

DEVELOPMENTAL CONTROLS COMMITTEE

April 11, 2023

The Developmental Controls Committee of the Lima/Allen County Regional Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, April 11, 2023, at 3:00 p.m. in the Conference Room of the Commission office located at 130 West North Street Lima, Ohio.

For the good of the order, attendance was called, and with a quorum present in person, Chuck Schierloh brought the meeting to order at 3:00 pm and proceeded with the agenda.

1. ROLL CALL

Mr. Paul Basinger	American Township
Mr. Kevin Cox	Perry Township
Mr. Steve Ewing	Auglaize Township
Mr. Jerry Gilden	Marion Township
Mr. Chuck Schierloh	City of Lima
Ms. Beth Seibert	Allen County
Ms. Kim Stiles	Allen County

GUESTS

Mr. Bradley Gossard	AM-V01-23 Petitioner
---------------------	----------------------

STAFF

Mr. Adam Haunhorst	Lima-Allen County Regional Planning Commission
Ms. Shaunna Basinger	Lima-Allen County Regional Planning Commission

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion 30 (4-11-23) DCC

Steve Ewing made the motion that the agenda be approved. Seconded by Kevin Cox, the motion carried.

3. APPROVAL OF DCC MINUTES – March 28, 2023

Motion 31 (4-11-23) DCC

Jerry Gilden made the motion that the DCC minutes of March 28, 2023, be approved. Seconded by Kevin Cox; motion carried.

4. STAFF RECOMMENDATION: BATH TOWNSHIP ZONING PETITION BA-01-23

Haunhorst brought zoning petition BA-01-23 before the committee stating that it requests to change a parcel of land in Bath Township from R-1 to R-2 to facilitate the building of a multi-family residence. Area zoning is mixed with R-1, R-2, and rural all being represented. There is an R-2 lot adjacent to this parcel. No new lots are being created therefore there are no access management issues. Although this petition “ticks several boxes”, (i.e. adjacent to R-2, fairly congruent with the area, makes good usage of land) it is in direct conflict with the Bath Township Comprehensive Plan (2005). Therefore, strictly because the Bath comprehensive plan states that this area be kept “low density,” it is the staff’s recommendation to deny this request. Haunhorst went on to say that he has had similar matters involving other townships in the past, where a request did not align with a comprehensive plan. However, after discussions with the township and understanding that the comprehensive plan is a living document meant to guide the vision of a community and therefore it will evolve and change as time passes, that the petition was approved and plans to update the comprehensive plan were initiated. Haunhorst further explained the options going forward: 1) the committee can accept staff recommendation to deny the petition 1a at which

point the township can disregard the LACRPC denial and approve the petition 2) committee members can deny staff recommendation, 2a) to which Haunhorst raised the parliamentary question of whether the “double negative” would result in approval of the petition automatically, or 3) at the request of the petitioner, the matter can be tabled until conversations can be had within Bath Township about whether or not they would support this project even as it in direct conflict with their comprehensive plan (2005). Haunhorst also encourages Bath Township reexamine the comprehensive plan to ensure it is still reflective of the current wants and needs of the township. If the township expresses interest in changing the 2040 projected land use to allow for denser development, staff would amend their recommendation.

Gilden questioned what the development would include. Gossard answered that four triplexes are planned to be built in a horseshoe lot which would have a courtyard at the center and parking between the road and the structures. They will be rented apartments. Gossard requested a copy of the Bath Township Comprehensive Plan.

Gilden also questioned what density the surrounding lots were marked as, to which Haunhorst replied medium to high density.

Cox questioned the plans for the portion of the land which resides in a floodplain. Gossard replied that the plan will allow for the required frontage without there needing to be any development in the back portion of the land where the floodplain resides, therefore the plan is to leave the land natural with nothing more than some possible drain spouts being installed.

Gossard made a final comment stating his opinion that more authority should be given to LACRPC and other like agencies to approve projects within individual townships. Haunhorst clarified that his role is technical assistance and guidance and that final say and authority lies with the township.

Motion 32 (4-11-23) DCC

Upon request from Bradley Gossard to table the matter, Paul Basinger made the motion to table Zoning Petition BA-01-23. Seconded by Beth Seibert; motion carried.

5. OTHER

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion 33 (4-11-23) DCC

Steve Ewing made the motion to adjourn Seconded by Kevin Cox; the motion carried.