



Municipal Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting

Minutes

March 13, 2025  
4:00 PM

**VIDEO BROADCASTING/RECORDING**

The meeting videos are broadcast live and published on YouTube.com  
<https://www.youtube.com/@cityofmountvernon3369>

**CALL TO ORDER**

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Matthew T. Starr	Chairman	Present
Tanner Salyers	Safety Service Director	Present
Anne Ellsworth	Member	Present
Todd Hawkins	Member	Present
Austin Swallow	Member	Present
Eric Diehl	Alt. Member	Excused
Jason West	Alt. Member	Excused

Others in attendance - City Engineer, Brian Ball; City Development Services Manager, Lacie Blankenhorn; City Law Director, P. Robert Broeren; Jay Mahan; Joe Updike; Mel Severns

**MINUTES APPROVAL**

- Municipal Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jan 9, 2025 4:00 PM

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Austin Swallow, Member
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Todd Hawkins, Member
<b>AYES:</b>	Starr, Salyers, Ellsworth, Hawkins, Swallow
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Diehl, West

**MPC ITEMS**

- 2025-MPC-02 : S Main ST Between Parrott ST and Adamson ST - Amend Zoning District of Parcels #66-05624.000; 66-05627.000; 66-05628.000; and 66-05629.000 from R-1A to R-3

Blankenhorn introduced the case.

Updike (sworn in) explained his request to amend that zoning of the property he owns along South Main Street between Parrott Street and Adamson Street from R-1A to R-3 for multi-unit apartments. It is approximately three quarters of an acre. The thinks it will serve well as a border property between R-1 zoning on the east

and south and commercial zoning to the west and north. A rough draft layout of the site revealed 8 units is the maximum the site can hold with accompanying required parking. The layout utilized 30' setbacks from each of the three streets bordering the property and a 20' setback on the rear. Updike said the property is properly served with by all utilities. In prior meetings about this property, concern was raised about the maximum height of 45 feet allowed in the R-3 district. Updike explained the size of lot significantly limits the amount and size of structures that can be built, further stating a 45 feet tall building could not be utilized due to parking requirement restraints.

Hawkins asked about the planned location of the property and whether it would be in the front or back. He also asked about the neighboring alley.

Updike said there is an undeveloped alley platted along the east side of half of the property. The entrance is off of Adamson Street. The platted alley was viewed on the County Auditor's website map.

Ball said the alley apron was concreted during the Main Street Parrott Street intersection project.

Updike said the alley is being utilized as a driveway for the house at 5 Adamson Street. He doesn't want to interfere with that and could opt to put a driveway on his property. He thinks an entrance on Adamson Street would be the best option to access his property, instead of a driveway off of Main Street or Parrott Street.

Updike plans for the parking area to be located in the middle of the property between 2 apartment structures.

There was further discussion about potential layout options and how the buildings would face.

Starr asked Updike if he would be the developer. Updike said yes, further explaining the property will change hands because he doesn't want it to be left in his personal name for liability reasons. He could potentially partner with someone.

Swallow asked Updike if he has a personal preference with regard to the 4 building design options that he presented. Updike said as a car guy he would gravitate to the design with the garage. He likes the layout of the apartment style that is located on Division Street, though aesthetically he doesn't like the roof design.

Swallow then asked about 3-unit buildings versus 4-unit buildings. Updike said it would depend on return on investment. Swallow said less density might be better for the neighborhood, to which Ellsworth agreed.

Mahan (sworn in) asked the commission members to articulate why they are voting yes or no to provide good information for City Council to vote on the matter. He also asked the commission to consider that there are other conditional uses that can be permitted on an R-3 property.

Starr asked if a zoning amendment is permanent or conditional. Blankenhorn said it is permanent unless this same process is followed again. Broeren said if the property were to be sold the zoning stays with the property.

Salyers asked if a site plan is required for R-3. Blankenhorn and Broeren said no. Blankenhorn said a site plan is required for PD.

Ellsworth asked if Mr. Updike has to come back to MPC with a design if the amendment is approved by City Council. Broeren said no, he or whomever owns the property can do anything that is allowable in an R-3, based on the use and size, not just limited to what was discussed during the hearing.

Starr asked Updike if he has developed any other properties, to which Updike said no.

Swallow asked Updike about his planned timeline. Updike was unsure. His plan was to get the zoning in place before moving forward with design or estimates for construction. He understands the commissions desire for more information about developing the property. Updike is also watching interest rates and build material prices.

Starr asked Updike if he has a rent range in mind. Updike said they would not be high end; that they would be basic rentals, likely with mid-grade finished. Starr said market rate rentals are currently around \$1,000 - \$1,200 per month. Updike said that is what he was basing some of his calculations on. If he builds units with a garage the rent could be a little more.

Starr asked if they would be 2-bedroom units, to which Updike said yes.

Swallow asked if the units would be Section 8 or subsidized housing, to which Updike answered no.

Ball said it is a great location for housing, within walking distance to many amenities.

Updike said he has a rental now that he constantly receives calls about vacancy. He thinks he could easily fill all units built here.

Salyers asked how long Updike has managed a rental. Updike said he still owns it and has owned it for approximately 8 years. Salyers agreed this is a great location for housing. He is not convinced it is a great location for the type of housing being proposed. He feels like it is too congested. Salyers views the subject property as different from any of the other examples provided with multi-unit structures. He voiced his concern about the increased number of automobiles next door to the neighbor using the undeveloped alley as his driveway. Salyers thinks the proposed development would be in imposition on that neighbor. Salyers asked about financing. He said there are a lot of variables that make him uncomfortable with moving forward on.

There were no communications received by the Development Services Manager.

Starr asked Ball if there were any engineering concerns. Ball said he did not want any new driveways onto Main Street. The site has access to all City utilities.

Starr asked Broeren if there were any legal concerns. Broeren said R-4 specifically mentions being a buffer between different types of zoning. R-3 does not contain that same language, so there is that to consider.

Starr confirmed that this is a recommendation to Council.

Swallow made a motion to approve the request.

Ellsworth asked if this property were to remain R-1 how many lots is it, is it 4. Updike said 4. Ellsworth then said there could be 4 individual houses on this property. Ball said the correct term is parcel. Broeren explained there are 6 platted lots. 3 of the northern lots were combined into 1 parcel. All of the parcels are zoned R-1A. If the individual lots meet Zoning Code regulations, then they could be built on separately. Ball said, by law, the City has to provide a driveway to each parcel. If 6 houses could be permitted, then that automatically triggers driveways onto South Main Street. Blankenhorn looked up the measurements of one of the parcels being 42.7 feet wide. The minimum lot width of an R-1A parcel is 40 feet so the parcels are individually buildable. Broeren said at least 4 of the parcels would have to be accessed from Main Street.

Hawkins said his biggest concern is the property being sold and not knowing the developer.

Starr agreed with Hawkins. He said it is known that housing is needed. He thinks this proposal is a logical fit, disagreeing with Salyers. Starr thinks it is a good location and checks a lot of boxes. Lack of a site plan adds to the uncertainty and he is concerned with Updike's inexperience in this type of development.

Ellsworth said she feels similarly. She prefers to see 6-8 tasteful rentals properties than 6 individual homes on much smaller plots with driveways onto South Main Street.

Swallow said he is in favor of this. Removing Mr. Updike from the equation, would the MPC be in favor of R-3 zoning for this property is what he believes should be considered and voted on. The commission should not be focus on who develops the property, but rather how the property can be developed. He likes that space limitations restricts how many units can be built. Everyone agrees that housing is necessary. This property operates as a buffer zone because of the uses across South Main Street and Parrott Street. Swallow doesn't think the Commission should be concerned about the individual parking in the public right of way.

Salyers said he would vote against R-3 whether Updike is part of the equation or not. He does not feel this is an appropriate location for condensed congested housing. He also said he doesn't want to see 4 to 6 separate houses built there. He thinks it should be up to 2 individual houses.

Swallow said the single proposed entrance is a benefit. There was further discussion about access scenarios.

Starr said he thinks the vote boils down to the zoning on this parcel. He does not want to be the housing police. The market can determine the numbers. There has to be trust in the free market. He thinks this is a good location for R-3.

Hawkins said this could be apartment development not on the east side.

Blankenhorn added a different scenario perspective. If the northern parcel could be re-split into it's original platting of 3 parcels, making 6 individually buildable parcels, the R-1A code allows you to build 1 500 square feet individual dwelling and add an accessory dwelling unit bring a potential total of 12 dwelling units with individual driveways for each parcel.

Hawkins said he would not be in favor of the opportunity to cram more units in. He thinks the restriction available with R-3 is favorable.

Salyers said with the scenario Blankenhorn described its more of a protection to amend to R-3 no matter who the owner is.

Broeren said a layout would need to be done to confirm, but it is likely you would get less units with an R-3 designation.

Severns (sworn in) asked why a site plan is not required for R-3. Blankenhorn explained a site plan is not required to be reviewed by the Municipal Planning Commission. A site plan is supplied when a Zoning Permit is applied for to ensure that what they are proposing to do fits Code. Often times with R-3 properties the proposal is for structures with more than 3 units per structure which classifies it as a commercial usage which requires permitting through the State. Starr said he thinks this is pretty typical among communities with R-3. The planned development is where site plans are reviewed by the planning commission.

Salyers said he has tried to view this request like would be living next door and he would not want to live next door to what is being proposed. There is a way to preserve what is being proposed through the zoning designation even if the property is sold.

Udike said the zoning regulations control what can happen on this property and the size of the land constrains the magnitude development.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMEND [UNANIMOUS]</b>	<b>Next: 3/24/2025 7:30 PM</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Austin Swallow, Member	
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Tanner Salyers, Safety Service Director	
<b>AYES:</b>	Starr, Salyers, Ellsworth, Hawkins, Swallow	
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Diehl, West	

**ADJOURN**

- Adjourn Motion

Hawkins made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Ellsworth seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 PM

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Todd Hawkins, Member
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Anne Ellsworth, Member
<b>AYES:</b>	Starr, Salyers, Ellsworth, Hawkins, Swallow
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Diehl, West



**Municipal Planning Commission**  
**40 Public Square**  
**Mount Vernon, OH 43050**

Meeting: 03/13/25 4:00 PM

Dept: Municipal Planning Commission

SCHEDULED

Category: Lands  
 Prepared By: Lacie Blankenhorn  
 Initiator: Lacie Blankenhorn

**MPC ITEM (ID # 4204)**

**DOC ID: 4204**

**2025-MPC-02 : S MAIN ST BETWEEN PARROTT ST AND ADAMSON ST - AMEND ZONING DISTRICT OF PARCELS #66-05624.000; 66-05627.000; 66-05628.000; AND 66-05629.000 FROM R-1A TO R-3**

Per Codified Ordinance Chapter 1103 a request to amend the zoning of 4 parcels has been submitted for review by the Municipal Planning Commission for a yes or no recommendation to City Council.

Description of Request: Joseph Updike requests to amend the zoning district of 4 parcels on South Main Street between Parrott Street and Adamson Street, #66-05624.000; 66-05627.000; 66-05628.000; and 66-05629.000 from R-1A to R-3 to allow for multi-family residential units to be constructed.

**COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Blankenhorn introduced the case.

Updike (sworn in) explained his request to amend that zoning of the property he owns along South Main Street between Parrott Street and Adamson Street from R-1A to R-3 for multi-unit apartments. It is approximately three quarters of an acre. He thinks it will serve well as a border property between R-1 zoning on the east and south and commercial zoning to the west and north. A rough draft layout of the site revealed 8 units is the maximum the site can hold with accompanying required parking. The layout utilized 30' setbacks from each of the three streets bordering the property and a 20' setback on the rear. Updike said the property is properly served with by all utilities. In prior meetings about this property, concern was raised about the maximum height of 45 feet allowed in the R-3 district. Updike explained the size of lot significantly limits the amount and size of structures that can be built, further stating a 45 feet tall building could not be utilized due to parking requirement restraints.

Hawkins asked about the planned location of the property and whether it would be in the front or back. He also asked about the neighboring alley.

Updike said there is an undeveloped alley platted along the east side of half of the property. The entrance is off of Adamson Street. The platted alley was viewed on the County Auditor's website map.

Ball said the alley apron was concreted during the Main Street Parrott Street intersection

project.

Updike said the alley is being utilized as a driveway for the house at 5 Adamson Street. He doesn't want to interfere with that and could opt to put a driveway on his property. He thinks an entrance on Adamson Street would be the best option to access his property, instead of a driveway off of Main Street or Parrott Street.

Updike plans for the parking area to be located in the middle of the property between 2 apartment structures.

There was further discussion about potential layout options and how the buildings would face.

Starr asked Updike if he would be the developer. Updike said yes, further explaining the property will change hands because he doesn't want it to be left in his personal name for liability reasons. He could potentially partner with someone.

Swallow asked Updike if he has a personal preference with regard to the 4 building design options that he presented. Updike said as a car guy he would gravitate to the design with the garage. He likes the layout of the apartment style that is located on Division Street, though aesthetically he doesn't like the roof design.

Swallow then asked about 3-unit buildings versus 4-unit buildings. Updike said it would depend on return on investment. Swallow said less density might be better for the neighborhood, to which Ellsworth agreed.

Mahan (sworn in) asked the commission members to articulate why they are voting yes or no to provide good information for City Council to vote on the matter. He also asked the commission to consider that there are other conditional uses that can be permitted on an R-3 property.

Starr asked if a zoning amendment is permanent or conditional. Blankenhorn said it is permanent unless this same process is followed again. Broeren said if the property were to be sold the zoning stays with the property.

Salyers asked if a site plan is required for R-3. Blankenhorn and Broeren said no. Blankenhorn said a site plan is required for PD.

Ellsworth asked if Mr. Updike has to come back to MPC with a design if the amendment is approved by City Council. Broeren said no, he or whomever owns the property can do anything that is allowable in an R-3, based on the use and size, not just limited to what was discussed during the hearing.

Starr asked Updike if he has developed any other properties, to which Updike said no.

Swallow asked Updike about his planned timeline. Updike was unsure. His plan was to get the

zoning in place before moving forward with design or estimates for construction. He understands the commissions desire for more information about developing the property. Updike is also watching interest rates and build material prices.

Starr asked Updike if he has a rent range in mind. Updike said they would not be high end; that they would be basic rentals, likely with mid-grade finished. Starr said market rate rentals are currently around \$1,000 - \$1,200 per month. Updike said that is what he was basing some of his calculations on. If he builds units with a garage the rent could be a little more.

Starr asked if they would be 2-bedroom units, to which Updike said yes.

Swallow asked if the units would be Section 8 or subsidized housing, to which Updike answered no.

Ball said it is a great location for housing, within walking distance to many amenities.

Updike said he has a rental now that he constantly receives calls about vacancy. He thinks he could easily fill all units built here.

Salyers asked how long Updike has managed a rental. Updike said he still owns it and has owned it for approximately 8 years. Salyers agreed this is a great location for housing. He is not convinced it is a great location for the type of housing being proposed. He feels like it is too congested. Salyers views the subject property as different from any of the other examples provided with multi-unit structures. He voiced his concern about the increased number of automobiles next door to the neighbor using the undeveloped alley as his driveway. Salyers thinks the proposed development would be in imposition on that neighbor. Salyers asked about financing. He said there are a lot of variables that make him uncomfortable with moving forward on.

There were no communications received by the Development Services Manager.

Starr asked Ball if there were any engineering concerns. Ball said he did not want any new driveways onto Main Street. The site has access to all City utilities.

Starr asked Broeren if there were any legal concerns. Broeren said R-4 specifically mentions being a buffer between different types of zoning. R-3 does not contain that same language, so there is that to consider.

Starr confirmed that this is a recommendation to Council.

Swallow made a motion to approve the request.

Ellsworth asked if this property were to remain R-1 how many lots is it, is it 4. Updike said 4. Ellsworth then said there could be 4 individual houses on this property. Ball said the correct

term is parcel. Broeren explained there are 6 platted lots. 3 of the northern lots were combined into 1 parcel. All of the parcels are zoned R-1A. If the individual lots meet Zoning Code regulations, then they could be built on separately. Ball said, by law, the City has to provide a driveway to each parcel. If 6 houses could be permitted, then that automatically triggers driveways onto South Main Street. Blankenhorn looked up the measurements of one of the parcels being 42.7 feet wide. The minimum lot width of an R-1A parcel is 40 feet so the parcels are individually buildable. Broeren said at least 4 of the parcels would have to be accessed from Main Street.

Hawkins said his biggest concern is the property being sold and not knowing the developer.

Starr agreed with Hawkins. He said it is known that housing is needed. He thinks this proposal is a logical fit, disagreeing with Salyers. Starr thinks it is a good location and checks a lot of boxes. Lack of a site plan adds to the uncertainty and he is concerned with Updike's inexperience in this type of development.

Ellsworth said she feels similarly. She prefers to see 6-8 tasteful rentals properties than 6 individual homes on much smaller plots with driveways onto South Main Street.

Swallow said he is in favor of this. Removing Mr. Updike from the equation, would the MPC be in favor of R-3 zoning for this property is what he believes should be considered and voted on. The commission should not be focus on who develops the property, but rather how the property can be developed. He likes that space limitations restricts how many units can be built. Everyone agrees that housing is necessary. This property operates as a buffer zone because of the uses across South Main Street and Parrott Street. Swallow doesn't think the Commission should be concerned about the individual parking in the public right of way.

Salyers said he would vote against R-3 whether Updike is part of the equation or not. He does not feel this is an appropriate location for condensed congested housing. He also said he doesn't want to see 4 to 6 separate houses built there. He thinks it should be up to 2 individual houses.

Swallow said the single proposed entrance is a benefit. There was further discussion about access scenarios.

Starr said he thinks the vote boils down to the zoning on this parcel. He does not want to be the housing police. The market can determine the numbers. There has to be trust in the free market. He thinks this is a good location for R-3.

Hawkins said this could be apartment development not on the east side.

Blankenhorn added a different scenario perspective. If the northern parcel could be re-split into

it's original platting of 3 parcels, making 6 individually buildable parcels, the R-1A code allows you to build 1 500 square feet individual dwelling and add an accessory dwelling unit bring a potential total of 12 dwelling units with individual driveways for each parcel.

Hawkins said he would not be in favor of the opportunity to cram more units in. He thinks the restriction available with R-3 is favorable.

Salyers said with the scenario Blankenhorn described its more of a protection to amend to R-3 no matter who the owner is.

Broeren said a layout would need to be done to confirm, but it is likely you would get less units with an R-3 designation.

Severns (sworn in) asked why a site plan is not required for R-3. Blankenhorn explained a site plan is not required to be reviewed by the Municipal Planning Commission. A site plan is supplied when a Zoning Permit is applied for to ensure that what they are proposing to do fits Code. Often times with R-3 properties the proposal is for structures with more than 3 units per structure which classifies it as a commercial usage which requires permitting through the State. Starr said he thinks this is pretty typical among communities with R-3. The planned development is where site plans are reviewed by the planning commission.

Salyers said he has tried to view this request like would be living next door and he would not want to live next door to what is being proposed. There is a way to preserve what is being proposed through the zoning designation even if the property is sold.

Urdike said the zoning regulations control what can happen on this property and the size of the land constrains the magnitude development.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMEND [UNANIMOUS]</b>	<b>Next: 3/24/2025 7:30 PM</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Austin Swallow, Member	
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Tanner Salyers, Safety Service Director	
<b>AYES:</b>	Starr, Salyers, Ellsworth, Hawkins, Swallow	
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Eric Diehl, Jason West	



City of Mount Vernon, Ohio

Application for Zoning Amendment

<i>Applicant's Information</i>			
Owner's Name, Address, Phone, and Email Address			
Joseph D. Updike 18254 New Gambier Rd.			
Agent's Name, Address, Phone, and Email Address			
<i>Site Information</i>			
Site Address		Legal Description	
South Main St.			
Parcel Number		Deed Volume and Page Number	
66-05624.000      66-05627.000 66-05628.000      66-05629.000			
<i>Use of Property</i>			
Present Use		Present Zoning District	
Vacant		R1A	
Proposed Use		Proposed Zoning District	
Apartments		R3	
<i>Documents to be Submitted</i>			
<p><b>The following documents must also be submitted with this application:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A statement of the reason(s) for the proposed amendment.</li> <li>2. A vicinity map at a scale approved by the Zoning Enforcement Officer showing property lines, thoroughfares, existing and proposed zoning, and such other items as the Zoning Enforcement Officer may require.</li> <li>3. A statement on the ways in which the proposed amendment relates to the comprehensive plan.</li> <li>4. The \$200.00 filing fee as established by ordinance.</li> </ol>			
<p>I hereby certify that the information submitted on this application and on any sketches, drawings or other documents submitted with this application is true and exact.</p>			
Date: 9/25/24		By: Joseph D Updike	
<i>Filing Information</i>			
Filing Date	Fee deposit	Date Paid	Receipt Number
	\$200.00		

This form revised 06-03-2024

Attachment: Application - Updike - S Main ST (4204 : 2025-Mpc-02)

9/24/2004

**Municipal Planning Commission  
Mount Vernon, OH 43050**

To the Municipal Planning Commission

I am submitting for your review a rezoning of 0 South Main St parcels 66-05624.000, 66-05627.000, 66-05628.000, 66-05629.000. This consists of roughly .75 acres at the southeast corner of the intersection of Parrot St. and South Main St.

The zoning change requested is from R1A to R3. This is to create a pathway for the construction of multi family apartment units on the above property. The total number of units is unclear currently until a site development plan is devised. Upon completion of the zoning change.

The reasons that we feel this would be a good fit are as follows.

- This is a transitional property, as it will act as a buffer between commercial property located to the north (Peppys Pizza) and to the west (Blubaugh's Body and Frame) and residential to the east and south.
- The city is deficient in affordable housing, and this can have a positive impact attracting citizens and new workers to the area.
- It is conveniently located on the south end of town close to the industrial park where most jobs are.

I can be at all meetings to address any questions you may have. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Joe Updike

18254 New Gambier Rd.

740-501-3533

# South Main Street

between Parrott ST and Adamson ST

## Zoning Amendment from R-1A to R-3

- Buildable land area inside setbacks 70' x 180'
- 8 Maximum dwelling units, with 90' x 120' parking area



Attachment: South Main Street Building Options (4204 : 2025-Mpc-02)

# Multi-Family in the Southend

- 107 Adamson ST
- 200 Fairmont AVE
- 217 Ames ST
- 211-213 Adamson ST
- 215 Riley ST
- 207 Martinsburg RD
- 228 Martinsburg RD
- 1010 S Main ST
- 20 Adamson ST
- 28 Adamson ST
- 237 Newark RD
- 247 Newark RD
- 200-202 Spruce ST



Attachment: South Main Street Building Options (4204 : 2025-Mpc-02)