orr Street frontage with the attached garage to be entered from the alley located along the west lot line.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a permit to allow the alteration of nonstandard lot. 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: The proposed improvements will result development density that is consistent, perhaps even less dense, than what is typically found in the neighborhood.
Staff Analysis: If the opportunity to develop this lot were refused one might argue that a hardship has been created.

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

Staff Analysis: A one-family dwelling unit use is permissible as a principal permitted use in this district and an attached private garage and a driveway use are permissible in this district as accessory uses.

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 not negatively affect the adjacent property values.

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: The information provided conforms to all applicable codes and regulations of the city and will be subject to the zoning and building permit review process.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This proposal is consistent with the goal and objectives and strategies described in the Land Use, Redevelopment, Housing, and Economic Development chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, the utilization of an existing platted lot for residential infill development in an established neighborhood already serviced by developed infrastructure.

This proposal is not consistent with the principles stated in the Plan with regards to infill development being complimentary with the character of the established neighborhood.

CONCLUSION

The development of this lot with the proposed one-family dwelling unit use would be a positive thing for the neighborhood, especially if the architecture of the proposed improvement is sensitive to the established character of the architecture found within the neighborhood. Not enough detail has been provided to know for certain if the architecture of the proposed structure will be complimentary of the surrounding properties.
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
Subject: PC Resolution 28-08

RECOMMENDATION

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

- Architectural plans prepared by an architect licensed in the State of Ohio shall be submitted with the zoning and building permit request for this project. Said plans shall include design elements that mimic the architectural styles and features of the existing structures found within the neighborhood.
RESOLUTION No. PC 29-08

WHEREAS, Habitat For Humanity, on behalf of the owner of Inlot 3906 on Orr Street, the subject parcel, has submitted a request to permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction of a one-family dwelling unit principal use structure, said lot being located in an R-1 One-family residential zoning district; and,

WHEREAS, section 154.066 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances states that a special use permit may issued to allow the issuance of a building permit to permit the structural alteration of a premises which constitutes a nonstandard use and describes three criteria in addition to the special use criteria that shall be considered; 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 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>
CITY OF PIQUA, OHIO

Application for Special Use Permit

1. Applicant's Name: Habitat for Humanitv of Miami County  Phone: 937-332-3763
   Applicant's Address: 150 E Race St, Troy, Ohio 45373

2. Owner's Name: Creekside Investments  Phone: 937-778-0830
   Owner's Address: 8645 N County Rd 25A, Piqua, OH 45356

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: Purchase interest

4. Location of Special Use Permit request:
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description): Lot 3906 in lot 3906 50
   B. Address: Orr Street, Piqua, Ohio

5. Existing zoning: Residential Lot

6. Existing usage: Residential Lot

7. Proposed usage: Residential Lot

8. Proposed special usage: Residential Lot

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

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    Build three bedroom house. Reduce setback on Grant Street to 26 feet. To be completed by 08/31/2008.

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: 5/23/2008
Signature of Owner: ______________________________ Date: 5/23/08

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: 5-23-08
Receipt No. 180 332  P.C. Res. No.: 

RECEIVED
MAY 23' 2008
CITY OF PIQUA
DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 23, 2008
To: Planning Commission Members
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Subject: PC Resolution 29-08

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Habitat For Humanity
Owner: Habitat For Humanity
Location: Inlot 3906
Zoning: R-1 One-family Residential

Land Use
   Existing: Vacant Lot
   Proposed: One-family dwelling unit; private garage; driveway

Request: To permit the alteration of a nonstandard lot to allow the construction of a one-family dwelling unit.

DISCUSSION/FINDINGS

The existing platted lot is generally equal in depth and width to the dimensions of the lots found in this area. The front entrance to the proposed dwelling unit will be oriented towards the Orr Street frontage with the attached garage to be entered from the alley located along the west lot line.

The zoning code includes criteria to be given specific consideration when determining whether to authorize the issuance of a permit to allow the alteration of nonstandard lot. 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: The proposed improvements will result development density that is consistent, perhaps even less dense, than what is typically found in the neighborhood.
Degree of hardship upon the applicant which would be caused by failure to grant a permit?

Staff Analysis: If the opportunity to develop this lot were refused one might argue that a hardship has been created.

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

Staff Analysis: A one-family dwelling unit use is permissible as a principal permitted use in this district and an attached private garage and a driveway use are permissible in this district as accessory uses.

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 not negatively affect the adjacent property values.

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: The information provided conforms to all applicable codes and regulations of the city and will be subject to the zoning and building permit review process.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This proposal is consistent with the goal and objectives and strategies described in the Land Use, Redevelopment, Hosing, and Economic Development chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, the utilization of an existing platted lot for residential infill development in an established neighborhood already serviced by developed infrastructure.

This proposal is not consistent with the principles stated in the Plan with regards to infill development being complimentary with the character of the established neighborhood.

CONCLUSION

The development of this lot with the proposed one-family dwelling unit use would be a positive thing for the neighborhood, especially if the architecture of the proposed improvement is sensitive to the established character of the architecture found within the neighborhood. Not enough detail has been provided to know for certain if the architecture of the proposed structure will be complimentary of the surrounding properties.
RECOMMENDATION

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

- Architectural plans prepared by an architect licensed in the State of Ohio shall be submitted with the zoning and building permit request for this project. Said plans shall include design elements that mimic the architectural styles and features of the existing structures found within the neighborhood.
May 23, 2008

To: Planning Commission Members

The supporting documents information included in the packet for Resolution 30-08, 31-08, and 32-08 represents the original draft of each proposed amendment. We continue to receive feedback on each of these proposals. Therefore, I will wait until all feedback is in and present the comments received, and any recommended amendments to the draft as a result thereof, at the June 3, 2008 meeting.

Chris Schmiesing

Christopher W. Schmiesing
City Planner
City of Piqua
WHEREAS, the City Commission, has submitted a request to amend the zoning chapter of the codified ordinances to modify code provisions pertaining to the allowable height, area, and location for an accessory structure; and,

WHEREAS, sections 154.141 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for considering an amendment to the zoning code; 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 as Exhibit 'A', 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>
WHEREAS, the City Commission, has submitted a request to amend the zoning chapter of the codified ordinances to modify code provisions pertaining to the allowable number, area, and type of signs for a special event; and,

WHEREAS, sections 154.141 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for considering an amendment to the zoning code; 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 as Exhibit ‘A’, 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>
MEMORANDUM

May 14, 2008

To: City Commission
   Planning Commission

Cc: Fred Enderle, City Manager

From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner

Re: Proposed Amendments to Zoning Code

Included with this memo you will find two separate documents that outline proposed amendments to the adopted community standards. Each of these proposals originated with a request from members of the City Commission that we take a look at two areas of concern. The two items include, certain issues pertaining to the size, location, and appearance of private garages, and limitations on special event signage. Each document defines the issues, describes the amendment objective, outlines a set of guiding principles used in drafting the proposed amendment text, and provides a draft of the general amendments to the text that are being proposed.

Please take a moment to review each of the proposals and provide us with your feedback so that we may be certain we have properly identified the issues, objectives, and guiding principles, and forward a final draft of the proposed amendments that will be acceptable.

It would be desirable to receive all responses back by Monday, May 19th. This would allow us to stay on schedule with a targeted July adoption date for the proposed amendments.

Thank you.
Issues

Size – Current code provisions limit the maximum size for a private garage in a residential zoning district to 24 feet by 30 feet (720 square feet – or – roughly a 2 ½ car garage). On occasion this provision results in a structure that is unnecessarily smaller than what is deemed desirable by the lot owner.

Location – Current code provisions define a private garage as an accessory structure, and an accessory structure as any structure detached from the principal building on the same lot. This results in detached private garages not being permissible on lots that do not include a principal structure when, in some instances, this may not be objectionable.

Appearance – Current code provisions restrict the height of a private garage to 15 feet from the finish grade to the mid-point of the gable end of the roof. Because the roof system of a private garage is often manipulated to maximize attic storage and still comply with the height restriction, private garages sometimes end up with roof lines that are out of character with the appearance of the principal structure. Current code provisions also provide no guidance concerning the minimum acceptable appearance of a private garage. As a result, detached private garages constructed with finish materials that contrast sharply with the materials used to finish the principal structure, often result in objections and complaints from neighbors.

Objective

The objective of this amendment is to update the current code provisions pertaining to size and location restrictions, to allow for an increase in the maximum size permissible for a private garage and/or the placement of a private garage on a lot with no principal structure present, when either or both are warranted by the prevailing characteristics of the subject lot and the surrounding area; and, to add code provisions prescribing the minimum appearance standards for a private garage.

Principles

A private garage should be of a height and size that is proportionately smaller than the principal structure to which the private garage is accessory to, and the orientation and placement of the private garage should reinforce its purpose as being incidental and subordinate to the existing or any possible future - principal use/structure constructed on the same lot.

The appearance of a private garage should be congruent with any existing principal structure improvement on the same lot, and respectful of the period and style of the dominate architecture typically found within the neighborhood concerned.
PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS

Residential Private Garages

**Code Amendments**

The code amendments necessary to satisfy the aforementioned issues in a manner that is consistent with the objective and principles described include the following **insertions** or deletions to the text of the code sections indicated.

§ 154.005 DEFINITIONS.

ACCESSORY BUILDING. **See ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, as defined in this section.** An open or enclosed accessory structure with a roof system supported by columns or walls.

GARAGE, PRIVATE. An accessory building or portion of a main building **with a connecting driveway providing access to or from a street or alley improvement,** designed or used for the storage or minor repair or maintenance of motor driven vehicles, boats, and similar vehicles or other personal property owned by, licensed to, or used by the **owner of the lot or the occupant** of the building to which it is accessory. The maximum size for a private garage shall be 24 feet by 30 feet in R-1, R-1A and R-1AA districts.

STRUCTURE HEIGHT. The vertical dimension measured from the average grade to the highest point of the structure, **or in the case of a building, the mid-point of the roof system (See § 154.005 Exhibit A).** The height of a stepped or terraced structure shall be the maximum height of any segment of the structure.

LOT LINE. Shall be as follows:

1. **FRONT LOT LINE.** In the case of an interior lot, that line separating the lot from the street. In the case of a corner lot or through lot, that line separating the lot from either street. **In the case of a lot with alley frontage and no street frontage, that line separating the lot from the alley.** See Exhibit C at the end of this section.

2. **REAR LOT LINE.** That lot line opposite the front lot line. In the case of a lot pointed at the rear, the REAR LOT LINE shall be an imaginary line parallel to the front lot line, not less than ten feet long, lying furthest from the front lot line and wholly within the lot. In the case of a corner lot, the REAR LOT LINE is established based upon the orientation of the house. See Exhibit C at the end of this section.

3. **SIDE LOT LINE.** Any lot line other than the front lot line or rear lot line. A SIDE LOT LINE separating a lot from a street is a side street lot line. A SIDE LOT LINE separating a lot from another lot or lots is an interior SIDE LOT LINE. See Exhibit C at the end of this section.

§ 154.020 R-1AA ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; § 154.021 R-1A ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; § 154.022 R-1 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; § 154.023 R-2 TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; § 154.024 R-3 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; § 154.024 R-3 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

(D) **Special uses.**

(____) Residential uses.

(____) **Private Garages not accessory to a principal structure**

(G) **Height and area regulations.**
(a) Accessory buildings within the (insert district name here) shall be regulated in conformance with the provisions of § 154.121.

(b) Accessory buildings not a part of the main structure may be located in the required rear yard, but these accessory buildings shall not be nearer than three feet to any side or rear lot line, nor more than 15 feet in height. A garage which is entered from an alley shall not be located closer than ten feet from the property line.

§ 154.025 B GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT; § 154.026 CBD CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT.

(G) Height and area regulations.

( ) Accessory buildings. Accessory buildings within the (insert district name here) shall be regulated in conformance with the provisions of § 154.121.

§ 154.121 CORNER LOT ACCESSORY BUILDINGS.

On a corner lot, accessory buildings within 25 feet of a residential lot shall maintain a minimum setback from the lot line equal to the required front yard of the residential lot. In the case of a narrow lot where compliance would be impractical, the Board of Appeals may grant a variance in the setback requirement, an accessory building shall not be nearer than three feet to the side lot line not less than ten feet to the rear lot line of the lot on which it is located.

(A) Accessory buildings shall conform to the general height and area regulations of the district in which the structure is located, unless otherwise specifically stated in this code.

(B) Accessory buildings accessory to a dwelling unit shall be permitted as follows:

(1) Location. The lot on which the accessory building is to be constructed is contiguous to an improved public street. Accessory buildings shall only be permitted in the rear yard, unless attached to the principal structure by a breezeway or a similar unenclosed structure, in which case the accessory building may be permitted in a side or rear yard.

(2) Setback. Accessory buildings permitted in the rear yard and less than 1,000 square feet in gross ground floor area shall be no closer to any side or rear lot line than three feet. Accessory buildings permitted in the rear yard and with a gross ground floor area of 1,000 square feet or more shall be no closer to any side or rear lot line than six feet. Accessory buildings permitted in a side yard shall conform to the front, side and rear yard requirements of the principal structure. When the use of the accessory building is a private garage, the side of the private garage to which the driveway provides entry into the structure, shall
be no closer to any lot line than ten feet. No accessory building shall be closer to any principal structure than ten feet or closer to any other accessory building than five feet.

(3) Area. An accessory building shall be permitted a gross ground floor area up to 720 square feet and the gross ground floor area may increase up to a maximum of the lesser of 50% of the gross area of the ground floor of the principal structure to which it is accessory or 50% of the gross area of the rear yard.

(4) Height. An accessory building shall be permitted a structure height up to 15 feet and the structure height may increase up to a maximum of 80% of the structure height of the principal structure to which it is accessory.

(5) Number. The maximum number accessory buildings permitted on a single lot shall be limited to three with no more than one accessory building to be occupied by a private garage accessory use.

(6) Design. All accessory buildings with a gross ground floor area greater than 200 square feet shall be designed and constructed to be a permanent structure that is uniform in appearance with the style and finishes of the principal structure, more specifically as follows:

(a) The slope and style of the roof system of the accessory building shall to be equal the slope and style of the principal structure.

(b) The roofing materials on the accessory structure shall be equal to the roofing materials on the principal structure.

(c) The siding materials on the accessory structure shall be equal to any of the siding materials on the principal structure.

(d) The material to be used for any accessory structure with a ground floor constructed on compacted sub-grade soil or aggregate materials shall be portland cement concrete pavement.

(C) Accessory buildings not accessory to a principal use, and to be constructed on a lot contiguous to an improved public street, may be permitted by special use permit as follows:

(1) Use. The intended use of the accessory building is listed as a special use in the zoning district of the subject lot.
(2) Location. An accessory building may be permitted only in the required rear yard as established by the front, side and rear yard requirements of the principal structure.

(3) Setback. Accessory buildings permitted in the rear yard and less than 1,000 square feet in gross ground floor area shall be no closer to any side or rear lot line than three feet. Accessory buildings permitted in the rear yard and with a gross ground floor area of 1,000 square feet or more shall be no closer to any side or rear lot line than six feet. When the use of the accessory building is a private garage, the side of the private garage to which the driveway provides entry into the structure, shall be no closer to any lot line than ten feet. No accessory building shall be closer to any other accessory building than five feet.

(4) Area. An accessory building may be permitted a gross ground floor area up to 720 square feet and the gross ground floor area may be permitted to increase up to a maximum of the lesser of 50% of the average gross ground floor area of all of the principal structures located on the adjacent lots or 50% of the gross area of the rear yard.

(5) Height. An accessory building may be permitted a structure height up to 15 feet and the structure height may increase up to a maximum of 80% of the average structure height of all of the principal structures located on the adjacent lots.

(6) Number. The maximum number accessory buildings permitted on a single lot may be limited to three with no more than one accessory building to be occupied by a private garage accessory use.

(7) Design. All accessory buildings with a gross ground floor area greater than 200 square feet shall be designed and constructed to be a permanent structure that is uniform in appearance with the style and finishes of the principal structure, more specifically as follows:

(a) The slope and style of the roof system of the accessory building shall be similar to the slope and style of any of the roof systems of the principal structures found within the neighborhood.

(b) The roofing materials on the accessory structure shall be similar to any of the roofing materials on the principal structures found within the neighborhood.

(c) The siding materials on the accessory structure shall be similar to any of the siding materials on the principal structures found within the neighborhood.
(d) The material to be used for any accessory structure with a ground floor constructed on compacted sub-grade soil or aggregate materials shall be portland cement concrete pavement.

(D) Accessory buildings not accessory to a principal use, and to be constructed on a lot not contiguous to an improved public street, may be permitted by special use permit as follows:

(1) Use. The intended use of the accessory building is listed as a special use in the zoning district of the subject lot.

(2) Location. An accessory building may be permitted on a lot contiguous to an improved public alley.

(3) Setback. Accessory buildings permitted on the lot shall be no closer to the lot line adjoining the public alley right of way than 20 feet. Accessory buildings less than 1,000 square feet in gross ground floor area shall be no closer to any side or rear lot line than three feet. Accessory buildings permitted in the rear yard and with a gross ground floor area of 1,000 square feet or more shall be no closer to any side or rear lot line than six feet. When the use of the accessory building is a private garage, the side of the private garage to which the driveway provides entry into the structure, shall be no closer to any lot line than ten feet. No accessory building shall be closer to any other accessory building than five feet.

(4) Area. An accessory building may be permitted a gross ground floor area up to 720 square feet and the gross ground floor area may be permitted to increase up to a maximum of the lesser of 50% of the average gross ground floor area of all of the principal structures located on the adjacent lots or 50% of the gross area of the lot.

(5) Height. An accessory building may be permitted a structure height up to 15 feet and the structure height may increase up to a maximum of 80% of the average structure height of the principal structures located on the adjacent lots.

(6) Number. The maximum number accessory buildings permitted on a single lot may be limited to three with no more than one accessory building to be occupied by a private garage accessory use.

(7) Design. All accessory buildings with a gross ground floor area greater than 200 square feet shall be designed and constructed to be a permanent structure that is uniform in appearance with the style and finishes of the principal structures found within the neighborhood, more specifically as follows:
(a) The slope and style of the roof system of the accessory building shall be similar to the slope and style of any of the roof systems of the principal structures found within the neighborhood.

(b) The roofing materials on the accessory structure shall be similar to any of the roofing materials on the principal structures found within the neighborhood.

(c) The siding materials on the accessory structure shall be similar to any of the siding materials on the principal structures found within the neighborhood.

(d) The material to be used for any accessory structure with a ground floor constructed on compacted sub-grade soil or aggregate materials shall be portland cement concrete pavement.
Issues
Size – Current code provisions limit the maximum size for a temporary sign relative to the area of the lot on which it will be placed, regardless of the type of advertisement.

Number – Current code provisions limit the maximum number of temporary commercial message signs permissible relative to the frontage of the lot on which it will be placed.

Type – Current code provisions limit the types of signage permissible for off-premise commercial messages to ground signs and monument signs. In addition to ground and monument signs, banner, pole, and window signs are permissible for off-premises noncommercial messages.

According to at least one local business and at least one local not-for-profit agency, the temporary sign provisions cited above place unreasonable limits on their ability to effectively advertise special events.

Objective
The objective of this amendment is to update the current code provisions pertaining to the size, number, and type of temporary advertising signs to establish a process for considering and allowing more liberal temporary signage allowance for special events.

Principles
Public, institutional, or commercial special events may require a more generous signage allowance to effectively promote, communicate, or advertise the unique qualities of the event.

Poorly designed or improperly placed temporary signs can have a significant negative effect on the aesthetics of a community and compromise the general safety of the public.

An inordinate number and/or excessive display of temporary signs, and the nonpermanent qualities of a temporary sign can cause a blighting influence on a neighborhood or locale and foster a negative image of the community.

Such special event sign allowance should be limited to events that occur not more than two times per year, do not run for more than a set number of consecutive days, and should be subject to an administrative permit process.
Code Amendments
The code amendments necessary to satisfy the aforementioned issues in a manner that is consistent with the objective and principles described include the following proposed insertions or deletions to the text of the code sections indicated.

§ 154.005 DEFINITIONS.

PERMANENT. A period of more than 180 consecutive days, unless otherwise specifically stated in this chapter.

SPECIAL EVENT. A particular or unique happening or occurrence that is open or available to the public.

TEMPORARY. A period of 180 consecutive days or less, unless otherwise specifically stated in this chapter.

§ 154.108 SPECIAL EVENT SIGNS.

(A) Intent. The intent of this section is to recognize the rights of an individual to display noncommercial messages protected by the First Amendment, to recognize the individual or entity who desires to display a commercial message in conjunction with a permitted land use, to recognize the need for special event signs to sometimes exceed typical time, place, and manner limitations allowing certain temporary sign types for these purposes. It is further intended to recognize the negative affect oversized and misplaced signs can have on the attractiveness of a community, including the deterioration of the natural environment, the clutter signs contribute to the landscape, the distractions and obstructions this sign type may cause to pedestrians and motorists alike, and the hazards that the aforementioned concerns may cause. Thus, this section is intended to establish regulations that allow special event signs without their becoming a nuisance to the community.

(B) Permitted special event sign types. Any of the temporary sign types indicated, with a message type the same as the message type heading under which the sign type is listed, shall be permitted as an accessory use to a lawfully established principal, special or nonconforming use conducted on the premise, subject to the limitations included in this code.

(1) Noncommercial message.

(a) Off-premise or on-premise.

1. Banner sign.
2. Ground sign.

3. Monument sign.

4. Pole sign.

5. Window sign.

6. Trailer sign.

(2) Commercial message.

(a) Off-premise or on-premise.

1. Banner sign.

2. Ground sign.

3. Monument sign.

4. Pole sign.

5. Window sign.

6. Trailer sign.

(C) Height, area, and setback regulations.

(1) General requirements for special event signs.

(a) The height, area, and setbacks of a special event signs shall be unrestricted, less the requirement that the sign shall be in full compliance with § 154.097 General Requirements and the provisions of this section.

(D) Other regulations.

(1) Location.

(a) Special event signs shall be permitted on the building face or in the yard adjacent to any building elevation facing a street, parking lot, drive through lane, or service drive, subject to the provisions established by this section of the code and provided the sign face is oriented towards the same street, parking lot, drive through lane, or service drive to which it is adjacent.

(2) Number.
(a) The maximum allowable number of special event signs shall be
unrestricted, less the requirement that the sign shall be in full compliance with §
154.097 General Requirements and the provisions of this section.

(3) Landscaping.

(a) None required for this sign type.

(4) Period of display.

(a) Special event signs may be displayed for a period of time not to
exceed 90 consecutive days not more than two times in any 12-month period,
provided 90 days has lapsed since the most recent past display of special event
signs at the same location.

(b) All special event signs shall be removed at such time when the
happening or occurrence the sign advertises is discontinued or the sign message
becomes obsolete.

Note: With the issuance of a permit being the only practical way to track the
frequency and duration of special event sign displays, it is proposed that the
special event sign type not be included under item 154.098(B)(2), the list of sign
types excluded from the permit requirement.
RESOLUTION No. PC 32-08

WHEREAS, the City Commission, has submitted a request to amend the zoning chapter of the codified ordinances to modify code provisions pertaining to minimum permit requirements and restoration standards for demolition projects; and,

WHEREAS, sections 154.141 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for considering an amendment to the zoning code; 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 as Exhibit 'A', 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>
MEMORANDUM

To: City Commission
   Planning Commission
Cc: Fred Enderle, City Manager
From: Chris Schmiesing, City Planner
Re: Proposed Amendments to Zoning Code

May 22, 2008

Included with this memo you will find a document that outlines a proposed amendment to the adopted community standards. The proposal originates with a request from the City Commission to address a current deficiency in our code as it relates to demolition projects. Currently the code is silent concerning permitting and restoration standards for demolition projects. The material provided with this document defines the issues, describes the amendment objective, outlines a set of guiding principles used in drafting the proposed amendment text, and provides a draft of the general amendments to the text that are being proposed.

Please take a moment to review the proposal and provide us with your feedback so that we may be certain we have properly identified the issues, objectives, and guiding principles, and to ensure that we forward a final draft of the proposed amendment that will be acceptable.

This item will be placed on the June 3rd Planning Commission meeting agenda. Prior to this date, please forward to us your feedback so we may incorporate the comments received into the final document as necessary.

Thank you.
Issues

Permit Requirement - A demolition permit requirement is included on the adopted fee schedule, however, current code provisions are silent regarding specific demolition permit requirements.

Minimum Standards – Current code provisions provide no guidance on the removal of incidental or accessory structures or improvements related to the structure being demolished, nor do they provide the minimum level of security or safety features to be maintained during the completion of the work, nor do they provide the minimum standards for the level of restoration expected upon the completion of the work.

Performance of Work – Current code provisions do not include performance bond or other surety requirements that ensure the completion of the work once it is started.

Objective

The objective of this amendment is to add provisions to the adopted community standards that require a permit and performance bond prior to commencing with demolition projects and to describe the minimum acceptable security, safety and restoration measures to be included in the scope of the demolition work.

Principles

Certain minimum safety and security provisions designed to prevent unnecessary danger to the public are necessary during the completion of demolition activity.

A partially completed demolition project is likely to have a negative effect on the general welfare of the community and or create unsafe conditions that warrant a performance bond or other surety requirement to ensure the completion of a demolition projects.

Minimum restoration standards applicable to and designed to prevent a demolition site from becoming a blighting influence and or a public nuisance should be established within the adopted community standards.
Proposed Code Amendments

The following proposed insertions or deletions to the text of the code sections indicated below provide proposed Permitting and Restoration Standards for demolition projects.

Note: The current content of section 154.127 of the supplemental regulation portion of the zoning chapter is obsolete. The issue of where it is acceptable and not acceptable to maintain a septic tank or well, and any minimum lot size requirements applicable thereto, are addressed in the plumbing and health codes. Therefore, the availability of this section number, and its being under the supplemental regulations heading, made this as logical location as any to insert the proposed amendment text.

SUPPLEMENTAL REGULATIONS

§ 154.120 INTENT.

The requirements and regulations of this section shall be applicable to all zoning districts within the city unless otherwise specified.

('97 Code, § 150.800) [Ord. 42-96, passed 9-17-96]

§ 154.127 SEPTIC TANKS OR WELLS. DEMOLITION STANDARDS; PERMIT REQUIREMENT.

Any residential construction utilizing wells and septic tanks shall be situated on a lot having a minimum site area of 1.5 acres. Use of septic tanks and wells shall be subject to the regulations of the Plumbing Code.

This section shall explain the applicable standards for demolition work and the procedure, process, and requirements to obtain a demolition permit within the city.

(A) Downtown Historic District. Demolitions within the Downtown Historic District requires an approved certificate of appropriateness. Said certificate of appropriateness shall be issued in compliance with §§ 152.01 through 152.08 prior to the commencement of any demolition within the Downtown Historic District for which a demolition permit issued in accordance with this section is still necessary.

(B) Demolition Permit Required. A demolition permit issued by the enforcing official shall be required for every demolition of any structure in excess of 200 square feet in area. Every application for a demolition permit shall include reasons for demolition, a site plan and such other documentation as may be necessary.

(1) Site Plan. A site plan, containing the following information at a minimum, shall be provided:

(a) The location and dimensions of all structures on the lot.
(b) Property boundaries and dimensions, including distances from other structures and or lot lines to the structure or structures to be demolished.

(c) Prominent natural features, landscaping, or other physical improvements found on the lot.

(d) Planned staging areas, equipment parking, and or dumpster locations.

(e) The location of all utilities and the disconnection and disposition thereof.

(f) An explanation of the purpose for the demolition project and a statement regarding the intended use of the vacated site.

(g) The natural features, landscaping, structures, or other physical improvements to be demolished and the intended clean-up and restoration of the site, including but not limited to the work items required to satisfy the following minimum demolition and restoration standards:

1. Excavation of all footers, foundations, slabs and service sidewalks incidental to the building being demolished.

2. Placement of compacted backfill in openings or excavations and grading thereof to match the existing surrounding surface contours.

3. Placement of six inches of topsoil over all backfilled or disturbed areas.

4. Placement of grass seed and mulching over all backfilled or disturbed areas covered with topsoil.

5. Placement of erosion control as deemed necessary by the enforcing official.

6. Placement of fence or other safety precautions to be taken to secure the demolition site, as deemed necessary by the enforcing official.

(h) The disposal location for the demolition debris.

(2) Permit Application. A permit application or other supporting documentation, containing the following information at a minimum, shall be provided:

(a) Anticipated start date and completion date for the demolition activity.

(b) Evidence that all taxes and utility bills are paid in full, as deemed necessary by the enforcing official.

(c) Any other information that, as deemed necessary by the enforcing official, to completely explain the proposed demolition.
(3) **License and Bond or Other Surety.** Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the owner, agent or person with control of the property subject to demolition shall execute a license provided by the city, granting to the city the right to enter the property. The license shall permit the city to correct or eliminate any unsafe condition or conditions at the demolition site before, during and after the demolition. The license granted by the applicant shall further provide that the city shall have the sole right to determine if a condition or conditions are unsafe. The license shall further include an agreement providing that the owner, agent or person with control of the property subject to demolition shall indemnify the city for its cost to correct or eliminate the unsafe condition or conditions. The agreement shall provide that the indemnification may be from the performance bond, cash deposit or other surety the owner, agent or person with control of the property subject to demolition shall post with the city to assure the city that the demolition work will proceed as permitted. The value of the surety shall not exceed the cost associated with the demolition and site restoration, as determined by a detailed estimate to be provided by the owner, agent or person with control of the property subject to demolition. Provided the enforcing official finds the estimate to be a reasonable estimation of the gross costs anticipated to complete the demolition and restoration project. The terms of the surety shall provide that the city may retain or claim the surety proceeds if the permit holder fails to perform the demolition or restoration activities in accordance with the permit granted. The value of the surety may be reduced during the course of the demolition work, at the sole discretion of the enforcing official, if, in the estimation of the enforcing official, sufficient surety remains to assure completion of the demolition and site restoration activity.

(4) **Other Approvals or Regulations.** Other regulatory agency approvals necessary prior to the issuance of a demolition permit by the city, or the regulations of other agencies which are applicable and to be adhered to during the completion of any demolition work include but are not limited to those of the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Air Pollution Control Authority, Department of Health, Department of Public Works, and the like.

(5) **Permit Expiration.** Any demolition permit issued under this section shall expire 30 days from the date of issuance if the demolition has not commenced; or if demolition has commenced and the work is delayed for a period of more than 10 consecutive days and the enforcing official determines that the delays were unnecessary, or if demolition has commenced and the work continues for a period of more than 30 consecutive days beyond the anticipated completion date indicated on the permit application, or upon completion of the demolition work in accordance with the permit issued. The enforcing official may authorize one or more extensions of the permit provided the enforcing official determines that the owner, agent or person with control of the property subject to demolition has demonstrated the ability to complete the work in a timely and workmanlike manner.

(Ord. -08, passed - 2008)
§ 154.143 ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(A) Enforcing officer. The Public Works Director, City Planner is designated as the enforcing officer or enforcing official of this chapter. The enforcing officer is authorized to issue orders to prevent and stop violations, to enforce and administer the provisions of this chapter. The Public Works Director, City Planner may be assisted by any personnel as the City Manager may authorize.

Note: While the revision to the provision identifying the City Planner as the enforcing officer is not necessarily related to the demolition permitting and restoration issue, because there were other revisions needed in this section of the code, this seemed to be an appropriate opportunity to amend this item as well.

(B) Building Permits; General. No building or other structure shall be erected, moved, added to, enlarged, extended, converted, reconstructed, demolished, or structurally altered without the building permits incidental and necessary to the enforcement of this chapter having been issued by the enforcing officer, the issuance of which may be held subject to compliance with any other requirement described within the City of Piqua Codified Ordinances that is deemed applicable to the subject project by the enforcing official. No building permit shall be issued except in conformity with the provisions of this chapter. The enforcing official may issue a comprehensive or consolidated permit approving one or more element of work subject to the requirements of this chapter: or, if the enforcing official deems a permit unnecessary to ensure the compliance of one or more element of work subject to the requirements of this chapter, the enforcing official may waive the permit requirement.

(’97 Code, § 150.808) (Ord. 42-96, passed 9-17-96) Penalty, see § 154.999
May 23, 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, June 3, 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 22-08</td>
<td>LAWSON LESLIE R &amp; MELODY G</td>
<td>324 W ASH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-08</td>
<td>MIKOLAJEWSKI SAMUEL D</td>
<td>320 W ASH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-08</td>
<td>REED TIMOTHY H &amp; VICKI M</td>
<td>417 CALDWELL</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-08</td>
<td>FRANZEL DEVELOPMENT CORP</td>
<td>419 CALDWELL ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-08</td>
<td>HEDBERG LORI J</td>
<td>9130 BRUSH CREEK DR</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-08</td>
<td>GROVE DERRICK &amp; STEPHANIE</td>
<td>410 CALDWELL</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-08</td>
<td>HUEY SHAWN O</td>
<td>408 CALDWELL</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 23-08</td>
<td>ROUSE RICHARD J &amp; ROBERTA M</td>
<td>1609 ECHO LAKE DR</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 23-08</td>
<td>FRENCH DANIEL P</td>
<td>1127 N SUNSET DR</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 23-08</td>
<td>HENKALINE KENNETH M</td>
<td>1206 MAPLEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 23-08</td>
<td>AUTOMOTIVE ARMATURE WORKS INC</td>
<td>1015 W HIGH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 24-08</td>
<td>KENNEDY WILLIAM J</td>
<td>25903 S RIDGELAND AVE</td>
<td>MONEE IL 60449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 24-08</td>
<td>GASTON CAROL J</td>
<td>8075 GRANDVIEW DR</td>
<td>CELINA OH 45822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 24-08</td>
<td>BRICKER KENNETH &amp; JOYCE</td>
<td>350 W STATLER RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 24-08</td>
<td>SPRING HILL NURSERIES LLC</td>
<td>7602 HYLAND LN</td>
<td>GUILFORD IN 47022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 24-08</td>
<td>KINNISON LARRY S &amp; SUE</td>
<td>2 KRESTREL CT</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 24-08</td>
<td>MIAMI CONSERVANCY DIST</td>
<td>38 EAST MONUMENT</td>
<td>DAYTON OHIO 45401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 24-08</td>
<td>BLACKE CLIFFORD A</td>
<td>1675 E STATLER RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 25-08</td>
<td>BATES JEANIE JORDAN</td>
<td>222 W ASH ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 25-08</td>
<td>SINK DALE</td>
<td>7200 PIQUA-CLAYTON RD</td>
<td>COVINGTON OH 45318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 25-08</td>
<td>STANPER TERRY D &amp; TONY D</td>
<td>PO BOX 339</td>
<td>NORTH HAMPTON OH 45349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 25-08</td>
<td>RYAN MARY ANN</td>
<td>940 COTTAGE AVE</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 25-08</td>
<td>SULLENBERGER PROPERTIES</td>
<td>9829 N SPIKER RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 25-08</td>
<td>WARD KENNETH L &amp; LYVONNE M</td>
<td>913 BOAL AV</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 25-08</td>
<td>HIEGEL JAMES A</td>
<td>1006 S GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 26-08</td>
<td>LARGE CATHERINE A</td>
<td>1207 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 26-08</td>
<td>NIMETY LEWIS &amp; LASULA</td>
<td>726 HEEMI RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 26-08</td>
<td>STOVER ALLEN J</td>
<td>1205 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 26-08</td>
<td>HOWARD ROY F</td>
<td>1209 GORDON ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 26-08</td>
<td>KISER PAT</td>
<td>PO BOX 248</td>
<td>COVINGTON OH 45318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 27-08</td>
<td>LAVY CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION INC</td>
<td>1708 COMMERCE DR</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 27-08</td>
<td>CISSNER TEENA C</td>
<td>902 NEW HAVEN RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 27-08</td>
<td>PLEASANT JACK W &amp; SARAH L</td>
<td>606 S DOWNING ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 27-08</td>
<td>GRIFFITH SHERYL A TR (LC) @(3)</td>
<td>510 N WAYNE ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF MIAMI COUNTY</td>
<td>150 E RACE ST</td>
<td>TROY OH 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>LAWSON DAVID W</td>
<td>PO BOX 1601</td>
<td>TROY OH 45373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>TIPPS JOHANNA</td>
<td>500 ORR ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>BURROKER F ALMEDA</td>
<td>1830 W PARKWAY</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>WARNER LARRY L &amp; BONNIE S</td>
<td>802 FURLONG RD</td>
<td>LAURA OH 45337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>ED LIETTE REALTY</td>
<td>8470 N CTY RD 25A</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>BRIDGES JAMES T &amp; MARY ANN</td>
<td>426 GRANT ST</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 28-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>ROTH DANIELA TRUSTEE (LC &amp; GLADYS C TR)</td>
<td>1228 GARBY RD</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 29-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>MCGRAW CAROL S % CAROL MEIRING</td>
<td>10941 SCHENK RD</td>
<td>SIDNEY OH 45365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 29-08 AND 29-08</td>
<td>CREEKSIDE INVESTMENTS LTD</td>
<td>8645 N CO RD 25A</td>
<td>PIQUA OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLUTION/MAILING ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY/STATE/ZIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTIRE PACKET TO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRED ENDERLE</td>
<td>INTER-OFFICE MAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS SCHMIESING</td>
<td>INTER-OFFICE MAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
<td>REGULAR MAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-MEETING NOTICE TO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMY WELKER</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS BOEKE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY COMMISSION</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN BURCH</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBBIE STEIN</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRED ENDERLE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY BUMGARNER</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORNA SWISHER</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN KIM</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STACY WALL</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM ZECHMAN</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE WILCOX</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIQUA DAILY CALL</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYTON DAILY NEWS</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPTW</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIQUA TV5</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>