Planning Commission

Meeting Date

08/05/2025

Location:
City Hall
209 S. Main Street

Time:
6:30 PM

Initial Submission Packet
Date: 07/25/2025

Table of Contents

LEGAL NOTICE

AGENDA

MEETING MINUTES
Meeting: 07/01/2025

RULES AND PROCEDURES AMENDMENT

APPLICATION 1: Appendix - Glossary of Terms - Restaurant Definition

Amendment

APPLICATION 2: Section 1141.38 - Zoning Amendment - Action by Council

Amendment

APPLICATION 3: Part Eleven - Zoning Code - Public Notifications

Amendment

APPLICATION 4: Section 1123.06 - Density Bonus Amendment

LEGAL NOTICE

Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission in the City of Marysville. The Public Hearing will be held on August 5, 2025 at 6:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers on the second floor located at 209 S. Main Street, Marysville, Ohio 43040.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. To hear an application for a Zoning Code Amendment to Part Eleven – Zoning Code, Appendix – Glossary of Terms.
2. To hear an application for a Zoning Code Amendment to Part Eleven – Zoning Code, Section 1141.38 – Zoning Amendment – Action by Council.
3. To hear an application for multiple Zoning Code Amendments to Part Eleven – Zoning Code addressing public notifications.
4. To hear an application for a Zoning Code Amendment to Part Eleven – Zoning Code, Section 1123.06 – Density Bonus.

Copies of the above application(s) are on file and may be viewed on the City's Website, Boards & Commissions, Planning Commission: https://www.marysvilleohio.org/155/Planning-Commission

If you have any questions, you may contact the Marysville Planning and Zoning Department at (937) 645-7361 or (937) 645-7328 or via email at agaver@marysvilleohio.org or jbeard@marysvilleohio.org.

PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD AGENDA
Tuesday, August 5, 2025, 6:30 p.m.
Council Chambers, 209 S. Main Street, 2nd Floor

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Time In: _____

Roll Call:

Chad Wolniewicz

Lesley Verbus

Matthew Fisher

Michael Nickoson

Robert Stillion

Bret Ingle

Paige Laub

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

July 1, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes

SWEARING OF CITIZENS & APPLICANTS: All applicants speaking before the Planning Commission tonight will have to stand and raise their right hand (if unable to stand, you may be seated). The designated chair for the Planning Commission will administer the swearing in statement.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: Citizen speaking is limited on comments to five (5) minutes, unless written permission prior to the meeting. (If the chair feels that they would like to authorize them to speak another five minutes later in the item, they may allow them to do so).

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATION:

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Vote on Rules and Procedures Amendment
2. To hear an application for a Zoning Code Amendment to Part Eleven – Zoning Code, Appendix – Glossary of Terms.

3. To hear an application for a Zoning Code Amendment to Part Eleven – Zoning Code, Section 1141.38 – Zoning Amendment – Action by Council.
4. To hear an application for multiple Zoning Code Amendments to Part Eleven – Zoning Code addressing public notifications.
5. To hear an application for a Zoning Code Amendment to Part Eleven – Zoning Code, Section 1123.06 – Density Bonus.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD LIAISON REPORT:

COMMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS:

Chad Wolniewicz

Lesley Verbus

Matthew Fisher

Michael Nickoson

Robert Stillion

Bret Ingle

Paige Laub

ADJOURNMENT:

Time Out: _____

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

07/01/2025

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
July 1, 2025 at 6:30 P.M.
Council Chambers – 209 S. Main Street – 2nd Floor

This meeting is available to watch by clicking here

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Nickoson at 6:38 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Nickoson, Robert Stillion, Lesley Verbus, Paige Laub, Matthew Fisher, and Chad Wolniewicz. Bret Ingle excused.

CITY ADMINISTRATION PRESENT: *Planning and Development Manager* Ashley Gaver, *Planning Officer* Jeff Beard, *Planning Intern* Catherine Rolnicki.

ADDITIONAL PERSONS PRESENT: Bob Baily, John Bland, Catherine Doran, Michael Stover, Randy and Dixie Grossman, Nicki Martin, Ray and Leslie Zimmerman, Julia Shuran, Shirley Hedrick, Dale Scheiderer, Larry Williams, Michael Gharrity, Richard Nielsen, Mary Jo Davis, Amanda Hill, Glenda Nicol, Mark Kehr, Larry and Toby Collier, Phyllis Roberts, Tim Reardon, Bill Westbrook, Michelle Madden, Alex and Melissa Rozanski, Jennifer Bailey, Scott Zink, Aaron Story, Helen Tabor, Richard and Billie Sprowls, Cindy Shay, Steve Wycoff, Gary Smith, Michael Himes, Gene Miller, Austin Miller, Todd Farris, Dave Perry, Cheyenne Deba, Andrew Mathers, Mike and Denise Alloway, Chris Searle, Nick Hoelscher, Erin and Susan Sullivan, Evelyn Graham, Kelly Darrow, Sara McSwords, Darrin Lane, Kiran Bassireddy, Tim Lane, Robin Herriott, Don and Bonnie Brown, Chris Winkle, Eyal Price, Leah Azizian, Sarah Sanders, Roger and Jyl Seacrest, Maury Atherton, Jerry and Elaine Troesch, Bart Jackson, Steve and Penny Cummings, Paul and Paula Bodey, Bill and Carol Davis, Candyce Ober, Martin Markham, Bonnie Kaltenbach, Svetlana Egorora, Joseph Scott, Edward Baynham, Cheyanne Pyles, Dennis Earl, Tanalee Stoll, Terri Grobb, Meg Michel, Richard and Kristine Rausch, John and Joyce Carder, Kenny Smith, Kathy Young, Raymond Smith

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner Fisher moved to approve the June 3, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as presented; voice vote in favor was unanimous.

SWEARING OF CITIZENS AND APPLICANTS: Chairman Nickoson asked anyone who thinks they may speak during the meeting to stand and raise their right hand to be sworn into the meeting. The swearing in statement was made by Chairman Nickoson.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATION: None.

- Commissioner Wolniewicz moved to adjust the agenda as it was posted to hear the following first, from initially being the third item on the agenda, voice vote in favor was unanimous. **To hear an application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Sketch Plan application for a development known as the Golf Village at Timberview Development located at 1107 London Avenue with Parcel ID number of 2900190321250. Additional parcels to be included in the development include 2900190320000, 2900190321000, 2900190322000, 2900190322010, 2900190322030, 2900190324000, 29001190325000, 2900190326000, and 2900190321030:** Todd Farris from Farris Planning and Design acknowledged the residents in attendance and stated he appreciates the attendance. He reviewed information as shown in Exhibit A.

  Commissioner Comments: Mr. Nickoson does not think density is what residents would expect for that area. Mr. Farris met with Timberview residents at Rolling Meadows. Ms. Laub agreed the density is heavy. Based on the current comp plan, this density doesn't match with allowable green space in the community. The Commissioners questioned the three story units. Mr. Farris explained there would not be a requirement to install an alley with the three story development. Ms. Verbus said this is a nice layout anywhere else; however for this location, the layout misses the mark. The density is off and seems to be better suited for an area with mixed use, with retail. Mr. Stillion questioned why the detention pond was so big, subarea A. Mr. Farris explained that is the requirement for what is being proposed. Mr. Stillion suggested a two story town home with a rear loaded garage is possible; you would just have to eliminate a building and it would decrease the density. Mr. Stillion asked why couldn't there be a mixed-use in subarea A on London Ave at the main entrance? Mr. Farris explained there is a lack of interest and not enough traffic on the road. Mr. Stillion commented that sixty-five percent of what is proposed will be open space but what is it without the golf course?. Mr. Farris said subarea A would be at sixteen point nine percent and subarea B would be twenty-five point two percent without the ponds. Mr. Fisher questioned why only nine holes as par three why not the entire eighteen holes? Have there been any thoughts of adding more public activities like disc golf or other similar activities? Mr. Farris had not really considered that. The thought was to keep it as undisrupted as possible. Mr. Wolniewicz suggested the duplexes existing to the north should have a larger buffer area. Mr. Wolniewicz would like to see a different product other than the duplexes.

  Citizen Comments: Richard Nielsen lives in the Timberview Community and enjoys the rural golf course property and has vital interest that the rural zoning code remain rural.

  Terry Grobb explained the golf course is directly behind her. She is curious about the exact location of subarea B and if she will be directly impacted. Mr. Nickoson explained it will be as shown in the exhibit. Ms. Grobb said she did like the bike path along the front.

  Richard Strauss lives on the eleventh fairway; the proposed project is not a good plan for that area. 'See the pond below, that area floods a great deal. We have a nice clear view of the backyard'. Mr. Strauss does not want dwellings right on his property line.

  Kelly Darrow questioned if the project passes, would the current landscaping, trees and creeks be taken into account? Will a traffic study be conducted?

Gary Barjackson was impressed by the representative from the developer. Mr. Barjackson is not a fan of sitting in front of so many people in a neighborhood that are looking at their property values decreasing. He also does not like the alleys, which are dark and invite crime. Why leave one side executive and one side par three? Mr. Barjackson comes from a long line of golfers; if you turn one side into a par three, no one will pay for it. He believes the developer knows that and is waiting to be able to develop that area. Moved to the community in 1999 because of the people and schools; he is PTBM (proud to be a monarch). Monarchs do right by one another. He hopes the applicant thinks that through and appreciates the time given.

Bonnie Coltenboch commented that there are traffic issues on London Ave now let alone with adding new development to the area. She just moved in November and had she known this development was a possibility, she wouldn't have done so. Nothing has been said about the creek that runs through section A and how to address the flooding. The buffer from existing homes to the new development isn't enough. Ms. Coltenboch questioned the neighborhood meetings regarding this project. She did not know of anyone that was included in these meetings, we are neighbors too and would appreciate being included.

Katherine Dorn is concerned about the buffers, the meeting packet wasn't very clear. She has seventeen windows on the back of her home and is concerned that the buffer is not enough since there will be two or three story units. This development not only has high density, but wants to remove the things that would take years to recreate. Will these properties be bought and then rented? Is the development going to have an HOA? Our neighborhood is well maintained; I wouldn't have bought this home if I had known this was coming in. Ms. Dorn's main concern is the distance from existing homes and the height disparities.

Jill Secrest agreed with concerns of density; There are no houses in Timberview that are even close to that. Cars will be everywhere and it junks up the neighborhood, which is what can be seen in new places all over the City. Traffic is already concerning depending on the time of day. Ms. Secrest built her home more than 20 years ago, there is nowhere else to go because nowhere else is as nice as what we have now. Please have compassion for people that live here. When the golf course is not successful in the future, there will just be more development.

Larry Williams had traffic concerns. Once standards start lowering, where does it end?

Kenny Smith expressed that the golf course has a legacy here and that needs to be taken into consideration.

Aaron Story had their house built in 1988; since then has had the privilege of looking across the street at the golf course. He never dreamed there would be anything different but is now faced to defend his neighborhood. Timberview is one of the nicest, if not the nicest neighborhoods in Marysville and this area adds to the community. If this is redeveloped, there should be executive style homes, just like in Timberview. What is being proposed doesn't fit. London Ave cannot handle the additional traffic. Par three courses are not popular and it is just a matter of time before it is developed along with the other part with more high density housing.

Scott Zenk thinks that the golf course changes will not be successful. The proposed homes will not be million dollar homes; beautiful homes exist and are not a million dollars. He is also concerned about the impact on the schools. The drainage is already an issue, there is flooding whenever it rains.

Paula Body hasn't heard any comments regarding the west development; neighboring small brick homes should be in the same conversation. Not just Timberview and the Lakes at Timberview should be taken into consideration. Ms. Body thinks the pond will not always have water and when it doesn't, it will be full of weeds. Subarea B also has three story interior units with no green space.

Morey Atherton stated that there are currently sixteen new developments with over thirty seven hundred dwellings that will be built. She doesn't understand when this is going to stop; four thousand new dwellings in our beautiful little town is too much.

Shirley Hedrick thinks there is too much density. Can the electric company provide for all of this? She had concerns regarding water and water pressure. Marysville is building too fast; Marysville is losing its hometown feel.

David Perry stated that there are still two open lots. Will this lead to more development when the golf course fails and bring down property values?

Amanda Hall is not directly affected but questioned if zoning affects other areas in the golf course areas; can townhomes be changed to apartments when going through the building process? She does not want rentals. The person who purchased the golf course does not live here, they could sell and then more development will be proposed.

Mark Kerr's read of the room is that no one wants the zoning changed. Traffic will be montumental. Since these units will not have basements, the garage turns into a basement meaning all vehicles will be parked in the street. Asphalt will cause heat sink, and when we see high electric bills because of extra urban sprawl, no one will buy, they will rent. We have enough rentals in Marysville. The concept as a whole has issues. Most of the people in this neighborhood bought with the current zoning; not for urban blight, which it will be in ten years.

Alex Rozanski commented that all City ordinances have doctrine. As a former member of Planning Commission, he always had Marysville's comprehensive plan in front of him and always reviewed that with every application. The comprehensive plan shows open space on page fifty-three. Mr. Rozanski stated that the City Council reviewed this area again and it was changed to Agricultural Residential District (ARD) with one acre lots. This was a deliberate act by the City Council. The current plan shows single family homes, at most. This board needs to consider the comprehensive plan, that is your doctrine.

Gene Miller thinks the Planning Commission has a difficult position. Many people were not included in some of the meetings mentioned tonight. The City's comprehensive plan should be seriously taken into consideration. As of now, all around the North end all single story homes are proposed; no two or three stories should be permitted. This will have a totally different feel for the neighborhood. It took Mr. Miller five minutes to get out of the neighborhood onto London Avenue the other day. He has concerns about the additional water run off this will

create. Mr. Miller thinks Timberview is a great neighborhood; he is not looking forward to two or three story townhomes, even with a buffer. He asked, "Please take the comp plan into consideration and ensure we have a voice, work with us and see a chance, for a win, win. There has to be a solution somewhere".

Billy Sprowls stated she was not invited to the first meeting, she didn't know anything except by word of mouth. She doesn't think word of mouth is fair that we were not notified. Ms. Sprowls is concerned with water runoff. She hopes Terrace drive isn't considered the step child anymore and that we are included.

Denise Alloway always sits on her front porch and watches golfers and has the pleasure to watch the sunset. If this development occurs she will sit on the front porch and look at townhouses. Traffic is also a concern. She can barely get back and forth to her mailboxes, someone needs to do something about it. Ms. Alloway stated that trees were planted and she cannot see the traffic coming; it will get worse.

Response to Citizen Comments: Mr. Farris replied to the citizen comments. The stormwater design, since initially built for a golf course, will have several significant requirement changes. The developer knows there are grading issues that will need to be resolved during Engineering review. Responding to Mr. Nickoson, if the ponds will be retention or detention; they will be wet all the time. Mr. Nickoson commented that this is just the preliminary plot, this is the first time we have seen this. If this moves forward, there will be more engineering done. Mr. Farris replied that buffers will be addressed, the City has standards to adhere to, we can meet with anyone that wants to. The plan is to match the current existing buffers but willing to do more if needed. As far as the preservation of trees and streams, we will preserve as many as possible and plant new ones as well. We will need to remove trees that pose drainage issues. In concern of two versus three story units, the applicant will check out the other products mentioned. There will be a traffic study completed and remedied to address any issues. We do anticipate giving extra right-of-way to the City to accommodate the traffic plans. The upgraded water and sewer capacity calculations will be presented to the City for review. Based on Mr. Stillion's comment about a second entrance to the subarea A; point made,the applicant will look into this. Mr. Stillion suggested lighting packages for rear loaded garages, Mr. Farris confirmed these would be installed. These are not the alleys of old times; there are decks and all of them would be lighted. The purpose of the alleys is to keep traffic off of the front streets; this was a comment from City Council. Mr. Nickoson questioned why you are not going with the current zoning route and reasoning. Mr. Farris replied there is currently a mix of SRD and ARD; we could do current zoning but we could be building a lot of road and there wouldn't be any golf course left. This is the fourth owner of the golf course; he knows what he is doing and how to operate. Mr. Farris explained that subarea C is the golf course. We want that brought into the PUD because it protects the golf course and to make any changes would have to come back to the board. If this is not part of the PUD, it would be straight zoning and could come in and build with less steps to complete. Mr. Wolniewicz questioned if there will be a Home Owners Association; Mr. Farris confirmed there would be an HOA to maintain. Mr. Farris confirmed that utilities can handle the additional capacity. They have not had communication with the schools; Mr. Nickoson highly encouraged him to reach out to the schools. Ms. Verbus commented about the public meetings that the applicant had and what kind of feedback was received. Mr. Farris replied that the first plan was nothing but townhouses and retail; feedback received was that they did not want that. The community also does not want rentals. At one

point there were medical offices along the front; that was not desired as well. After multiple changes, more green space was added. We tried to listen to as much as we could and do what we thought was a thoughtful plan. Mr. Nickoson questioned the natural spring and existing creek. Mr. Farris was not aware of a natural spring, there have been preliminary environmental studies but there will be more.

Mr. Nickoson suggested that the overall feeling from this board and several others, is concerned with density and three story buildings. The applicant could table or ask for a motion to approve. Mr. Farris would like to table the application. Mr. Nickoson requested that they meet with residents and share contact information.

Commissioner Stillion moved to table the Sketch Plan Application and the question put, stood:

Mr. Nickson - YES; Ms. Verbus - YES; Mr. Wolniewicz - YES; Mr. Fisher - YES; Ms. Laub - YES; Mr. Stillion - YES

Vote 6-0; Motion Carried.

Next Step: To present the Sketch Plan Application to the Planning Commission.

- Commissioner Verbus moved to adjust the agenda as it was posted to hear the following second, from initially being the fifth item on the agenda, voice vote in favor was unanimous. **To hear an application for a Final Plat application for Amrine Meadows Section 2 Phase 3A located in the southeast corner of State Route 31 and Amrine Wood Road:**

  Commissioner Comments: Mr. Nickoson questioned if there was a walking path along Amerine Woods as part of the Plat. Nickie Martin, representing Pulte Homes stated she doesn't recall if there is one along Amrine Woods or not. Mr. Nickoson commented that since initially approved, the land to the east, called Marysville North, will have a walking path along it and it will end. He requested that the applicant look into extending the walking path so they can connect, and people will not walk into a fence. Ms. Martin confirmed that they will work with Staff and look into that.

  Citizen Comments: None.

  Response to Citizen Comments: None.

  Commissioner Fisher moved to approve the Final Plat Application and the question put, stood:

  Mr. Fisher - YES; Ms. Laub - YES; Mr. Stillion - YES; Mr. Nickoson - YES; Ms. Verbus - YES; Mr. Wolniewicz - YES

  Vote 6-0; Motion Carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

- **To hear an application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan application for a development known as the Trails at Weaver Road Development located at 14373 Weaver Road:** Ms. Verbus and Ms. Laub recused themselves. Gary Smith along with G2 Planning and Design and developers reviewed a presentation as shown in Exhibit A which reviewed changes from the previous meeting to this meeting. We have agreed to install concrete driveways and determined which lots will have side loaded garages. All corner lots will have side loaded garages unless the City engineer says they cannot. We have added a connection to the West. The plan was updated moving larger lots, seventy foot lots to the north so it would be consistent with lots that are contiguous. There was discussion of the pond location and lack of amenities; working with engineering we were able to make changes. We were also asked to consider alley loaded products; we talked to five different builders and none were able to incorporate that into the design. Mr. Scheiderer gave a brief history of the proposed property. He is the former property owner; this land has been family owned and farmed since 1959 prior to gifting it to the Lutheran church. When Adena Pointe and Weaver Ridge developed, the roads dead ended into our fields. It was obvious our land would be next and since we annexed it in the 1990's. The land gift to the foundation was intended to be transferred upon the death of him and his wife but with the rapidly escalating price of land and the need for St. Johns, God asked us to extend the opportunity of Christian education for years to come. In 2021we offered the land to the church. All contributions come from members and school families. There was a major need to expand the school; dropping classes and turning away students. If this construction is further delayed then they will need to have further cuts. Mr. Scheiderer shared not as an emotional appeal but a background behind the decisions.

  Commissioner Comments: Mr. Nickoson appreciates increasing the lot size on the North side, he thinks it looks better with the existing homes. Mr. Stillion commented on the exit towards State Route 736 and wondered if that would connect all the way through; Mr. Smith was not sure, they do not control that area of land. Mr. Fisher questioned the connectivity to the pocket parks. Mr. Smith explained they wanted to ensure open space in different sections and make it possible so you can still quickly move from one to another. Buyers don't like having a path between houses so we made it easy enough to walk from one road to another; there are sidewalks on both sides of the street.

  Citizen Comments: Andrew Mathers is pleased to see the updates to the plan. There is still a higher density but he appreciates the changes. The traffic study does not say this development triggers any improvements, but existing traffic issues are exasperated with this addition. More importantly, Mr. Mathers is concerned with a sight line study; he doesn't think it follows ODOT compliance. This is a fast blind curve for anyone that drives it and doesn't feel this is a good location for the entrance. He thinks the park entrance is safer.

  Michelle Madden feels that adding 300 homes on smaller lots and adjoining developments does not align with the comprehensive plan. People want usable backyards but side lots are not comparable. This seems like this PUD process is bypassing the zoning requirements to cram in more housing. Currently there are drainage issues and it will only get worse. Ms. Madden thinks the developer's profits are being outweighed by the needs of the community. She understands the person selling the land, but that cannot come at the expense of others.

Kathy Young stated that this is going to be the next Professional Parkway.

Response to Citizen Comments: Bill Westbrook replied to several comments. The site distance and traffic study was done by licensed practitioners and in both cases, was approved by the City Engineer. We wouldn't be able to do this if it wasn't safe. It does meet the standard traffic requirements. We have been working on the plan for the entrance for over eight months, it would be difficult to make a change this late in the game. Mr. Nickoson said it wouldn't be a bad thing to look into it since the speed limit changes so quickly. Mr. Smith explained that the City gave us parameters, if they request us to reevaluate, we will. Mr. Smith corrected the density numbers previously stated; there are two point five units an acre which equals two hundred and fifty homes, not three hundred. In the areas of SRD on the comprehensive plan, it is recommended that there are three to six units an acre. We are a little less than two point five which is less dense than the comprehensive plan suggests. Adjacent developments have some lots that are larger and some that are smaller, what is missing is the open space. From a development standpoint, Mr. Smith feels like what they have is comparable; from a land use perspective, there is very little difference. Mr. Nickoson questioned the stormwater issues. Mr. Smith said they are working with the City Engineer to come up with a master stormwater development program. The entire development will have a stormsewer system and any current ponding will be fixed. Mr. Nickoson commented on the connector location, if moved to south he would be against it. It would create a straight line, having the turns will help people to slow down. Professional Parkway has a different purpose and will have a completely different feel. Mr. Nickoson likes the potential future connectivity and doesn't want them to have a pass through.

Commissioner Wolniewicz moved to approve the Development Plan Application and the question put, stood:

Mr. Stillion - YES; Mr. Nickoson - YES; Mr. Wolniewicz - YES; Mr. Fisher - YES

Vote 4-0; Motion Carried.

Next Step: To be presented to City Council in the form of an Ordinance.

NEW BUSINESS:

- **To hear an application for a Conditional Use application for two Single-Family Detached homes located at 502 E 9th Street:** Michael Gharety, construction manager for Habitat for Humanity for Delaware and Union Counties presented the application. If this is approved, he will work to divide the lots to provide two homes for the families.

  Commissioner Comments: Mr. Stillion questioned how the lots would be split. Mr. Gharety explained the lots will be divided vertically parallel to Walnut Street. The house on Walnut Street will face 9th Street and be rear loaded onto Walnut Street; the other house will be front loaded. Both houses will be facing 9thStreet. Mr. Gharety said they will keep as many trees as possible and they will be required to add a sidewalk on both lots.
  Citizen Comments: None.

  Response to Citizen Comments: None.

Commissioner Laub moved to approve the Conditional Use Application and the question put, stood:

Mr. Stillion - Yes; Mr. Nickoson - Yes; Ms. Verbus - Yes; Mr. Wolniewicz - Yes;
Mr. Fisher - Yes; Ms. Laub - Yes

Vote 6-0; Motion Carried.

- **To hear an application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Sketch Plan application for a development known as the Golf Village at Timberview Development located at 1107 London Avenue with Parcel ID number of 2900190321250. Additional parcels to be included in the development include 2900190320000, 2900190321000, 2900190322000, 2900190322010, 2900190322030, 2900190324000, 2900l190325000, 2900190326000, and 2900190321030:** This item was moved to be heard first on the agenda.

- **To hear an application for a Conditional Use application to permit Single-Family Attached homes located along Milford Avenue with Parcel ID number of 2900191250020:** Chris Winkle, Guider Winkle Partners gave a short presentation of the application. All proposed units will be two story duplexes. Reviewing the application as it was provided in the meeting packet, there are already duplexes in the area. The proposed use meets what is already existing.

  Commissioner Comments: None.

  Citizen Comments: John Bland, worked with the City over the past twenty years to get lower density in this area. What is being proposed does not match the work completed across the street. Mr. Nickoson commented that feelings on the density will be addressed in the next application. Mr. Bland had no issues with the use, his issue is with the density.

  Response to Citizen Comments: None.

  Commissioner Fisher moved to approve the Conditional Use Application and the question put, stood:

  Ms. Verbus - Yes; Mr. Wolniewicz - Yes; Mr. Fisher - Yes; Ms. Laub - Yes; Mr. Stillion - Yes;
  Mr. Nickoson - Yes

  Vote 6-0; Motion Carried.

- **To hear an application for a Density Bonus application to permit an increase in the permitted density per acre for Single-Family Attached homes located along Milford Avenue with Parcel ID number of 2900191250020:** Chris Winke, Guider Winkle Partners, explained the density bonus request. Per the zoning code, the Suburban Residential District (SRD) allows four units per acre; we are asking for a density bonus of seven point five units per acre. Initially, the thought was townhomes and higher density but that didn't fit the area. The idea we came up with is two story duplexes; two thousand square foot units. These will be larger units to make them more marketable; three bedrooms with two car garages. There is a requirement of

ten percent of open space; what is proposed will have twenty point seven, not including the pond it will have twelve point five percent. Having two stories will help screen the electrical substation in the area. All units will have concrete driveways; some two cars, some one car. There will be different color options and covered patios at the rear of the units.

Commissioner Comments: Mr. Nickoson likes the architecture but feels the layout is awful, the open space not accessible. Kids would basically be playing in someone else's back yard. Mr. Nickoson doesn't understand creating four dead end streets; there are also no sidewalks. Mr. Stillion suggested eliminating the four dead end streets or adding sidewalks. All of these issues are because of the higher density. Mr. Wolniewicz questioned if instead of the pond, it's reconfigured to be completely open. He suggested having more of a boulevard situation and an area to play and have underground detention. Mr. Wolniewicz urged the applicant to look into one way traffic and how that could impact the development. He doesn't like the proposal as is, it needs usable green space. Mr. Nickoson questioned how many units could be built without the density bonus. Right now they are proposing forty four units, 22 buildings; without density bonus they would have eleven buildings. Mr. Wolniewicz urged the applicant to define usable open space. Mr. Nickoson stated there is no way to access the open space you have. Ms. Verbus agreed that usability and accessibility is the desire for the open space. She explained that the size isn't necessarily the major concern here; it feels like you're walking in someone's back yard and isn't accessible. Mr. Stillion commented that the board cannot design this for you, design with accessibility and give the board something that makes sense. Mr. Stillion stated that the architecture is out of style by about fifteen years and the roof line needs to be changed. Mr. Wolniewicz commented that the clients are here from New York; is there a chance for conditional approval? If modifications are made, can we still approve the unit count. Mr. Nickoson replied that the request is for the density bonus; the layout of the neighborhood is not up for approval. Ms. Verbus commented that the applicant will be hard pressed to find a design that the board will be happy with given this high of a density. Mr. Wolniewicz asked the applicant if there is any flexibility in the design/layout regarding the density or if they are going to stick with just this size? That is why he is hesitant to vote yes.. Mr. Wolniewicz urged the applicant to evaluate the structures themselves to accommodate a better layout and open the space up. He is leaning against doing a conditional approval. Mr Beard explained that there are two levels of density bonus, they could reduce from twenty two to sixteen buildings. Ms. Azizian, the applicant, explained that a lot of thought was put into this product type; we know Marysville is growing and think this complements the area. This product will sell for about three hundred and seventy thousand dollars and has the space people need. They will consider adding more clear open spaces but would like a conditional approval to have a chance to proceed with the Design Review Board. Mr. Wolniewicz spoke to potential changes to give more open space. Mr. Stillion asked if there were any amenities in the open space such as a playground and where the mailboxes would be located. Mr. Nickoson verified that for a density bonus approval the applicant would need six architectural features; Mr. Wolniewicz said that according to the code, they have eight. He suggested they add some board and batten to break things up and isn't really sure if the porch should count as a feature since it's just a stoop. Mr. Nickoson stated that even if they do not count the porch, it still meets the requirement for the density bonus. Mr. Wolniewicz suggested that a double gable could help the elevations. Mr. Stillino doesn't like the side elevations, the architecture doesn't line up and it doesn't look great.

Citizen Comments: None.

Response to Citizen Comments: None.

Commissioner Stillion moved to approve the Density Bonus Application and the question put, stood:

Mr. Wolniewicz - No; Mr. Fisher - Yes; Ms. Laub - Yes; Mr. Stillion - Yes; Mr. Nickoson - Yes; Ms. Verbus - No

Vote 4-2; Motion Carried.

Next Step: To be presented to Design Review Board

- **To hear an application for a Final Plat application for Amrine Meadows Section 2 Phase 3A located in the southeast corner of State Route 31 and Amrine Wood Road:** This application was heard as the second agenda item.

- This item was moved up to follow habitat. **To hear an application for a Conditional Use application for a Religious Place of Worship located at 111, 151 Morey Drive and Parcel 2900021574000:** Bob Bailey with Civil Solutions gave a brief overview of the application. Currently the building is being released to the Head Start program. The plan is to continue to partner with them and after the purchase of the property, look at adding onto the existing building to create a place of worship for Beloved United Methodist Church, which is currently functioning at the YMCA.

  Commissioner Comments: None.

  Citizen Comments: None.

  Response to Citizen Comments: None.

  Commissioner RS moved to approve the Conditional Use Application and the question put, stood:

  Mr. Fisher - Yes; Ms. Laub - Yes; Mr. Stillion - Yes; Mr. Nickoson - Yes; Ms. Verbus - Yes; Mr. Wolniewicz - Yes

  Vote 6-0; Motion Carried.

  Next Step: To be presented to the Board of Zoning Appeals

DISCUSSION ITEMS: Mr.Nickoson stated that two to three minutes versus five minutes for public comments is really all that is needed; beyond that they need to be more concise or they are rambling.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD LIAISON REPORT: None.

COMMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL COMMISSION MEMBERS: None.

ADJOURN: There being no further business to bring before the Commission, Commissioner Verbus moved to adjourn the meeting. The voice vote in favor was unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 10:32 p.m.

Rules and Procedures Amendment

Engineering, Planning and Zoning
City Hall, 209 S. Main Street
Marysville, Ohio 43040-1641
(937) 645-7350
FAX (937) 645-7351
www.marysvilleohio.org

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE CITY OF MARYSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

1. The day and hour of the Planning Commission meetings shall be the first Tuesday of each month at 6:30 pm. When a conflict occurs with the meeting date, it shall be adjusted to the first Wednesday of the month at 6:30 pm, and noted in the yearly calendar. If there are no applications submitted for 'old business' or 'new business', the meeting shall be postponed until the following month. Special meetings shall be publicly announced in the local newspaper and the city website at least 48 hours in advance.

2. The order of business for the Planning Commission meetings shall be:
   a. **Call Meeting to Order**
   b. **Roll Call**
   c. **Approval of Minutes**
   d. **Swearing in of Citizens & Applicants**
   e. **Comments of Citizens - Citizen Comments are limited to five (5) minutes, unless prior permission is granted by the designated Chairperson.**
   f. **Report of Administration**
   g. **Old Business**
   h. **New Business**
   i. **Discussion Items**
   j. **Boards and Committees Representative Report**
   k. **Individual Commissioners Comments**
   l. **Adjournment**

3. Each Commissioner and citizens, before speaking upon any subject, shall address the presiding officer and be recognized by him or her.

4. Unless a conflict(s) of interest is recognized, each member of the Commission shall be required to vote upon all questions before the Commission. When such conflict(s) are recognized the member shall refrain from any conversation or discussion on the issue. Commission members shall notify the Chairperson prior to any discussion on a subject where a conflict of interest may exist where the member's personal interests or concerns may affect his/her loyalty to the public interest. After notification the stated conflict of interest shall be made public by inclusion in the meeting minutes. The Commission Member shall then remove him/herself from the room and exclude him/herself from any discussion or vote on the subject. If the Chairperson has a conflict of interest, the same procedure shall be followed by notifying the next officer in succession.

5. An agenda as well as administration comments for each meeting shall be delivered to the Commission seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled meeting.

6. The meeting agenda shall be delivered to all applicants for items on the agenda seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled meeting. A copy of the meeting minutes or a decision letter outlining all decisions of the application shall be mailed to the applicant(s) no later than two (2) weeks after the meeting occurred.

7. Any item not on the agenda may be considered with the majority consent of the members present. This shall not include any item requiring a deadline as specified in Chapter 1100 of the Planning & Zoning Code.

8. Prior to any official application updates/changes associated with the Planning Commission along with all zoning and sign permits, staff shall present the updates to the Commission during a regularly scheduled meeting for review and approval.

9. Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be elected at the first meeting of the calendar year. In the absence of both, the members present shall select an interim chair to serve as Chairperson until the return of the Chairperson and/or Vice Chairperson. If the Chairperson position becomes vacant after being elected then the Vice Chairperson will become Chair for the remainder of the year. If the Vice Chairperson position becomes vacant during the year then the board shall elect a new Vice Chairperson.

10. A Majority of all members of the Commission shall be considered a quorum for the conducting of business. A lesser number may meet to adjourn to a later date and time. A majority vote of all members is necessary for the passage of matters for sketch plan, preliminary and final plats, density bonus, conditional uses, and zoning amendments (including, rezoning, zoning code amendments and PUD) and matters that directly affect an applicant's property rights. A motion for approval of a conditional use must have a supermajority of affirmative votes of all Planning Commission members in order to pass, therefore if less than five (5) members are present, no action will be taken, and the item will be tabled and added to the following month's agenda. A majority vote of all members present is required for all other matters put to motion.

11. Motions do not require a second.

12. The Planning Commission Chairperson may appoint Ad Hoc Committees as necessary to deal with matters needing attention. These committees shall then report their findings back to the Planning Commission as a whole. After the matter has been addressed, the committee may be dissolved by a majority vote from the Commission. Committee meetings must be advertised at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Minutes for the committee will be completed by a member of the committee and a copy given to the Chairperson.

13. Per Rules of Council, the Chairperson or appointee will provide Planning Commission updates at the second City Council meeting of each month when applicable.

14. These Rules of Procedure shall be available for public inspection. These rules may be amended by majority consent of all the members of the Commission.

Application 1

Appendix - Glossary of

Terms - Restaurant

Definition Amendment

August 5, 2025

To: City of Marysville
Planning Commission Members

From: Jeff Beard
Planning Officer

RE: Zoning Amendments: Part Thirteen - Building and Property Regulations

To hear an application for an Amendment to the Appendix - Glossary of Terms.

Project History:

During the Planning Commission and Design Review Board process for Scooter's Coffee, it became apparent that the current definition for "Restaurant" required further detail.

Proposed Text Amendment:

The amendment to the Appendix - Glossary of Terms would provide an updated definition for restaurant as specified in "Exhibit A". The Red Text is the updated language for the proposed text amendment.

- RESTAURANT means establishments that prepare and serve ~~providing~~ food and beverages ~~services~~ to patrons in exchange for payment, typically consumed on-site ~~who order and are served while seated and pay after eating.~~ Takeout service may be provided.

If you have any questions about the aforementioned items, please feel free to contact us by phone at (937) 645-7361 or (937) 645-7328 or by email: agaver@marysvilleohio.org or jbeard@marysvilleohio.org.

Exhibit A

Appendix - Glossary of Terms

RESTAURANT means establishments that prepare and serve food and beverages to patrons in exchange for payment, typically consumed on-site. Takeout service may be provided.

Application 2

Section 1141.38 - Zoning

Amendment - Action by

Council Amendment

August 5, 2025

To: City of Marysville
Planning Commission Members

From: Jeff Beard
Planning Officer

RE: Zoning Amendments: Part Eleven - Zoning Code

To hear an application for a Zoning Amendment to Section 1141.38 - Zoning Amendment - Action by Council.

Project History:

City Council members requested Planning staff review and amend the number of votes required by City Council to pass an amendment of the planning commission's recommendation from a three fourths majority to a simple majority of all members of Council.

Proposed Text Amendment

The amendment to Section 1141.38 would provide an updated requirement for the number of votes for City Council to approve an amendment as specified in "Exhibit A". The Red Text is the updated language for the proposed text amendment.

Section 1141.38

- Within ninety (90) days after the public hearing required by Section 1141.35, Council shall take final action on the recommendation of the Planning Commission. A vote to amend the recommendation must receive a ~~three-fourths affirmative~~ majority vote of all members of Council. The vote to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Commission, whether amended or not, must receive a majority vote of all members of Council.

If you have any questions about the aforementioned items, please feel free to contact us by phone at (937) 645-7361 or (937) 645-7328 or by email: agaver@marysvilleohio.org or jbeard@marysvilleohio.org.

Exhibit A

Section 1141.38 - Zoning Amendment - Action by Council

Within ninety (90) days after the public hearing required by Section 1141.35, Council shall take final action on the recommendation of the Planning Commission. A vote to amend the recommendation must receive a majority vote of all members of Council. The vote to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Commission, whether amended or not, must receive a majority vote of all members of Council.

Application 3

Part Eleven - Zoning Code -

Public Notifications

Amendment

August 5, 2025

To: City of Marysville
Planning Commission Members

From: Jeff Beard
Planning Officer

RE: Zoning Amendments: Part Eleven - Zoning Code

To hear an application for a Zoning Amendment to the following sections:

- Section 1105.041 - Notification to the Board of Education and Property Owners
- Section 1105.111 - Reserved
- Section 1131.09(b) - Procedure for Certificate of Appropriateness Before Design Review Board
- Section 1133.06(c) - Exterior Plan Application
- Section 1135.12 - Public Notification
- Section 1135.15(c) - Filing of Development Plan
- Section 1141.20 - Notice to Parties in Interest
- Section 1141.26 - Procedure for Hearing Notice
- Section 1141 - Administration and Procedures
- Section 1141.37 - Zoning Amendment - Notice to Property Owners By Council

Project History:

The code sections listed above relate to the notification requirements for agenda items for the Planning Commission, Design Review Board, Board of Zoning Appeals, and City Council. The code sections vary in the wording of the requirements. These proposed amendments will bring each section into alignment.

Additionally, City staff raised the issue of certified mail being required in addition to first-class mail. City staff have reported that a large number of certified mail is returned. Further, the cost of certified mail has steadily increased, and it is costly to send the number of envelopes often required for the meetings. The proposed amendments would remove the requirement of certified mail and only require first-class mail.

Proposed Text Amendments:

The amendments to Section 1105.041, 1105.111, 1131.09(b), 1133.06(c), 1135.12(a), 1135.15(c), 1141.20, 1141.26, 1141.331, and 1141.37 would provide consistent language for who to notify of the public meeting, when to notify those necessary for the public meeting, and the type of mail to be sent as specified in "Exhibit A". The Red Text is the updated language for the proposed text amendment.

Section 1105.041 - Sketch Plan Notification ~~Notification to the Board of Education and Property Owners~~

~~Before preparing and submitting a preliminary plat for any subdivision which contains residential living units, to the Division of Engineering the subdivider shall also give notice, by way of the City, to (a) the Board of Education of the Marysville Exempted Village School District, of the proposed subdivision (b) Such notice shall contain the proposed location of the subdivision and a copy of the sketch plan, to ascertain the Board's desires as to the location of school sites within the subdivision. The Board of Education may communicate its desires to the Commission by no later than seven (7) days prior to the hearing on the preliminary plat. In addition to delivering the foregoing notice to the Board of Education, the City shall no later than (i) seven (7) days prior to a hearing on a preliminary plat the City shall publish notice of such hearing in selected media outlets and (ii) ten (10) days prior to a hearing on a preliminary plat send notice to all owners of property contiguous to and across from the subject property via certified mail and first class mail.~~

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Sketch Plan, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.The City shall send notice of the Planning Commission's review of an application for Sketch Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1105.111 - Notification to Board of Education and Property Owners ~~Reserved~~

Before preparing and submitting a preliminary plat for any subdivision which contains residential living units, to the Division of Engineering the subdivider shall also give notice, by way of the City, to (a) the Board of Education of the Marysville Exempted Village School District, of the proposed subdivision (b) Such notice shall contain the proposed location of the subdivision and a copy of the sketch plan, to ascertain the Board's desires as to the location of school sites within the subdivision. The Board of Education may communicate its desires to the Commission by no later than seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting In addition to delivering the foregoing notice to the Board of Education, the City shall no later than (i) seven (7)

days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on a preliminary plat the City shall publish notice of such hearing in selected media outlets and (ii) ten (10) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on a preliminary plat send notice to all owners of property contiguous to and across from the subject property via first class mail.

Section 1131.09(b) - Procedure for Certificate of Appropriateness Before Design Review Board

Prior to the Design Review Board's review of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing. The City shall send notice of the Design Review Board's review of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting ~~day of the hearing~~ to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, such notices shall not be required for any application that pertains to City- owned property.

Section 1133.06(c)- Exterior Plan Application

Prior to the Design Review Board's review of an application for Exterior Plan review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing. The City shall send notice of the Design Review Board's review of an application for Exterior Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting ~~day of the hearing~~ to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, such notices shall not be required for any application that pertains to City-owned property.

Section 1135.12 - Public Notification

~~(a) At least ten (10) calendar days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting regarding the Sketch Plan, the City Staff shall mail notifications to the adjacent property owners by mail of the proposed development.~~

~~(b) Notice of the meeting shall also be given in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days before the date of the meeting.~~

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Sketch Plan review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.The City shall send notice of the 1135Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Sketch Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission

meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1135.15(c)- Filing of Development Plan

~~Prior to Planning Commission's consideration of the proposed Development Plan, the City shall (i) send notice of the proposed Development Plan to adjacent property owners via first class mail and certified mail no later than ten (10) days prior to the public hearing, and (ii) publish notice of the public hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the public hearing.~~

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Development Plan review, the City shall publish a notice of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing.The City shall send notice of the Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Sketch Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1141.20 - Notice to Parties in Interest

Before holding the public hearing required in Section 1141.18, written notice of such hearing shall be mailed by the clerk or secretary designated to keep the minutes, by first-class ~~and certified~~ mail, at least ten (10) days before the day of the regularly scheduled Board of Zoning Appeals meeting to all property owners contiguous to or directly across the street from the property concerned. The notice shall contain the same information as required of notices published in selected media outlets as specified in Section 1141.19.

Section 1141.26 - Procedure for Hearing Notice

~~Upon receipt of the application for a conditional use permit specified in Section 1141.23, the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing, publish notice in selected media outlets seven (7) days before the hearing, and send written notice to all parties in interest via first class mail and certified mail ten (10) days before the hearing all according to the procedures specified in 1141.19 and 1141.20.~~

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Conditional Use review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.The City shall send notice of the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Conditional Use review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting day of the hearing to all

owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1141.331 - Zoning Amendment - Notice to Property Owners By Planning Commission
Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Zoning Amendment review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. If any proposed amendment proposes to rezone or redistrict ten (10) or less parcels of land, as listed on the tax duplicate, written notice of the hearing shall be mailed by the City at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting day of the hearing to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1141.37 - Zoning Amendment - Notice to Property Owners By Council
If any proposed amendment proposes to rezone or redistrict ten (10) or less parcels of land, as listed on the tax duplicate, written notice of the hearing shall be mailed by the City Clerk, by first class ~~and certified mail,~~ at least ten (10) days before the day of the regularly scheduled City Council meeting to all owners of property within, contiguous to and directly across the street from such area proposed to be rezoned or redistricted to the address of such owners appearing in the County Auditor's current tax list or the Treasurer's mailing list and to such other list or lists that may be specified by Council. The failure to deliver the notification, as provided in this section shall not invalidate any such amendment. The notice shall contain the same information as required of notices published in selected media outlets as specified in Section 1141.19.

If you have any questions about the aforementioned items, please feel free to contact us by phone at (937) 645-7361 or (937) 645-7328 or by email: agaver@marysvilleohio.org or jbeard@marysvilleohio.org.

Exhibit A

Section 1105.041 - Sketch Plan Notification

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Sketch Plan, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.The City shall send notice of the Planning Commission's review of an application for Sketch Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1105.111 - Notification to Board of Education and Property Owners

Before preparing and submitting a preliminary plat for any subdivision which contains residential living units, to the Division of Engineering the subdivider shall also give notice, by way of the City, to (a) the Board of Education of the Marysville Exempted Village School District, of the proposed subdivision (b) Such notice shall contain the proposed location of the subdivision and a copy of the sketch plan, to ascertain the Board's desires as to the location of school sites within the subdivision. The Board of Education may communicate its desires to the Commission by no later than seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting In addition to delivering the foregoing notice to the Board of Education, the City shall no later than (i) seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on a preliminary plat the City shall publish notice of such hearing in selected media outlets and (ii) ten (10) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on a preliminary plat send notice to all owners of property contiguous to and across from the subject property via first class mail.

Section 1131.09(b) - Procedure for Certificate of Appropriateness Before Design Review Board

Prior to the Design Review Board's review of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing. The City shall send notice of the Design Review Board's review of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, such notices shall not be required for any application that pertains to City- owned property.

Section 1133.06(c) - Exterior Plan Application

Prior to the Design Review Board's review of an application for Exterior Plan review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing. The City shall send notice of the Design Review Board's review of an application for Exterior Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, such notices shall not be required for any application that pertains to City-owned property.

Section 1135.12 - Public Notification

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Sketch Plan review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.The City shall send notice of the 1135Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Sketch Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1135.15(c) - Filing of Development Plan

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Development Plan review, the City shall publish a notice of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing.The City shall send notice of the Planning Commission's review of an application for Planned Unit Development Sketch Plan review at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1141.20 - Notice to Parties in Interest

Before holding the public hearing required in Section 1141.18, written notice of such hearing shall be mailed by the clerk or secretary designated to keep the minutes, by first-class mail, at least ten (10) days before the day of the regularly scheduled Board of Zoning Appeals meeting to all property owners contiguous to or directly across the street from the property concerned. The notice shall contain the same information as required of notices published in selected media outlets as specified in Section 1141.19.

Section 1141.26 - Procedure for Hearing Notice

Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Conditional Use review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.The City shall send notice of the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Conditional Use review at least ten (10)

days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting day of the hearing to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1141.331 - Zoning Amendment - Notice to Property Owners By Planning Commission
Prior to the Planning Commission's review of an application for a Zoning Amendment review, the City shall publish a notice of the hearing in selected media outlets at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. If any proposed amendment proposes to rezone or redistrict ten (10) or less parcels of land, as listed on the tax duplicate, written notice of the hearing shall be mailed by the City at least ten (10) days before the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting day of the hearing to all owners of properties contiguous to or directly across from the property concerned via first-class mail.

Section 1141.37 - Zoning Amendment - Notice to Property Owners By Council
If any proposed amendment proposes to rezone or redistrict ten (10) or less parcels of land, as listed on the tax duplicate, written notice of the hearing shall be mailed by the City Clerk, by first class at least ten (10) days before the day of the regularly scheduled City Council meeting to all owners of property within, contiguous to and directly across the street from such area proposed to be rezoned or redistricted to the address of such owners appearing in the County Auditor's current tax list or the Treasurer's mailing list and to such other list or lists that may be specified by Council. The failure to deliver the notification, as provided in this section shall not invalidate any such amendment. The notice shall contain the same information as required of notices published in selected media outlets as specified in Section 1141.19.

Application 4

Section 1123.06 - Density

Bonus Amendment

August 5, 2025

To: City of Marysville
Planning Commission Members

From: Jeff Beard
Planning Officer

RE: Zoning Amendments: Part Eleven - Zoning Code

To hear an application for a Zoning Amendment to the following sections:

- Section 1123.06 - Density Bonus Program

Project History:

The code section listed above relates to the Density Bonus Program which allows for two to four additional dwelling units to be built on a property if additional development requirements are met. The code section requires that additional architectural features are added to the buildings to qualify. The proposed amendments will maintain the additional architectural features, but will also require developments to have additional open space and a high quality site design.

City staff and Planning Commission have raised the issue of developments requesting a density bonus with poor site plan and open spaces. This has prompted a reevaluation of the criteria and review process for density bonus applications compared to similar cities. The proposed amendment aims to ensure that increased density is accompanied by thoughtful design and high-quality amenities for residents.

Proposed Text Amendments:

The amendments to Section 1123.06 would provide increased development standards and objectives that applicants shall meet to obtain a density bonus, as specified in “Exhibit A”. The Red Text is the updated language for the proposed text amendment.

Section 1123.06 Density-Bonus Program

(a) **Purpose.** The City of Marysville density bonus program is applicable to all forms of single-family (attached), multi-family, and mixed-use development as provided in Chapter 1121 of this Planning and Zoning Ordinance. The density bonus program is intended to accommodate additional density beyond the as of right densities set forth in the applicable zoning regulations for the subject property.

(b) **Specific Objectives**. The following objectives shall promote high-quality development that enhances the visual character, functionality and the overall community:

1. **Promote harmonious development:** Ensure new development integrates seamlessly with existing neighborhood character and natural features.
2. **Enhance public realm:** Create attractive, safe, and accessible public and semi-public spaces.
3. **Improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation:** Foster efficient and safe movement for all modes of transportation.
4. **Encourage environmental awareness:** Support sustainable practices and conservation of existing natural features.
5. **Foster community identity:** Reinforce the unique identity and sense of place within the municipality.

(c) ~~(b)~~ **Procedure.** To receive a density bonus for any development, the developer shall file an application ~~together with a development plan application with~~ to the Planning Commission for review. The Planning Commission shall hear all applications for density bonuses and determine whether each application should be approved or denied based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the hearing at which the proposed Plan bonus is considered.

(d) ~~(c)~~ **Eligible Building Typologies.** As provided in Chapter 1121 of this Planning and Zoning Ordinance, the residential and mixed-use building typologies are eligible for the density bonus program as described under Table 1123A.

(e) ~~(d)~~ **Development Plan Review.** Any project considered for a density bonus under the provisions of this subchapter shall also be further considered by the Design Review Board in accordance with Chapter 1133. The approval of any density bonus under this subchapter shall be conditional upon such approval by the Design Review Board.

(f) ~~(e)~~ **Development Requirements for Density-Bonus.** In order to qualify for a density bonus, an applicant must demonstrate compliance with the applicable requirements for the corresponding density bonus level for which the applicant has applied. The requirements are set forth in the Design Criteria within this section and Table 1123A.

(g) ~~(f)~~ **Design Criteria.** Before granting the density bonus application, the Planning Commission shall find that the information submitted with the application establishes the following:

1. The design shall respond to the unique characteristics of the site and its surroundings, including topography, natural features, adjacent land uses, and architectural styles.
2. The development shall exhibit a high degree of aesthetic quality, contributing to the visual environment through thoughtful massing, materials, colors, and landscaping.
3. The design shall incorporate sustainable practices, including but not limited to, stormwater management, energy efficiency, and native landscaping.
4. Setbacks can be utilized to accommodate landscaping, and provide appropriate transitions between public and private realms and adjacent land uses. Variations in setbacks may be encouraged to create visual interest and respond to site conditions.
5. The development shall feature diverse architectural facades to encourage visual interest and unique neighborhood character.
6. The development shall provide adequate and appropriately designed common open space that is publicly accessible, usable, and integrated into the overall site design. Pedestrian connectivity is encouraged between adjacent properties and community facilities.
7. Driveway access points shall be minimized and consolidated where possible to reduce conflicts with pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

(h) ~~(f)~~ **Adaptive Reuse Density-Bonus.** Development projects incorporating the redevelopment and conversion of an existing nonresidential principal use within a building to a residential or mixed-use project are eligible for a density bonus subject to the following conditions:

1. The last use of the building prior to the redevelopment project shall have been any

nonresidential use and the proposed redevelopment project shall either be a mixed- use project or a residential project.

2. Redevelopment projects that incorporate only a residential component shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional two (2) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district;
3. Redevelopment projects that incorporate a nonresidential component on any portion of the subject property, including out-lots shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional four (4) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district for any residential component of the underlying redevelopment project; and
4. Redevelopment projects that qualify for this adaptive reuse density bonus may proceed under any other density bonus provision under the Zoning Code.

(i) ~~(g)~~ Blighted Property Density Bonus. Development projects incorporating the redevelopment of a "blighted property" are eligible for a density bonus subject to the conditions set forth below.

1. For the purposes of this subsection (i), "blighted property" shall mean either (A) a property with a structure that is dilapidated, unsanitary, unsafe, or vermin infested that because of its condition has been designated by the Division of Engineering as unfit for human habitation or use; or (B) a property that poses a direct threat to public health or safety in its present condition by reason of environmentally hazardous conditions, solid waste pollution, or contamination.
2. Redevelopment projects that incorporate only a residential component shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional two (2) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district;
3. Redevelopment projects that incorporate a nonresidential component on any portion of the subject property, including out-lots shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional four (4) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district for any residential component of the underlying redevelopment project; and
4. Redevelopment projects that qualify for this adaptive reuse density bonus may proceed under any other density bonus provision under the Zoning Code.

TABLE 1123A		
BUILDING TYPOLOGY /DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	**LEVEL 1 DENSITY BONUS (ADD 2 UNITS PER GROSS ACRE ABOVE AS-OF-RIGHT DENSITY)**	**LEVEL 2 DENSITY BONUS (ADD 4 UNITS PER GROSS ACRE ABOVE THE AS-OF-RIGHT DENSITY)**
Single-Family (attached) Building Typology	Addition of ~~one (1)~~ two (2) architectural or design features per building set forth under Chapter 1133.09.	Addition of two (2) architectural or design features for the front and rear elevations, and one (1) for each side elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.09.
	Additional 5% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District	Additional 10% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District
Mixed-Use Building Typology	Addition of ~~two (2)~~ four (4) architectural or design	Addition of four (4) architectural or design features for the front and rear elevations, and two (2) for

	features per building set forth under Chapter 1133.10	each side elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.10.
	Additional 5% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District	Additional 10% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District
Multi-Family Building Typology	Addition of two (2) architectural or design features per elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.09	Addition of four (4) architectural or design features for the front and rear elevations, and two (2) for each side elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.09.
	Additional 5% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District	Additional 10% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District
Adaptive Reuse (All Building Typologies)	General adaptive reuse redevelopment in accordance with Section 1123.06~~(f)~~ (h)	General adaptive reuse redevelopment in accordance with Section 1123.06~~(f)~~ (h) and incorporation of mixed-use element.

Blighted Property (All Typologies)	General redevelopment of blighted property in accordance with Section 1123.06~~(g)~~ (i)	General redevelopment of blighted property in accordance with Section 1123.06~~(g)~~ (i) and incorporation of mixed-use element.

Exhibit A

Section 1123.06 Density-Bonus Program

(a) **Purpose.** The City of Marysville density bonus program is applicable to all forms of single-family (attached), multi-family, and mixed-use development as provided in Chapter 1121 of this Planning and Zoning Ordinance. The density bonus program is intended to accommodate additional density beyond the as of right densities set forth in the applicable zoning regulations for the subject property.

(b) **Specific Objectives**. The following objectives shall promote high-quality development that enhances the visual character, functionality and the overall community:

6. **Promote harmonious development:** Ensure new development integrates seamlessly with existing neighborhood character and natural features.
7. **Enhance public realm:** Create attractive, safe, and accessible public and semi-public spaces.
8. **Improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation:** Foster efficient and safe movement for all modes of transportation.
9. **Encourage environmental awareness:** Support sustainable practices and conservation of existing natural features.
10. **Foster community identity:** Reinforce the unique identity and sense of place within the municipality.

(c) **Procedure.** To receive a density bonus for any development, the developer shall file an application to the Planning Commission for review. The Planning Commission shall hear all applications for density bonuses and determine whether each application should be approved or denied based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the hearing at which the proposed Plan bonus is considered.

(d) **Eligible Building Typologies.** As provided in Chapter 1121 of this Planning and Zoning Ordinance, the residential and mixed-use building typologies are eligible for the density bonus program as described under Table 1123A.

(e) **Development Plan Review.** Any project considered for a density bonus under the provisions of this subchapter shall also be further considered by the Design Review Board in accordance with Chapter 1133. The approval of any density bonus under this

subchapter shall be conditional upon such approval by the Design Review Board.

(f) **Development Requirements for Density-Bonus.** In order to qualify for a density bonus, an applicant must demonstrate compliance with the applicable requirements for the corresponding density bonus level for which the applicant has applied. The requirements are set forth in the Design Criteria within this section and Table 1123A.

(g) **Design Criteria.** Before granting the density bonus application, the Planning Commission shall find that the information submitted with the application establishes the following:

8. The design shall respond to the unique characteristics of the site and its surroundings, including topography, natural features, adjacent land uses, and architectural styles.
9. The development shall exhibit a high degree of aesthetic quality, contributing to the visual environment through thoughtful massing, materials, colors, and landscaping.
10. The design shall incorporate sustainable practices, including but not limited to, stormwater management, energy efficiency, and native landscaping.
11. Setbacks can be utilized to accommodate landscaping, and provide appropriate transitions between public and private realms and adjacent land uses. Variations in setbacks may be encouraged to create visual interest and respond to site conditions.
12. The development shall feature diverse architectural facades to encourage visual interest and unique neighborhood character.
13. The development shall provide adequate and appropriately designed common open space that is publicly accessible, usable, and integrated into the overall site design. Pedestrian connectivity is encouraged between adjacent properties and community facilities.
14. Driveway access points shall be minimized and consolidated where possible to reduce conflicts with pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

(h) **Adaptive Reuse Density-Bonus.** Development projects incorporating the redevelopment and conversion of an existing nonresidential principal use within a building to a residential or mixed-use project are eligible for a density bonus subject to the following conditions:

5. The last use of the building prior to the redevelopment project shall have been any nonresidential use and the proposed redevelopment project shall either be a mixed- use project or a residential project.
6. Redevelopment projects that incorporate only a residential component shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional two (2) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district;
7. Redevelopment projects that incorporate a nonresidential component on any portion of the subject property, including out-lots shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional four (4) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district for any residential component of the underlying redevelopment project; and
8. Redevelopment projects that qualify for this adaptive reuse density bonus may proceed under any other density bonus provision under the Zoning Code.

(i) Blighted Property Density Bonus. Development projects incorporating the redevelopment of a "blighted property" are eligible for a density bonus subject to the conditions set forth below.

5. For the purposes of this subsection (i), "blighted property" shall mean either (A) a property with a structure that is dilapidated, unsanitary, unsafe, or vermin infested that because of its condition has been designated by the Division of Engineering as unfit for human habitation or use; or (B) a property that poses a direct threat to public health or safety in its present condition by reason of environmentally hazardous conditions, solid waste pollution, or contamination.
6. Redevelopment projects that incorporate only a residential component shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional two (2) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district;
7. Redevelopment projects that incorporate a nonresidential component on any portion of the subject property, including out-lots shall be eligible for a density bonus of an additional four (4) units per gross acre above the maximum density otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district for any residential component of the underlying redevelopment project; and
8. Redevelopment projects that qualify for this adaptive reuse density bonus may proceed under any other density bonus provision under the Zoning Code.

TABLE 1123A		
BUILDING TYPOLOGY /DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	**LEVEL 1 DENSITY BONUS (ADD 2 UNITS PER GROSS ACRE ABOVE AS-OF-RIGHT DENSITY)**	**LEVEL 2 DENSITY BONUS (ADD 4 UNITS PER GROSS ACRE ABOVE THE AS-OF-RIGHT DENSITY)**
Single-Family (attached) Building Typology	Addition of two (2) architectural or design features per building set forth under Chapter 1133.09.	Addition of two (2) architectural or design features for the front and rear elevations, and one (1) for each side elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.09.
	Additional 5% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District	Additional 10% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District
Mixed-Use Building Typology	Addition of four (4) architectural or design	Addition of four (4) architectural or design features for the front and rear elevations, and two (2) for

	features per building set forth under Chapter 1133.10	each side elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.10.
	Additional 5% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District	Additional 10% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District
Multi-Family Building Typology	Addition of two (2) architectural or design features per elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.09	Addition of four (4) architectural or design features for the front and rear elevations, and two (2) for each side elevation set forth under Chapter 1133.09.
	Additional 5% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District	Additional 10% Open Space in excess of the minimum requirement for the associated Zoning District
Adaptive Reuse (All Building Typologies)	General adaptive reuse redevelopment in accordance with Section 1123.06(h)	General adaptive reuse redevelopment in accordance with Section 1123.06(h) and incorporation of mixed-use element.

Blighted Property (All Typologies)	General redevelopment of blighted property in accordance with Section 1123.06(i)	General redevelopment of blighted property in accordance with Section 1123.06(i) and incorporation of mixed-use element.