CALL TO ORDER
1. Chair Comments
2. Roll Call

OLD BUSINESS
3. Meeting Minutes
   - September 11, 2012 Meeting Minutes
   - October 9, 2012 Meeting Minutes

NEW BUSINESS
4. Resolution PC 21-12
   - A resolution to authorize a change to the current nonconforming use to allow a dwelling unit use at 827 W. North Street.

5. Resolution PC 22-12
   - A resolution to authorize a bed and breakfast special use at 1220 Park Avenue.

OTHER BUSINESS
6. Monthly Reports
7. Complete Streets Policy
   - A public hearing to present information and solicit public comment concerning the proposed City of Piqua Complete Streets Policy

ADJOURNMENT
8. 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: Jim Oda, Jean Franz, Mark Spoltman, and Mike Taylor
Members Absent: Brad Bubp (Arrived at 6:15 P.M)
Staff Members: Chris Schmiesing, Becky Cool
Attendees: Dr. Norman Armstrong, Georgia Armstrong, Mike Shoemaker

Moved by Mrs. Franz, seconded by Mr. Taylor to excuse Mr. Bubp from the September 11, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting. Voice vote, Mr. Taylor, Aye: Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye: and Mr. Spoltman, Aye. Nay, None. All were in favor of excusing Mr. Bubp.

MEETING MINUTES
Chairman Spoltman asked if there were additions, deletions or corrections to be made to the meeting minutes included in the agenda packet. Mr. Oda made a motion to approve the August 14, 2012 meeting minutes as submitted. Mrs. Franz. seconded the motion. Voice vote, Mr. Oda, Aye: Mr. Taylor, Aye: Mrs. Franz, Aye: Mr. Spoltman, Aye: Nay: None. A roll call vote resulted in a 4-0 vote in supporting the motion to approve the meeting minutes as submitted.

NEW BUSINESS

PC-17-12

A Resolution to recommend an amendment to the zoning code to include a Bed and Breakfast use as a special use in the R-1AA One Family Residential and R-1A one Family Residential zoning districts

Mr. Schmiesing stated there is a letter included in the Zoning Commission Packet from Dr. Norman & Georgia Armstrong requesting to amend the Zoning Code to provide an opportunity for them to operate a Bed & Breakfast at their residence at 1220 Park Avenue.
Mr. Schmiesing gave a brief overview of the request for the change in the zoning code at this time. There was discussion on the information presented by Mr. Schmiesing regarding a special use being required on an individual basis as to the activity being requested at that time.

This is contrary to the original proposal previously presented when the property was proposed for rezoning and the request was denied. Mr. Schmiesing suggested amending the zoning code to include a Bed and Breakfast as a special use in the R-1AA and R-1A zoning designation. Under the Special Use category each request would come before the Planning Commission to be considered on an individual basis. Mr. Oda asked if there is any particular difference having a Bed & Breakfast as a Special Use. Mr. Schmiesing explained the Bed & Breakfast standards, and the permissible use in the R-1AA & R-1A districts. This is related to an amendment to the Zoning code and not related to any particular property at this time.

Georgia Armstrong, 1220 Park Avenue, applicant came forward stating Piqua is so lucky to have a City Manager and City Planner wanting to improve the City of Piqua. Our home was built in 1887 and is over 12,000 square feet, said Ms. Armstrong. At this time they would like to have a Bed and Breakfast in their home located at 1220 Park Avenue. The home is very large, to much for just two people. Their plans are to utilize three of the bedrooms for guests. Parking will not be an issue as we have a very large parking area, stated Ms. Armstrong. Dr. Norman Armstrong, applicant came forward and commented on the number of deer that cross their property daily, and asked if the city could possibly help with controlling them in some way.

Mr. Oda asked if the applicants understood the difference between this request for an amendment to the Zoning Code versus their past request for the rezoning of their property.

Mr. Schmiesing stated the nature of the use would be a Special Use in the R-1AA and R-1A One-Family Residential zoning district. Mr. Schmiesing further explained the special use requirements.

Mrs. Armstrong commented fund raisers have been held at their home, and they had some very famous entertainers stay with them also. All of them have stated the home should be a Bed and Breakfast due to the size and location of the residence.

Chairman Spoltman stated he believes this is something that will benefit the community and feels this is a better fit than rezoning the property.

Ms. Franz stated she has stayed in several Bed & Breakfasts and enjoyed them very much. Parking will not be an issue with the Armstrong’s large parking area they have available, which is a plus for this type of business.

Mr. Taylor stated he is in favor of the amendment to allow the Bed & Breakfast in the R-AA and R-1A One-Family Residential zoning district as a Special Use.

Chairman Spoltman stated after approval by the Planning Commission this will go to the City Commission for their review. Mr. Schmiesing explained the next step in the process in making the amendment to the zoning code.
Public Comment

No one came forward to speak for or against PC 17-12.

After a brief discussion a motion was made by Mr. Oda. seconded by Mrs. Franz. to approve PC 17-12. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mr. Taylor, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; and Mr. Spoltman, Aye. A roll call vote resulted in a 5-0 vote.

PC-18-12

A Resolution to approve a Contractor Office and Shop use of an accessory structure located in a B General Business zoning district at 321 S. Roosevelt

Mr. Schmiesing gave a brief overview of the request explaining the applicant would like to conduct a business at the 321 S. Roosevelt location, which is Zoned B Business at this time. The proposed business will be located in the garage behind 321 S. Roosevelt. Access to the business will be off of the alley with several parking places for customers coming to the business. Mr. Schmiesing state we received one comment from an adjoining property owner of the restaurant, Mr. Bil Caserta, who voiced his concern over the this request due to the applicant constructing a deck over the front porch of the home recently, and questioning whether the proper permits had been secured first. Also additional improvements have been made in the garage without the proper permits, and he has had issues with parking in the parking lot in the rear of the business and his restaurant.

Mr. Shoemaker, applicant came forward and gave a brief explanation of the type of business he would be operating out of the garage, along with number of customers he anticipates, and the number of vehicles being there at one time. Mr. Shoemaker further stated he will be parking his vehicles in the garage area, and plans on improving the gravel parking area by adding asphalt. Mr. Shoemaker further stated he was not aware he needed to get a permit for the previous improvements he made. Mr. Schmiesing explained for future reference whenever there are any changes or alterations to a commercial structure a permit is required.

Mr. Oda asked what the office would consist of. Mr. Shoemaker indicated there would be two desks and chairs and a cabinet. Mr. Spoltman asked if all of the vehicles and trailer Mr. Shoemaker has that were work related would fit on his property. Mr. Shoemaker stated yes, and explained where he would be parking the vehicles and trailer. Mrs. Franz stated she was aware of the location of the property and thought the improvements were very nice. Mr. Spoltman asked what type of work Mr. Shoemaker did. Most of the work is installing siding and roofing stated Mr. Shoemaker. There was discussion concerning the use of the house as a dwelling, and the number of vehicles beside the work vehicles that would be located at the 321 S. Roosevelt address. Mr. Shoemaker explained. Mr. Schmiesing commented on the 7’ width on the side of the garage being the concrete slab covered by gravel as it is considered a nonstandard condition, and if altered would need to brought up to standards and explained what would need to be done.
Mr. Oda explained when moving in to a different zoning classification there are different restrictions that apply. Mr. Shoemaker stated he was a little confused on what is required of him at this time, and that he was only trying to improve the property.

Mr. Spoltman stated he has driven by and it is a nice looking property.

**Public Comment**

No one came forward to speak for or against PC 18-12.

Motion was made by Mr. Bubp, seconded by Mrs. Franz, to approve PC 18-12. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mr. Taylor, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye, Mr. Spoltman, Aye. A roll call vote resulted in a 5-0 vote.

**Monthly Reports - Projects**

Mr. Schmiesing stated the E. Ash Street Project is wrapping up nicely and should be open sometime in the near future ahead of the proposed scheduled date.

Mr. Schmiesing also commented we are waiting to hear back from the Ohio Department of Development on the draft plans for the Redevelopment Strategy for the Riverfront Project. Anc will keep the Board updated.

**Adjournment**

With no further business to conduct it was moved and seconded that the regular meeting be adjourned. With all those present in favor the regular meeting was adjourned at 6:40 P.M.
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: Jim Oda, Jean Franz, Mark Spoltman, Brad Bupb
Members Absent: Mike Taylor
Staff Members: Chris Schmiesing, Becky Cool, Amy Havenar
Attendees: Steve Reindel, Jim Sherry, Amber Crumrine, Gary Urasek

Moved by Mr. Oda, seconded by Mr. Bupb to excuse Mr. Taylor from the October 9, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting. Voice vote, Mr. Bupb, Aye: Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye: Mr. Spoltman, Aye. Nay, None.

Chairman Spoltman stated at this time he would like to change the order of the Planning Commission Agenda and move up PC 20-12 under New Business and the rest of the agenda up for consideration as he feels Resolution PC 19-12 might entail a lengthy discussion due to the nature of the item.

Moved by Mr. Oda, seconded by Mrs. Franz to change the order of the Planning Commission Agenda of October 9, 2012 as discussed. Voice vote, Mr. Bupb, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Oda, Aye; and Mr. Spoltman, Aye. Nay, None.

Monthly Reports - Projects
City Planner Chris Schmiesing stated the board members received an email with the monthly permit activity report, and asked if there were any questions regarding the report at this time.

County Road 25A Phase II Reconstruction
City Engineer Amy Havenar came forward and gave a brief overview of the project at this time. Phase II will be kicking off in July 2013 and will extend from Country Club Road to Looney Road, and will be typical of the last phase of construction. Greg Urasek of Kleingers & Associates passed out full sets of plans to the Board Members for review at this time.

Ms. Havenar stated that Mr. Schmiesing invited them to come and share their information. As in all capital improvements, they like to run them by the Planning Commission to make sure the vision and direction they are going is consistent with the Planning Commission vision, and they are following what was set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. The project total cost will be $3.5
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million with the city receiving a little over $2 million in Federal Grant funding, and receiving $950,000 in Issue 2 funding through the Ohio Public Works Commission. The remainder of the cost will be borne by the City of Piqua and the Miami County Engineers Office and be split 50/50 since part of the project is in the City, and part of it is in the County, stated Ms. Havenar. The project is scheduled to take about a year to complete but this will be an ODOT let project similar to Ash Street project. The project will consist of five lanes from Country Club Rd. going down to four lanes at Siedel Parkway, and three lanes west of Looney Road where it funnels down to the existing cross section it is now, stated Ms. Havenar.

Mr. Schmiesing asked Board Members to turn to sheet 78 in the plans that were passed out, were they can see the illustration and be able to follow along with the design as it is explained. Ms. Havenar stated traffic will be maintained and there will be one lane open each way during construction, but it will still be congested. There will be limited utility work done along with storm sewer and mains, with a four-foot tree lawn and a five-foot sidewalk the entire route of the project. There is a Phase III plan for 2015/2016, which picks up at Looney Rd. and goes out past Indian Ridge Drive and will complete the 25-A construction, stated Ms. Havenar.

Mr. Schmiesing stated he wanted to remind the Planning Commission the format is similar, as other capital improvement project just want to give you the opportunity to comment and ask questions. Mr. Schmiesing further stated there are comment sheets in the back of the room if anyone present would like to leave their comments.

Greg Urasek of Kleinger's & Associates presented a more detailed explanation of the project going thru the plans that were previously handed out.

There was a brief discussion and several questions were raised concerning the number of traffic lanes, the width of lanes, will construction be done on both lanes at same time, sidewalks, and tree plantings. Mr. Urasek answered all of the questions.

NEW BUSINESS
PC-20-12
A Resolution to recommend the zoning designation of 437 Kitt Street change from B General Business to R1 One-Family Residential

Mr. Schmiesing stated this is an item that was brought to us by the prospective buyer of the property who is having difficulty trying to get financing due to the zoning of the property at this time. This particular property has a zoning designation of B General Business and is a single-family residence and has never had a business type use in the location. This is a 100% residential unit and would like it to have it zoned an R-1 One-Family Residential.

Public Comment
Amber Crumrine current resident of 437 Kitt Street and owner came forward to answer Board members questions.

Mr. Schmiesing stated the request will go to the Piqua City Commission at their October 16, 2012 meeting for approval

Motion was made by Mr. Oda, seconded by Mrs. Franz to approve PC 20-12. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Buyp, Aye, Mrs. Franz, Aye, and Mr. Spoltman, Aye. Nay, None.
PC-19-12
A Resolution to recommend an amendment to the zoning code related to high-rise/highway oriented signage

Mr. Schmieszing stated in light of the AV system not working he provided a print out of a power point presentation that was given at a City Commission Work Session in September. Mr. Schmieszing gave a brief overview of the request for the change in the zoning code at this time. The owner of the property, Mr. Sherry reached out to the City Commission to express concern he had with the current sign code and the provisions in the code that prevented him from being able to replace the existing Paul Sherry high-rise sign out by the interstate at Exit 83 in Piqua.

Mr. Schmieszing went through the slides explaining the context. The first slide shows the existing current sign conditions as a detached sign with 1260 sq ft of sign, 90 ft. in height with a setback of 25 ft. and was permitted in 1997. This was permissible in the previous code as shown in the slide. The proposed sign area is 601 sq. ft., 90 ft. high, set back of 25 ft. and would be installed on the current existing poles. A permit request was received for this sign, but due to the current sign code provisions this request could not be processed. The next slide is an illustration of the proposed location of the sign as it relates to the properties affected further explaining the area.

The next slide is Sign Code Section 154.101 Permanent; Detached Signs with Mr. Schmieszing explaining the applicable language. The next slide explains Sign Code Section Section 154.096 Definitions and Exhibits and explains that a Billboard is an off-premise sign with a display area larger than the display area allowed for an off-premise sign listed as an authorized accessory use in a particular use group. Off-Premise Sign is a sign erected, maintained or used in the outdoor environment for the purpose of the display of commercial or noncommercial messages not appurtenant to the use of, products sold on, or the sale or lease of, the property on which it is displayed. Mr. Schmieszing stated it is his interpretation of the two definitions is the sign is a billboard, which in section 154.099, billboards is a prohibited sign type. So that made it impossible to consider it for a variance for the proposed sign. The next slide shows Sign Code Section 154.099 Prohibited Signs showing the signs that shall be prohibited unless specifically authorized by the provisions stated in 154.099 through 154.103, (E) Bill Board. The next slide shows the Sign Code Section 154.106 Nonconforming Signs and Structures, (2).

All signs that do not conform the standards of this subchapter shall be brought into conformity under any of the following conditions: (c) upon any alterations to the existing sign structure, including altering, rebuilding, enlarging, extending, or relocating. The repainting or re-facing of existing nonconforming signs shall not be considered an alteration as long as the re-facing complies with the general regulations section of this code. The Sign Code was reviewed by the Planning Commission, and several public meetings where held where business leaders and community members participated in the conversation. The Planning Commission and the City Commission approved the updates and the Sign Code was updated in 2006, stated Mr. Schmieszing. As a point of reference the code as it is currently written allows for a high-rise interstate sign within 1500 feet to be up to 200 sq. ft. and not to exceed 80 ft. in height. The next slide shows illustrations of other current interstate signs in area that existed before the current sign code was adopted in 2006. They include the Marathon Station on Rt. 36 East, Red Lobster, Rt. 36, Waffle House, Rt. 36 and Cracker Barrel Rt. 36, providing the size of each sign. Also the Home Depot Sign, LaQuinta Sign, and Speedway Sign explaining the sizes and the installation dates. Mr. Schmieszing provided information of several examples of sign standards and how the City of Piqua relates to other communities in the area including Sidney, Troy and Tipp City providing their sign code information compared to the City of Piqua's sign code. Other Non-Confirming Freestanding Signs in the area include Advanced Auto Parts and they are
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bringing it into code at this time, and the Papa Johns sign was damaged and they have not
requested to replace it at this time.

Mr. Schmiesing further stated the City Commission provided guidance to the staff expressing
their interest in accommodating the proposed sign at the Sherry property and directing staff to
formulate code language that would do that. Mr. Schmiesing highlighted and explained the
proposed amendments to the Sign Code.

Changes to be amended are listed in Sections: 154.005 Definitions “Lot” 154.096, Definitions
and Exhibits High-Rise/Highway Oriented Signs, 154.097 General Requirements (B) (8),
154.097 General Requirements (C) (5), 154.101 Permanent Detached Signs (C) (1), 154.097
General Requirements (2) (a) (5), 154.104 Computation of Height and Area (A) 2.

There was discussion on the information presented by Mr. Schmiesing regarding the proposed
changes by Board Members, with questions being answered by Mr. Schmiesing.

Public Comment
Jim Sherry, applicant came forward and asked if there were any questions for him at this time.
Mr. Oda asked what type of damage was done to the sign and why Mr. Sherry could not repair
the current sign. Mr. Sherry explained the damage that was done and reason it cannot be
repaired, further explaining the type and size of the sign he is proposing. Mr. Oda asked if Mr.
Sherry was in agreement with what Mr. Schmiesing presented and is proposing. Mr. Sherry
stated as long as it fits his sign type.

Steve Reindel, Wilshire Dr. Chairman of the Board of Zoning Appeals, stated almost half of the
requests that come before the BZA relate to sign variances, and noted that a Public Input
meeting was held in 2006 to establish the Sign Code for businesses and others with a lot of time
being put into the proposed changes. His concern is that the Planning Commission will be
making changes that will affect the rest of the City and would like them to consider the impact to
the Sign Code before adopting the proposed changes at this time.

Mr. Spoltman stated right now this cannot go to the BZA since it is a prohibited sign by the
current code. Mr. Spoltman is concerned that a lot of effort was put into the establishing the sign
code and for the most part it has been working quite well. This is a situation where if the
language were changed this sign would fit into a non-conforming use and could go before the
BZA is there room to work with the sign owner? Mr. Reindel stated there is always
consideration but in the past his point of view is because there has been a board of individuals
who spent a lot of time to develop the code, there has to be a very good reason to consider
having a variance for that particular sign type. Mr. Schmiesing further explained the role the
BZA plays in considering and granting variances.

Mr. Bubp asked if they are just modifying the existing zoning laws to accommodate this
particular sign, and is that something we want to do is that the only reason we are doing this is
so they can have the sign. It seems odd to modify the zoning regulations to accommodate a
sign, and the question is do we really want this sign. What does it mean to the City for future
properties up and down I-75 are we allowing the ability to have a Los Vegas strip of lighted
signs up and down I-75 when no other communities have that? Why do we want this sign? Mr.
Spoltman commented are we interested not in this particular sign, but in what changing the
code would allow. There was discussion concerning this type of sign, is it acceptable on a
leased lot and what and if there are going to be any changes now. In 2006 this type of sign was
not acceptable do we want it now, stated Mr. Bubp. Mr. Spoltman stated he agrees with Mr.
Bubp, but now this particular type of sign is prohibited. Mr. Schmiesing explained the way the
language currently describes a billboard or off-premise sign on a lot, makes it an off-premise sign, which makes it a billboard sign. The item was brought to the Planning Commission through the City Commission asking staff to review the sign code and see if it could be amended to accommodate the subject sign. Any amendment to the Sign Code would not only affect this sign on this property, but any other property that would meet the eligibility requirements in the future, stated Mr. Schmiesing. Mr. Bubp stated he has some major concern, not with the language, or the illumination, but with having more of this type of signs, why do we want these? Mr. Spoltman stated according to the chart that Mr. Schmiesing provided previously outlining the size and type of signs in other neighboring communities; this is way outside the community standards. Mrs. Franz commented that when the sign code was adopted it was set so that the community would never be embarrassed by signage.

Mr. Oda stated due to the restrictions in the code are there that many sites along I-75 that would meet the requirements? Mr. Schmiesing stated he did not know the exact number. Mr. Schmiesing provided several examples of action taken by the BZA on sign variances, in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011, with none in 2012 so far with most of the variances being denied. The BZA has been consistent in their role of enforcing the code as it was adopted, only granting variances when there are unique or peculiar circumstance that provided the basis to grant an exception, stated Mr. Schmiesing.

Mr. Spoltman asked Mr. Bubp if the issue with the lot definition was a problem, with Mr. Spoltman stating his personal issue was with the area as the other changes are reasonable. Mr. Oda stated he does not have any problem with the lot or the height either. Mr. Bubp stated as it currently stands there is no way that the sign could be put up today, with Mr. Schmiesing replying yes. Mr. Schmiesing asked if it would be possible to go through each change so they would have a better understanding of the changes in question, and proceeded to review the changes as suggested.

There was discussion regarding the sign code and the various changes including the 30-second time allotted for the moving sign among the other changes proposed.

The proposed changes are: Maximum Height- **90 feet**, Maximum Sign Area- **200 sq. ft. plus 10 sq. feet for each acre of lot greater than 10 acres, not to exceed 400 sq. feet**; Minimum Lot Area-N/A. Mr. Spoltman asked if this was agreeable with the BZA. Mr. Reinhold explained his concerns.

Mr. Sherry answered the questions that were posed to him previously. What he would be advertising on the sign, is the property owner/lease all the same. Mr. Sherry stated all he is trying to do is to replace the damaged 1200 ft. sign with a new state of the art sign that is one-half the square footage of the original sign. Mr. Sherry continued by further stating all he is trying to do is put up the most efficient state of the art sign that he can that is going to last the longest period of time in his business, and that is how he came up with the 600 sq. ft. If he goes smaller he would not be able to get his message across he feels.

Mr. Spoltman stated the Planning Commission is not being asked to consider just this one sign, but all signs. Mr. Sherry replied this will not only help grow his business, but it would also help the City of Piqua, noting that he would like to do things such as promote the Piqua-troy football game.

Mr. Oda asked if this passes, and if it also passes the City Commission would the 400 sq. ft. be enough? Mr. Sherry stated he did not know. If not he would leave it as it is, take his money and run and invest it somewhere else. Mr. Sherry also stated he agrees the 1200 sq. ft. is a little excessive.
There was additional discussion on what the goal is for the sign and Mr. Sherry voiced his concerns. Mr. Bubp voiced his concerns with the changes to the sign code. Mr. Sherry further stated he is here to grow his business, and have an awesome looking sign coming into the City of Piqua that all he is asking for.

Mr. Bubp voiced his concerns on the signage along I-75, and there was continued discussion regarding the sign. Mr. Sherry voiced his concerns about the size and the readability of the sign if the size was to be made smaller than his request of 600 sq. ft. Mr. Schmiesing gave a brief overview of typical sign size requirements as it relates to the conspicuity of the message relative to the travel speed of the vehicle.

Mr. Oda made a motion to recommend to the City Commission the changes in the Sign Code Ordinance to include the changes that were discussed previously and agreed upon by this body. Mr. Bubp seconded the motion, with voice vote approval all in were in favor of the modifications to PC 19-12. Mr. Spotman stated the modifications to PC 19-12 were approved.

Moved by Mr. Oda, seconded by Mr. Bubp to approve PC 19-12, as amended. Roll call vote, Mr. Oda, Aye; Mr. Bubp, Aye; Mrs. Franz, Aye; Mr. Spotman, Aye. Nay, None. Motion carried on a 4-0 vote to adopt PC 19-12, as amended.

PC 19-12 will be forwarded to the City Commission to be presented at their October 16, 2012 Regular City Commission Meeting.

**Adjournment**

With no further business to conduct it was moved and seconded that the regular meeting be adjourned. With all those present in favor the regular meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M.
RESOLUTION No. PC 21-12

WHEREAS, Jamie P. Rowley, owner of 827 W. North Street, in the City of Piqua, Ohio, has submitted a request to change the current nonconforming personal services use to a dwelling unit use; and,

WHEREAS, sections 154.060 of the City of Piqua Code of Ordinances provides the procedure for authorize the continuation of a nonconforming use; and,

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

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, board member __________________ hereby moves to recommend (approval or denial) of the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, and 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>
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Application for Zoning Change

1. Applicant’s Name ______________________ Phone ________
   Applicant’s Address ____________________________
   __________ Piqua Troy Rd __________ Troy OH 45373

2. Owner’s Name ______________________ Phone ________
   Owner’s Address ____________________________
   __________ Piqua Troy Rd __________ Troy OH 45373

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant __________

4. Location of Rezoning request
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description) ________
   B. Address __________ W. North St. ________

5. Existing zoning __________

6. Existing usage __________

7. Proposed zoning __________

8. Proposed usage __________

9. Is this “Request for Zoning” contingent upon annexation? Y ______ N ______

10. Describe the reason for the requested rezoning: ________
    ________
    ________
    ________

11. Has a Rezoning Request for this location been made before? Y ______ N ______
    If yes, give date of previous application ________

12. No. of site plans submitted (16 required UNLESS waived) ________

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 10/3/12

Signature of Owner __________________________ Date 10/3/12

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

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

$56.00 Fee paid ________ Date fee paid 10-2-12 ________

Receipt no. ________ P.C. Res. no. ________
RESOLUTION No. PC 22-12

WHEREAS, Dr. Norman Armstrong and Georgia Armstrong, owners of 1220 Park Avenue, in the City of Piqua, Ohio, has submitted a request to authorize a special bed and breakfast use of the subject property; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has studied the request, conducted a public hearing on the matter, and has established findings that indicate 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 recommend [approval or denial] of the request made, as described by this resolution, the testimony provided, and the documents attached hereto, and 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: Dr. Norman Armstrong
   Applicant's Address: 1220 Park Avenue, Piqua, OH 45356
   Phone: 937-216-8012

2. Owner's Name: Dr. Norman and Georgia Armstrong
   Owner's Address: 1220 Park Avenue, Piqua, OH 45356
   Phone: 937-216-8012

3. Type of legal interest held by applicant: Owner

4. Location of Special Use Permit request:
   A. Legal description (Inlot No. or attach legal description)
   B. Address: 1220 Park Avenue, Piqua, OH 45356

5. Existing zoning: R1AA

6. Existing usage: One-family residential

7. Proposed usage: Bed and Breakfast

8. Proposed special usage: Bed and Breakfast

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

10. Describe the reason for the requested special use:
    See attached letter

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: __________

Signature of Owner: ____________________ Date: 10-29-12

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: 10-29-12

Receipt No: 206676  P.C. Res. No: 22-12
October 29, 2012

To: City of Piqua Planning Commission

Subject: Bed and Breakfast Proposal

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing this letter to request being placed on the agenda for your December Planning Commission meeting. We are requesting that our lovely, historical home on 1220 Park Avenue located in Piqua be allowed to operate as a Bed and Breakfast. We are enclosing pictures of the house and property. Also, enclosed is a drawing from the Miami County Engineering Department outlining the boundaries of the 6.25 acres encompassing the estate.

We will not be able to attend the December meeting because we will be in Florida for a short time. If you have any questions for us concerning our desires and plans for the property, please feel free to contact us at 937-216-8012. If you feel there are too many conflicts presented at this meeting, we are requesting that you table the agenda and wait until we return to Piqua.

Thank you for allowing us to request a Bed and Breakfast proposal. We know this will be a positive agenda for the city of Piqua.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Norman Armstrong
Mrs. Georgia Armstrong

Dr. Norman Armstrong
Mrs. Georgia Armstrong
November 2, 2012

*** MEETING NOTICE ***

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

TIME: 6:00PM
DATE: Tuesday, November 13, 2012
LOCATION: Commission Chambers – 2nd Floor
Municipal Government Complex
201 W. Water Street

To view the Planning Commission packet in its entirety, visit http://www.piquoh.org/agenda_plan_comm.htm, or stop by the Development Office.

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

Chris Schmiesing
Christopher W. Schmiesing
City Planner
*** MEETING NOTICE ***

Please be advised that the City of Piqua Planning Commission will hold a meeting at the time and location stated below. It has been determined by this office that you may have an interest in an item on this meeting agenda (see enclosed meeting agenda). To view the Planning Commission packet in its entirety, visit http://www.piquaoh.org/agendaplancomm.htm or by visiting the Development Office.

TIME: 6:00 P.M.
DATE: Tuesday, November 13, 2012
LOCATION: Commission Chambers, Municipal Government Complex
201 W. Water Street

This is your opportunity to speak in favor of, or object to, the referenced item. If you desire to state your opinion concerning this matter and are 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 matter.

Christopher W. Schmiesing
City Planner

Enc.
# PLANNING COMMISSION
## NOVEMBER 13, 2012
### MAILING LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOLUTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY STATE ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC 21-12</td>
<td>JAMIE ROWLEY</td>
<td>4239 PIQUA TROY RD.</td>
<td>TROY, OH 45373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 21-12</td>
<td>JANET HARTLEY</td>
<td>819 W. NORTH ST.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 21-12</td>
<td>DOTTIE B LLC</td>
<td>606 ANN ST,</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 21-12</td>
<td>MICHAEL &amp; KELLY PELTIER</td>
<td>1377 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 21-12</td>
<td>MARJORIE DEANE</td>
<td>824 W. NORTH ST.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>DR. &amp; GEORGIA ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>1220 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>LONNIE &amp; MICHELE STARRETT</td>
<td>1222 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>CHARLES &amp; SHIRLEY SANDERS</td>
<td>103 LAKEWOOD PLACE</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>JAMES &amp; TRACY GOVER</td>
<td>105 LAKEWOOD PLACE</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-22-12</td>
<td>JAMES SEVER</td>
<td>118 LAKEWOOD PLACE</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>JANICE BUECKER</td>
<td>1000 ECHO LAKE DRIVE</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>JOHN &amp; DONNA DAVIS TRUSTEE</td>
<td>1227 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>WILLIAM &amp; NANCY ULBRICH</td>
<td>1225 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>BARBARA MANFREDI</td>
<td>1243 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>C BRUCE DRIVER</td>
<td>1249 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 22-12</td>
<td>JEAN CLINE</td>
<td>1229 PARK AVE.</td>
<td>PIQUA, OH 45356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ENTIRE PACKET TO:
- GARY HUFF: INTER-OFFICE MAIL
- CHRIS SCHMIESING: INTER-OFFICE MAIL
- PLANNING COMMISSION: REGULAR MAIL

## E-MEETING NOTICE TO:
- AMY WELKER: EMAIL
- CHRIS BOEKE: EMAIL
- CITY COMMISSION: EMAIL
- DEAN BURCH: EMAIL
- DEBBIE STEIN: EMAIL
- GARY HUFF: EMAIL
- BILL MURPHY: EMAIL
- LORNA SWISHER: EMAIL
- MARTIN KIM: EMAIL
- STACY WALL: EMAIL
- AMY HAVENAR: EMAIL
- BRUCE JAMISON: EMAIL
- PIQUA DAILY CALL: EMAIL
- DAYTON DAILY NEWS: EMAIL
- WPTW: EMAIL
- PIQUA CHANNEL 5: EMAIL
- MIAMI COUNTY HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION: EMAIL