

OPPOSED TO SUP 2006-22

April 14th, 2022, additional comments AND COPIES OF EMAILS added after the hearing April 19, 2022

To City Plan Commission,

Cc. Toledo City Council, Reynolds Corners Neighbors

From Sue Terrill 1722 Eileen Rd. Toledo, OH 43615

Reynolds Corners Area Block Watch Leader

Organized successful opposition against the similar SUP 1004.20 in 2020.

(I wore Edward Drummond Libbey shirt celebrating the anniversary of his birth April 17th...among services to our community-one of the first members of the newly organized City of Toledo Plan Commission, named as president, and longest serving on that first board for I believe 5 one-year terms)

Part of my testimony: I was only allowed three minutes, so I was not permitted to have time to bring up other specific points from the report that I had intended to present. So, I now submit this to the Plan Commission in writing April 19, 2022 for the Toledo City Council's consideration.

"Look what I have brought....my cart of communication, petitions, letters? Yes, from last time-2020 SUP 1004-20 -when Toledo City Council eventually voted to oppose a 16-bed residential drug and alcohol treatment center on the main walkway of our neighborhood. This shows the extra work that was involved from the Reynolds Corners community last time when everyone at City Hall including the Plan Commission were in the process of hurriedly leaving the City Hall to begin work from home as we all learned of covid, and Reynolds Corners neighbors had to stare it in the face."

Nothing has changed, this site is still not suitable (and left to deteriorate -photos) and the community has to go through this again? We are **Opposed to SUP 2006-22 for the same reasons as last time: that special use permits should not be allowed for a 16-bed residential drug and alcohol treatment center in the 5000 block of Dorr St.- the former Neville Funeral Home- next to backyards, a beauty salon, barbershop, and multifamily housing with close proximity to a daycare center and the main street of our neighborhood.**

Ah, but something has changed. There is a new group home on Westhaven Rd. far less than the required 500 feet away. With this latest SUP 2006-22 the Plan Commission is even more emboldened adding another SUP exception with the Westhaven Rd. Group home.

And what is that 20/20 Plan (from 1999!) for the Reynolds Corners community that the Plan Commission uses as basis of support for this recommendation? It does not fulfill the 20 /20 Plan that would encourage new commercial development or the bring the unity needed for an urban village. Is this the commercial development Reynolds Corners needs? How will this impact the possibility of future growth and development in the very central part of the Reynolds Corners business recovery area?

UPDATE The City Plan Commission approved BOTH the main Special Use Permit (SUP) 2006-22 which was defeated in 2020 by the City Council through hard work at the onset of Covid, and, yet, added even another Special Use Permit allowing the group home on Westhaven Rd. far within the 500 feet spacing limit-only across the street to be allowed as well.

The following are issues I see in the Plan Commission report, the Plan Commissions responses to citizens involved with the issue, and in appropriately contacting citizens in the neighborhood.

*We have NO neighborhood organization (Block Watch doesn't count) and this makes us vulnerable to this second attempt. We had no awareness that this could happen again, and once again to Unison's advantage few people see or notice Plan Commission signs. (And why is that? Signage needs to be updated!) I saw the sign for the first time Monday, April 11th in the afternoon. Two days ago (April 12th) I began petitioning- not necessarily easier this time as I discovered yesterday. Few people answered their door. Yesterday (April 13th) the first house an elderly owner was recovering from Covid. I made the decision to stop going door to door so not to affect my health or spread any disease among my neighbors. I had not brought sanitizer for the pens...and thought these people who I was contacting had hopefully had received a letter **yet I found some troubling issues going to the addresses on the list provided by the Plan Commission when approached by a neighbor.***

MAILING LIST ISSUES?

As noted to the Plan Commission hearing I asked Mr. Latsko on April 11th as soon as I knew about and before the hearing to provide the mailing list. Dutifully he sent me the following items in email: (See the email) 1 But, when I asked April 13th that he send me the full address mailing list rather than it being cut off by the adjusted margins as well as an alphabetic street listing, I received no reply to this request before or since the hearing. Emails 3.1, 3.2

Look at the list I received this time -unlike for the last SUP when it was complete! Email ML or 1-4. At the hearing Mr. Fallow then asked Mr. Johnny Latsko to see the list (email?) Mr. Johnny Latsko showed Mr. Fallows something. Unsure if it was the list Mr. Latsko provided to me with the margin cutoffs. (Guess this was part of my 3 minutes.)

By the time I received the mailing list I had no time to track down or send out letters like I did last time to out of the area homeowners nor money to do so. I have asked Plan Commission rep Mr. Latsko on April 13th to send me the list by street order to better facilitate contacting neighbors since we have such limited time and no available resources. Email 3.1

The MAP THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION SENT

I also questioned the map with red boundaries sent to me with the mailing by Mr. Latsko. Email 1 attachment 1 I asked that he enlarge it for me which he did. He told me that this map represented where the letters were sent. (See the map. Email 4, Sent April 13th) He described it as "the map of those who were sent mailings" and "those who received public notice" Email 4. The map shown in the email with the redlines.

It appeared to me, if I am looking at the redlined map correctly, that it is a much larger and a different area than the when the letters were sent last time in 2020 for this same issue. (I have a copy of that old map?) Yet, the number of letters sent out this time were significantly less. (From 150? to 135, 136 homeowners last time to 96 homeowners this time.) See email 1, 4th attachment-the mailing list.

In the past sup 1004-20 in 2020, Unison's Mr. Moebius testified 150? letters were sent out for that SUP 1004-20. There was a discrepancy then, too, where proponents testified that 150 letters were sent out but this differed from the number in the actual Plan Commission mailing list given to and used by us of 135, 136.

This time the list provided by my count 103-1(space) is 102. The lists include at least 6 names of our council member, Plan Commission Latsko and the proponents of the plan? See email 1-4th attachment.

If those last 6 names are removed keeping the list to strictly homeowners it brings the total down to 96 homeowners remaining on the official mailing list.

Past 150, or 136, 137 homeowners to current 96 homeowners is significantly different. What explains this?

Why does the map appear to encompass a larger, somewhat different area, yet the number of homeowners is far fewer than last time? The map in email 1, attachment 1.

I asked Mr. Latsko how the homeowners were selected, but without any reply before or since the Plan Commission hearing. I noted on Plan Commission paperwork it is through the Auditors Office Tax List. Yet, when I did a quick check without this resource only using ARIES, I found discrepancies. Mr. Latsko did not answer my request about how to check this information either. (Email)

In addition, just to review this discrepancy required a lot of citizen time while petitioning...and stopped me from efficiently getting signatures in a limited time window ...to determine what the issue might be. Possible examples of discrepancies were turned in to the Plan Commission hearing. See copy of the email is quoted below.

At the hearing I handed this info in email format to the Plan Commission.

(When I was gathering signatures last night April 12th, one of the neighbors, Mrs. Jacqueline Allen, 1690 Idlewild Ct, called me over when I did not stop at her house while looking for houses listed on the PC provided mailing list for SUP 2006-22.

I noted that her house was not on the list that I received from the Plan Commission. We both looked thru the lists and could find neither of her two properties of 1659 Copley and 1690 Idlewood. She wanted to sign the petition I was carrying and recognized me from the previous attempt for the proposal.

I remember last time in 2020 circulating a petition for SUP 1006-20 when the property on 1690 Idlewood Dr. was on the list. In addition, I noted to her that 5107 Newhart was not on the list either and I I know they were on the list last time. She then pointed out 4 houses near her which she said were long time property owners.

In my check with ARIES, 5102 Newhart has been a property owner for almost 4 years. Not under Wray or ORSURVTC...neither listed

5104 Newhart has lived there since 2001 Tania Barnett

1690 Idlewild owner listed under Inverness Ventures

1659 Copley owner Listed under Inverness Ventures, Formerly Fusion Notes

5107 Newhart. previously on the list. So, if you do owe taxes, you are not sent a letter? *

5120 Brandel Ct. was on the list, signed the petition for 2 owned properties and it was significantly further in distance than all these homes.

--

5116 Brandel owes taxes. Is that why they were not on the list this time?

I turned in to the Plan Commission hearing a petition of 17 homeowner names- of which 15? were on the mailing list or possibly should be?

Citizen representation is needed in this process. We have no neighborhood organization representing us. Our council representatives need to reach out to the neighborhood early. Waiting to hear from our councilman and any other council members who want to prioritize keeping the community informed by open monthly meetings in the community...not thru other organizations.

In paths of truth and right,

Sue Terrill

The Summary I brought to review at the hearing,

A petition with names all RC and 18 of which received the mailing.

Hand over these issues

Issues how the Plan Commission informs the public.

When were signs placed for the meeting and the Hearing. Mailing list.

Provided with incomplete view of the mail list by PC, parts cut off. Asked PC for fuller list. None provided
Unlike last time.

102 names on the list minus officials is 96 residents who were sent mailing.

Is this correct?

Why is the map provided to which mailings were sent even more expansive than last time. Greater area yet fewer names. Explain. I see that the boundaries were shifted.

Last time 2020 Unison's Mr. Moebius testified there were 150 names on mailing list. This did not correspond with list I had from the Plan Commission of 135/136. Yet now almost 40 names fewer in larger area? Noted at Plan Commission hearing.

Improper description of property to the East

On page 13- 1 list the "area description on the East CR/Salon, Retail." On p. 13-2 in the first paragraph, you do not note that there is multifamily housing to the east and part of the Salon/ Barber building. Only listed as a salon, retail in the report, it is a salon/barber shop in a multifamily building.

Please look at your own map "The Zoning and Land Use Map" on p XX of staff report and see it is listed there a **multifamily** building with a **barber** in the complex. **Copy of Map enclosed.** Email 7. no response.

Parking spaces p. 13-3 The Doll House Issue owner, Ms. Winston.

P. 13-5 Listed under "requirement" is: and under "Division of Transportation," it states "a CROSS ACCESS AGREEMENT IS REQUIRED." HAS THIS BEEN OBTAINED? This was not answered at the hearing even though Ms. Winston appeared to oppose the agreement and stated about ¾ of the area was her property. Email sent April 13th asking Plan Commission before the hearing to clarify. No response back from Plan Commission since sent. April 13th before the hearing. See email 6

And No. 9 What is the location of the dumpster?

How security lighting might affect the neighbors, especially in the apartments and residences.

Trees trimmed provided privacy to the multifamily housing next door "? to the East"

Neighborhood meeting notes April 7. "20/20 Plan" from 1999 says commercial development. Is this the commercial development or will this negatively impact the commercial development that Reynolds Corners needs? May turn business away.

13-4 How does this reflect on future waivers or spacing. If someone wants this bad enough can they continue to bring pressure on neighbors. The agency has already only created negative conditions for

approval. Mr. Gibbons mentioned this spacing issue but did not explain what was occurring. This certainly might affect our issue.

Why were there NO ENVIRONMENTAL COMMENTS" listed in the report?

Have yet to receive the Unison yearly annual and the most recent quarterly reports about the success of their programs. I had emailed and spoke to Unison Ms. Kobold, Director on the Eastside and have yet to receive any response for this information. (Copy of email provided.) Unison effusely expressed openness at the hearing. Yet, immediately after the hearing when I asked Ms. Kobold about my email request to her for Unison's agency reports she stated was not aware of it. Her first comment: "How did I get her email?" right after Plan Commission meeting. I got it from their paperwork

In the past I went to all their sites to search down a copy these reports -unavailable at all their sites, even their employees were surprised they had none to offer- and when I reviewed reports, I found beds not filled and the lowest rating from the Mental Health Board for Unison. So has this improved?

Back FENCE ONLY 3.5 HIGH?

Unison Citizen Meeting at the Library April 7th?

I heard the Unison lawyer testify at the hearing that 8 people attended the April 7th citizen meeting at the library. He noted that it was 4/4 split: -with 4 for and 4 against. Mr. Fallows appeared pleased to hear so. I have heard from those in attendance that to characterize that there even was a vote in this way would not be accurate. Just looking at the copy of the Plan Commission sign in sheet for the event does not produce those numbers

The actual Plan Commission sign in sheet showed 6 signatures 5 of whom were residents-one a Plan Commission rep, Mr. Latsko. I know at least 3 were against. One of whom is listed on the petition I turned in. See copy.from PC email.

I will follow up, but if I should be correct that would mean that the real possibility of the count could be at least 3 against and two maybe supportive? See actual copy of the citizen sign in list from Plan Commission and note names on petition. A lengthy letter in opposition was provided in 2020 from the first two names listed on the sign in sheet. Another name is listed in opposition on the petition turned in. Yet an erroneous perception was presented by Unison at the hearing, uncorrected by Mr. Latsko?

For the record I think there should be a written report from these meetings. In the past I was told it was not a requirement, but I questioned that. I contacted Mr. Latsko He said it is not a requirement. See email.

Be certain, if I had been aware of that neighborhood meeting, I would have attended myself and encouraged others to attend.

I provided today April 14th one page of our petitions at the hearing. Other material has been submitted to Mr. Latsko and to me but I was not able to bring to the meeting. Issues with citizens dealing with computers and drop- offs including my own. Breakdown of those on the mailing list.

When questioned by Mr. Fallows at the hearing if there were any emails or phone calls (only), Mr. Latsko replied that no phone calls were received and only 4 emails. No other mention of any other letters, etc. So, were there no others- including the statement in the report that since you want to have

an exclusion for the new, since 2020, group home on Westhaven? The staff report states “it is supported by the LCMHSB which did not object.” Please show us that documentation? I had asked for this documentation previous to the hearing. Please see my email to Mr. Latsko attached. No response was received before or since.

Why should a citizen have to be following up with the details to determine if a report, a proposal or hearing was done fairly? What checks do we have as concerned citizens? Tell me council people and Mayor? Who represents us in these matters so close to our homes? Don't we need someone to monitor this for the citizens who are not organized- the weakest link. Tell me who stands for us?

Thank you for your consideration.

I have experience with being the weakest link and I know how it has destroyed our neighborhoods in the past. Meet your constituents monthly at a regular open meeting –not affiliated with any organization.

In paths of truth and right,

Sue Terrill