

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

**Tuesday, June 26, 2018
100 W. Spring Valley Road**

Council Chambers

7:00 P.M.

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance.
2. Attendance.
3. Excuse Absent Members.
4. Approval of Minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of April 24, 2018.
5. Reading of Opening Statement.
6. Public Hearings None.
7. Old Business – None.
8. New Business.
 - A. Application P-2018-0014: Record Plan for Hills Office Park – Consolidation of two lots.
 1. Applicant: Kurt Ziessler for Burkhardt Engineering, Inc.
 2. Location: Northeast Corner at Clys Road and Bigger Road.
 - B. Application P-2018-0015: Major Site Plan for Veterinary Clinic.
 1. Applicant: Kurt Ziessler for Burkhardt Engineering, Inc.
 2. Location: 6421 Clys Road.
9. Communications.
10. Adjournment.

The Centerville Planning Commission will hold its next regularly scheduled meeting in the Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 31, 2018.

PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Council Chambers
100 W. Spring Valley Road
Tuesday, April 24, 2018

At 7:00 p.m., Mr. Clark called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Paul Clark, Amy Korenyi-Both, Jim Durham, Bill Etson, Robert Muzechuk, Don Stewart, and Kevin Von Handorf. Also present were Planner Mark Yandrick, Attorney Steven Bacon, Staff Engineer Alisha Burcham and Assistant Clerk of Council Julie Weaver.

Present in the Council Chambers were Councilmember John Palcher, Councilmember Mark Engert and City Manager Wayne Davis.

Mr. Clark welcomed Mr. Bacon, who was standing in for Mr. Liberman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No additions or corrections were suggested for the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of March 27, 2018.

MOTION: Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion for approval of the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of February 27, 2018, as distributed. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0-3 with Mr. Stewart, Mr. Muzechuk and Mr. Von Handorf abstaining.

READING OF THE OPENING STATEMENT

Mr. Clark read the opening statement for public hearings.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application P-2018-0010: Amendment to the Final Development Plan for Cornerstone Phase III . Cornerstone Developers for the Village Center at Cornerstone North

Planner Mark Yandrick gave the staff report for the Amendment to the Final Development Plan for Phase III of Cornerstone North submitted by Robert Hall, III, for Cornerstone Developers. The new plan would remove three smaller buildings and change the configuration of the village center on the 14 acres north of Dille Drive to accommodate a large, upscale restaurant. The plan also moved the building on the outlot at the northeast corner of Wilmington Pike and Village Center Drive northward to create a wider view corridor for the large restaurant. Mr. Yandrick used aerial maps and photos to show existing conditions for the site, which has B-PD zoning. He stated any Final Development Plan must be in harmony with the approved Preliminary Development Plan, and he pointed out the major components of the original approval of the Final

Development will remain, including setbacks, mounding requirements, the materials palette, landscaping and types of lighting. Staff felt the additional parking required would isolate the restaurant from other shops in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. Yandrick noted the major differences in the two plans were connectivity and walkability. The Final Development Plan approved in October 2015 was laid out to encourage public gathering and pedestrian activity, but the revision isolated the large restaurant among parking fields, in conflict with the vision for design intimacy and the promotion of small, local businesses for both daytime and nighttime activity. Staff would like to see Building A returned to its previous location to buffer the impression of the sizeable parking lot at Village Center Drive.

Mr. Yandrick discussed the questionable need for the change to the view corridor. Staff felt southbound traffic would have a wider view corridor with the original placement of the proposed building on the southern portion of the lot; the prospective user insisted this structure be moved northward. Noting a monument sign could be permitted at the intersection of Village Center Drive and Wilmington Pike, Mr. Yandrick used a diagram to show the slight difference in the view corridor for northbound traffic on Wilmington Pike.

Because of incompatibility with the vision of the previously approved plans, the Planning Department recommended denial of Application P-2018-0010. Mr. Yandrick reminded everyone the amendment to the Final Development Plan for Phase III would go to City Council for review and a final decision following the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Yandrick then presented an alternate to denying the application should the Planning Commission see fit to compromise with the applicant. In that case, staff recommended the following eight conditions:

1. This Final Development Plan amendment shall conform to the approved Cornerstone North Preliminary Development Plan Amendment 1 and all conditions of approval contained therein as determined by the City Planner.
2. All lots shall be subject to Major Site Plan review in accordance with the Unified Development Ordinance. A review for UDO and FDP compliance will be conducted as each development proposal comes forward for Major Site Plan review.
3. The final location of all buildings, parking, landscape areas, and related items shall generally conform to this Final Development Plan, as depicted, unless otherwise conditioned herein.
4. All other relevant conditions of Case P-2015-0030, a Final Development Plan for Cornerstone North Phase III, shall remain in effect.
5. Return the proposed "Future Retail/Restaurant" building at the northwest corner of Cornerstone North Blvd. and Village Center Dr. to the intersection corner as originally proposed in the adopted Phase III FDP (P-2015-0030).

6. Return the small “Building A” to its original proposed location along Cornerstone North Blvd. as adopted in the Phase III FDP (P-2015-0030).
7. Intersection control measures shall be designed to meet current engineering and safety standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
8. Revised storm water calculations and exhibits shall be provided to the satisfaction of the City Engineer for proposed changes in drainage.

Questions followed. When Mr. Clark asked about the size of Building A that staff wanted to have returned to its original position, Mr. Yandrick stated staff had about 6,000 square feet in mind. When Ms. Korenyi-Both asked how long staff had to review the changes to the development plan, Mr. Yandrick responded it was 45 days, per the requirement, but no changes were submitted by the applicant since staff comments were sent. Mr. Etson noted moving Building A would take away about 25 parking spaces and asked if returning Building A to its previous position would leave enough parking spaces for the restaurant and other users. Mr. Yandrick stated it would depend on the types of users for the remainder of Phase III and suggested asking the developer’s representatives the question during the public hearing.

Mr. Clark opened the public hearing, and Mr. Robert Hall, the applicant representing Oberer Land Developers, 3445 Newmark Drive, Miamisburg, first reassured Planning Commission that the Major Site Plan for the park at Cornerstone had been resubmitted with modifications and that Oberer Developers, Ltd. was working to comply with the requirements generated with previous Cornerstone approvals. Emphasizing his belief that the amendment to the Final Development Plan should stand on its own merit rather than on compatibility with the approved Preliminary Development Plan, Mr. Hall requested approval of the amended FDP. Having the regional draw of Cooper’s Hawk Winery, an upscale destination restaurant of 12,500 square feet with an exterior patio and a retail area for wine and accessories, would benefit Cornerstone as a whole and would benefit the City of Centerville because of the positive impact on the Tax Increment Financing. Mr. Hall reviewed the progress being made at Cornerstone and noted a \$1.9 million investment in the infrastructure by the developer. He stated leases continued to be signed for Cornerstone as a whole and requested City cooperation in the relocation of the site for the building on the outlot along Wilmington Pike to improve the view corridor for Cooper’s Hawk. Shifting the building northward was a condition by the user for purchase of property. Mr. Hall pointed out the shift would improve walkability for the site from the hotel and the park path. He discussed pedestrian connectivity, the parking situation and the unacceptability of reintroducing Building A, because of the impact on the total number of parking spaces. He stated changes were being considered to eliminate parking spaces where vehicles back into drive aisles or intersections. He respectfully asked Planning Commission to recommend approval of the amendment to the Final Development Plan, excluding Conditions No. 5 and No. 6 shown in staff’s alternate recommendation.

Mr. Chris Conley, Oberer Realty Services, 3445 Newmark Drive, stated there had been numerous iterations of the plan, but the current submittal was the only one the potential user had approved. He added an easement will be needed for valet parking on the back and reminded the group Planning Commission would review the final building plan as a Major Site Plan prior to

construction. He stated Cooper's Hawk would be investing \$10-12 million in the facility, and he requested a recommendation for approval.

Comments and questions from Planning Commission followed. Mr. Clark asked about a timeline; Mr. Conley stated the company would like to open summer 2019. Mr. Von Handorf pointed out that the site was at the northern front door to the development, but the developer was asking permission to remove two attractive buildings and pedestrian-friendly hardscape without any tradeoffs for the lost amenities. Mr. Conley responded that significant amenities had been installed on the south side of the property, including a tower structure and fountain per the previously approved plan. He stressed the importance of landing this quality regional draw. Mr. Von Handorf countered that the Village Center Drive intersection was a major concern. The building would be an island in a sea of parking—rather than an attractive entrance to the village center neighborhood with pedestrian-friendly amenities. Mr. Conley stated having Cooper's Hawk would help build out the rest of the area.

Mr. Muzechuk verified he was hearing that, without the approval of the view corridor and the parking, the client would not locate at Cornerstone; Mr. Conley reiterated that the client wanted both the view corridor and the parking spaces.

Mr. Clark asked about topography—the difference in elevation from Wilmington Pike; Mr. Yankdrick estimated a grade change of two to four feet. Mrs. Burcham, Staff Engineer, added that the mounds along Wilmington averaged four feet high. When Mr. Clark noted the Cooper's Hawk in Liberty Township, "a destination restaurant", was at the rear of the center, Mr. Conley stated that location was not doing as well as expected. The user was insisting on visibility here.

Ms. Korenyi-Both expressed the need for pedestrian crossing signs on Cornerstone Boulevard to improve safety and the general walkability of the area. She also pointed out confusion at the 4-way stop in front of Costco near the multi-lane intersection onto Feedwire Road.

Mr. Clark closed the public hearing.

When Mr. Etson asked about any further amendments to the plans for the park and Phase III, Mr. Hall and Mr. Conley stated the park plans were under revision and some elements of this amendment submittal were being reviewed, following engineering comments concerning parking spaces along drive aisles, intersections and crosswalks. A pedestrian walkway being moved northward was not shown at this point. Mr. Conley stated any changes to the layout would be presented with the Major Site Plan, along with elevations.

Mrs. Burcham, Staff Engineer, clarified the areas where engineering staff had parking concerns, areas where pedestrian safety was an issue and areas where entry features could be needed. When Mr. Stewart asked if the number of required parking spaces could be maintained, Mrs. Burcham said the answer was unclear at this point.

Additional comments and questions followed. Mr. Muzechuk asked if granting more parking to Cooper's Hawk would shortchange other businesses in the center. Mr. Yandrick said it as impossible to project the numbers without knowing the end-users. Shared parking opportunities

did exist. Mr. Muzechuk stated Cooper's Hawk seemed to be requiring a very large share of the available parking spaces.

Mr. Von Handorf reiterated the pedestrian feel was changing and was not being addressed. The applicant had taken out two buildings and replaced them with parking spaces. Ms. Korenyi-Both pointed out types of tenants at Cornerstone did not encourage people to walk from one area to another. Mr. Etson proposed a condition to revise the western parking area adjacent to the intersection to make it more pleasing to the eye.

Ms. Korenyi-Both asked if there was consensus to strike Conditions #5 and #6, as requested by Mr. Hall. Mr. Etson and Mr. Von Handorf asked not to strike both without replacing the verbiage with something to convey the intent of the Commission, without being too specific.

MOTION: Ms. Korenyi-Both attempted a motion to approve Application P-2018-0010 with the conditions recommended by staff, but striking Conditions #5 and #6 and adding something that works for the City and the applicant for parking at the intersection of Cornerstone North Boulevard and Village Center Drive.

Discussion of the motion followed with Mrs. Burcham suggesting using the early part of Condition #6 to return Building A to its original position or to provide a pedestrian feature that would be conducive to traffic flow to the approval of the City Engineer and the applicant. Mr. Hall stated agreement with the language as long as the approval of the applicant was included.

Ms. Korenyi-Both's motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Von Handorf then made a motion to approve the Amendment of the Final Development Plan for Phase III at Cornerstone, subject to the conditions recommended by staff, but striking condition 5, keeping Condition #6 and adding "or provide pedestrian-oriented architectural features at the Cornerstone North intersection to the satisfaction of City staff." Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-2 with Mr. Durham and Mr. Clark voting no.

Application P-2018-0011: Variance for a Wall Sign on a Non-Frontage Façade
Home2 Suites by Hilton, 5161 Cornerstone North Boulevard

Mr. Yandrick gave the staff report on the variance requested by Becky Ross of KAP Signs for a wall sign on a non-frontage elevation. The UDO requires that a wall sign on a business be displayed on the frontage generating the area for the sign, but Home2 Suites at 5161 Cornerstone North Boulevard wanted the wall sign on the longer south façade for greater visibility. Mr. Yandrick shared photos of the area, discussed existing conditions and reviewed the history of the placement of the building perpendicular to Wilmington Pike for better protection of the residential neighbors to the west. Staff felt the hardship was having only the narrow side of the building on the public frontage, a hardship not created by the current owner of the property, but rather by the City and the developer.

Staff recommended approval of the variance, subject to the following one (1) condition:

1. No wall sign shall be permitted on the west or east facades of the building with the approval of this wall sign on the south side of the building.

When Mr. Clark opened the public hearing, Mr. David Blang of KAP Signs stated the variance was needed because of the unique situation and said he was available to answer questions. Mr. Clark asked if Mr. Blang had any issues with the condition requested by staff, and Mr. Blang responded in the negative. Hearing no other questions and seeing no other speakers, Mr. Clark closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the variance requested in Application P-2018-0011 for the wall sign on a non-frontage façade. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Selection of a Vice Chair for Planning Commission

At the previous meeting, members had tabled selection of the vice chair until more Planning Commission members were present.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to remove the issue of naming a vice chair from the table. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

The Rules of Procedure for the Planning Commission require the annual appointment of a vice chair for the Planning Commission. Mr. Clark thanked Ms. Korneyi-Both who had served as vice chair for three years. She had requested that the duties be passed to another member upon the expiration of her term. Mr. Yandrick explained the main requirement was for the vice chair to preside over any meetings in the absence of the chairman.

MOTION: Mr. Durham nominated Mr. Von Handorf for the office of vice chair of the Planning Commission. Mr. Clark verified that Mr. Von Handorf would be willing to serve, before Mrs. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Selection of Representation for a City Council Work Session

Mr. Yandrick announced the Centerville City Council was inviting three representatives of various boards and commissions to Council work sessions for input from the groups. Council had extended an invitation to Planning Commission members to visit the work session on May 14, 2018.

Mr. Clark, Mr. Von Handorf and Mr. Durham volunteered to meet with City Council.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Yandrick announced the Major Site Plan for the park at Cornerstone and the Major Site Plan for Tire Discounters on Feedwire Road should be on the May agenda for Planning Commission. He stated the readiness of the Tire Discounters application was dependent upon decisions by its corporate leadership.

The next meeting of the Centerville Planning Commission will be held in the Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 22, 2018. The date is early because of the Memorial Day holiday the following week.

ADJOURNMENT

Seeing no further business, Mr. Clark adjourned the meeting about 8:20 p.m.

Paul Clark, Chair



Record Plat

June, 2018

Case No.: P-2018-0014
Name: Hills Office Park Replat
Applicant: Kurt Ziessler, Burkhardt Engineering, Inc.
Location: 6421 Cloy Road
Parcel ID: O68-1925-0003 & 0004
Zoning: O-S, Office-Services
No. of Lots: 1
Acres: +/- 2.17 Acres
Purpose: Lot consolidation
Dedication: Yes

Summary: The Applicant, Kurt Ziessler of Burkhardt Engineering, LLC representing the Owner (Kracken Properties, LLC) proposes to consolidate two (2) lots into a single lot to facilitate development of a 15,000 square foot emergency medical facility for animals. The lot consolidation is necessary to prevent a common property line from bisecting the building and site, thus creating building code and zoning code issues. Additionally, various ingress/egress, private drainage, and detention easements will be established to accommodate cross-access vehicular traffic and long-term maintenance of stormwater drainage facilities. A very small area at the southwest corner of the site (0.0008 acres, or 34 square feet) will be dedicated as public right-of-way to accommodate the roadway and sidewalk radius at the intersection of Cloy and Bigger Roads.

Staff has no objections to the proposed record plan.

Standards of Approval (Article 5.09(P)(2))

The following standards shall be considered in the review of Record plat applications:

- a. *That the Record plat is consistent with the approved Preliminary Plat, Development Plan, or Residential Cluster Development;*

No such plan exists for the subject site.

- b. *The property has been surveyed and a record plat prepared including all information relating to the property has been submitted with the application including electronic copies;*

All related information has been properly submitted.

- c. *The City Engineer has approved all construction plans and documents prior to recording of the plat;*

The City Engineer indicated no issues with the proposed plat.

- d. *Documents establishing any owners association and other development agreements have been approved by the Municipal Attorney's Office; and*

No such documents are required.

- e. *The maintenance bonding requirements have been met.*

No such bonding is required.

Planning Department Recommendation

The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL of the proposed plat, without conditions.



Application No. P-2018-0014

**City of Centerville
Subdivision Application**
100 West Spring Valley Road, Centerville, Ohio 45458
Phone: (937) 433-7151 Fax: (937) 428-4763
E-mail: planning@centervilleohio.gov
www.ci.centerville.oh.us

1. Type of Application
(Check all that apply)

- Subdivision, Minor (Lot Split) Preliminary Plat Record Plat

2. General Information

Applicants Name: Kurt Ziessler
Company/Business Name: Burkhardt Engineering, Inc.
Mailing Address: 28 North Cherry Street
City: Germantown State: OH Zip Code: 45327
Phone No.: 937-388-0060 Fax No.: 937-716-2309 E-Mail: kziessler@burkhardtinc.com
Property Address: SW corner of intersection of Bigger Road and Clys Road
Zoning District: City of Centerville Lot Area: (Acres or Sq. Ft.) 2.1772 Acres
Existing Use: Vacant Land Proposed Use: Veterinary Clinic
Auditors Parcel ID No.: 068-1925-0003/068-1925-0004 County: Montgomery
Proposal Description: Consolidation of Lots 3-4 of the Hills Office Park Plat, Section 14, Town 2, Range 6, M.Rs.

Please call (937) 433-7151 ext. 4760 to schedule an appointment or if you have any questions regarding this application.

Departmental Use Only

DATE STAMP HERE	FEES	REVIEW	SUBDIVISION
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p style="font-size: 24px; text-align: center;">RECEIVED</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MAY 30 2018</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CITY OF CENTERVILLE PLANNING DEPT.</p> </div>	Application Fee: <u>\$ 750</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved
	Parkland Fee: _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Denied
	Other Fee: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Bd. of Arch. Review	Date: _____
	TOTAL FEE: <u>750</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City Council	_____ Signature

3. Property Owner Information

Property Owner Name: Kracken Properties, LLC
Mailing Address: 6995 East Kemper Road
City: Cincinnati State: OH Zip Code: 45249
Phone No.: _____ E-Mail: _____

4. Applicant Signature

I understand that approval of this application does not constitute approval for any administrative review, conditional use permit, variance, or exception from any other City regulations which are not specifically the subject of this application. I understand further that I remain responsible for satisfying requirements of any private restrictions or covenants appurtenant to the property.

I certify that I am the applicant and that the information submitted with this application is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that the City is not responsible for inaccuracies in information presented, and that inaccuracies may result in the revocation of this zoning certificate as determined by the City Planner. I further certify that I am the owner or purchaser (or option holder) of the property involved in this application, or the lessee or agent fully authorized by the owner to make this submission.

I certify that statements made to me about the time it takes to review and process this application are general. I am aware that the City has attempted to request everything necessary for an accurate and complete review of my proposal; however, that after my application has been submitted and reviewed by City staff, it may be necessary for the City to request additional information and clarification.

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury, that all the information provided on this application is true and correct.

Kurt M. Ziessler
Printed Name of Owner or Authorized Agent

30 MAY 2018
Date


Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent

Departmental Use Only

Application Status		
RECOMMENDED By: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> As Submitted <input type="checkbox"/> With Conditions _____ Date	By: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> As Submitted <input type="checkbox"/> With Conditions _____ Date	APPROVED By: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> As Submitted <input type="checkbox"/> With Conditions (See Attachment) _____ Date



Major Site Plan

June, 2018

Application: P-2018-0015
Applicant: Burkhardt Engineering
Owner: Kracken Properties LLC
Location: 6421 Cloyo Road
Site Area: +/- 2.1 acres
Zoning: O-S, Office-Service
Existing Use: Vacant
Proposed Use: Veterinarian Hospital

Adjacent Uses/Zoning: North: Light-Industrial, I-1
East: Office Service, O-S
South: Condos, R-PD
West: Office-Space, O-PD

Summary: The Applicant, Burkhardt Engineering, on behalf of Compassion First Veterinarian Hospital proposes to build a new 15,000 sq. ft. vet hospital and relocate the existing facility from next door at 6405 Cloyo Road.

Site Background & Existing Conditions

The site is currently vacant and undeveloped with a general slope from NE to SW on the site. The applicant received a variance approval (P-2017-0011) in April 2017 to construct a 15,000 sq. ft. building, whereas the O-S Zoning District Maximum Building Area is 10,000 sq. ft.. The four conditions of approval were as such:

1. *The Variance shall expire without granting of a final Certificate of Zoning Compliance and Building Permit for construction within 16 months of approval.*

2. *The subject lots shall be consolidated via record plat.*
3. *The proposed building shall be located within the southwest corner of the site.*
4. *The maximum building size shall be 15,000 square feet.*

The proposed location includes one (1) building of approximately 15,000 square feet. The site will be accessed via an access drive from Bigger Road. Additionally, vehicles can access the site via the property to the east, which connects to Cloyo Road. There's an existing cross-access easement already in place on the adjacent property, which will connect vehicles to the current curb cut on Cloyo Road at 6375 Cloyo Road.

The site currently has a stormwater easement for the 42" storm water pipe that traverses the subject site from northern section to SE corner of the property.

Grading and Setbacks

The applicant will be adding a parking lot and several catch basins, which will drain into existing concrete channel on the eastern portion of the subject site before dumping into the 42" storm drain that traverses the site..

There are existing drainage swells between the building and Bigger Rd and Cloyo Road frontages that will remain

The building and parking setbacks for this property have been met on the proposal.

Fire Connection & Water

The Fire Department Connection will be built on the south side of the building with a fire hydrant being installed nearby. With Exhibit C-4.0 (Utility Plan), the exhibit shows the 400' Fire Hydrant Length being able to circumnavigate the building to be able to fight a fire from the best angle.

Parking, Vehicle and Pedestrian Design & Circulation

The plan proposes 62 parking spaces as well as drive through access between Bigger Road and the adjacent eastern property. There is a dumpster on the north end of the parking lot and the applicant has shown the dumpster vehicles will be able to access and navigate the site. There are 8 parking spaces that are planned for future development. Building 8 spaces or fewer would only require Staff Approval of Minor Site Plan in the future, as opposed to Planning Commission Approval for greater than 8 spaces.

There is adequate pedestrian accessibility on site. Because of the nature of this specialty animal/vet hospital (*or any permitted use of O-S Zoning District*), it is not expected to generate pedestrian traffic from surrounding areas and because of the difficulty with existing ditches, a pedestrian connection to the Right-Of-Way sidewalks on Clyo Rd. and Bigger Rd. is not included.

Landscaping & Screening

The applicant has met all of the landscape bufferyards and parking lot landscaping requirements. There's existing tree coverage on the north side that will remain and count towards the bufferyard requirement. If removed at some point in the future, new landscaping would be required.

Parking Lot Lighting

The applicant has proposed 5- 20' high poles with McGraw Edison Gleon lights downward directed. Additionally there are some wall mounted downward directed lights on the north side of the building.

All lighting requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance are met.

Stormwater Management

The proposed improvements will direct stormwater eastward on the site to the existing drainage flow patterns towards the SE corner of the site. This plan includes a detention basin on the eastern portion of the site to mitigate stormwater before entering the public storm sewer.

Building Architecture

The proposed building has a hip-roof system with elevated accents at the corners and the main entry on the eastern façade. The roof consists of asphalt shingles on the plans. There are dormers on the roofs to break up some of the massing.

There are different size windows surrounding the building. The only portion that lacks windows is the northern façade, but the applicant has chosen to change brick color along with the attached carport canopy for transport and deliveries.

Although signage is reviewed as part of the Major Site Plan, applicants are encouraged to show the application. A ground sign on site is being substituted for a wall sign on the east façade, which is along a non-public frontage. This meets the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance. The applicant will be required to be apply for sign permits after the Construction Documents are approved.

The Unified Development Ordinance requires all buildings with a public frontage to a public street shall contain at least one entrance on any façade fronting on a public street. Because the previous variance approval conditioned that the building be placed on the southwest corner of the site and the existing drainage swales that exist between the building and both public street, staff is in support of the current proposal that doesn't have an entrance facing a public street.

Summary

In summary, Planning Staff contends the application sufficiently meets the standards of approval for a Major Site Plan. The proposed parking lot layout, hardscape design, architecture, site design, parking, lighting, and landscaping are consistent with UDO requirements where applicable.

Standards:

Article 5.09(N)(2) – The following standards shall be considered in the review of Major Site Plan applications:

- a. *That it fully complies with all applicable requirements of the UDO;*

It appears – at this time – the plan complies with all applicable UDO requirements, except for the public facing entrance requirements. Staff recommends PC waive this requirement for the above stated reasons.

- b. *That it fully complies with an approved Final Development Plan, if applicable;*

No such plan exists nor is required.

- c. *That it adequately protects other property or residential uses located on the same property from the potential adverse effects of a non-residential use;*

Residential uses are located across Clys Road. First, the architecture of the building is a residential style with hip-roof. Secondly, the landscaping should help ease the transition of the new building being built. Additionally, no site lighting is proposed for this facade. The lighting plan also shows that beyond 10' past the property line, the lighting plan meets the Unified Development Ordinance for lumens being carried off of the property.

All other site requirements meet the U.D.O standards and do not negatively impact adjacent properties.

- d. *That it is consistent with the use and character of surrounding properties;*

The site is located within an office park environment. The proposed use is Vet Office/Hospital, which is a permitted use. Building will be the largest in the area but not out-of-scale with other similar commercial office buildings.

- e. That it provides safe conditions for pedestrians or motorists and prevents the dangerous arrangement of pedestrian and vehicular ways; and*

Safe conditions for pedestrians and motorists appear to be present.

- f. That it provides safe ingress and egress for emergency services.*

Ingress and egress points appear adequate for access by emergency services.

Recommendation: APPROVE, with the following three conditions:

1. If the existing tree line and brush along the northern property line is ever removed, a landscape buffer yard consistent with standards of the Unified Development Ordinance shall be planted.
2. Planning Commission waives the requirement for an entrance along a public facing façade.
3. Construction document notes and detailed plan review comments from the Public Works Department or other review agencies shall be incorporated into construction plans subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. An Ohio-licensed professional engineer is to stamp, sign, and date the plans.



Development Plan Application

City of Centerville - 100 West Spring Valley Road • Centerville, Ohio 45458
Phone: 937.433.7151 Fax: 937.428.4763 E-mail: planning@centervilleohio.gov

P-2018-0015

Application No.

5-30-18

Date Received

Type of Application

- Development Plan, Prelim.
 Development Plan, Final
 Landscape/Lighting Plan
 Major Site Plan
 Amend.

Applicant Information

Applicant Name Kurt Ziessler
 Mailing Address 28 North Cherry Street
 City Germantown State OH Zip 45327
 Phone No. 937-388-0060 Fax No. 937-716-2309 E-mail kziessler@burkhardtinc.com

Request Information

Property Owner Kracken Properties, LLC
 Company/Business Name Dayton Care Center
 Property Address Corner of intersection of Clys Road and Bigger Road
 Zoning District City of Centerville Parcel ID No. 068-01925-0003/068-01925-0004
 Existing Use Vacant Land Proposed Use Veterinary Clinic
 Proposal Description *(include pertinent information as an attachment if needed)* Proposed veterinary clinic and its associated pavement, parking facilities, utilities, landscaping, signage, and any other proposed improvements which are needed to service the clinic.

Public Hearing: Any application which requires a public hearing, such as a Development Plan, shall include the submission of names and mailing addresses of all property owners within 500 feet of any parcel(s) involved in the application request in accordance with Article 5.11 of the Unified Development Ordinance.

Applicant Signature

I understand that approval of this application does not constitute approval for any administrative review, conditional use permit, variance, or exception from any other City regulations which are not specifically the subject of this application. I understand that approval of this application request does not constitute approval of a building occupancy permit. I understand further that I remain responsible for satisfying requirements of any private restrictions or covenants appurtenant to the property.

I certify that I am the applicant and that the information submitted with this application is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that the City is not responsible for inaccuracies in information presented, and that inaccuracies may result in the revocation of this zoning certificate as determined by the City Planner. I further certify that I am the owner or purchaser (or option holder) of the property involved in this application, or the lessee or agent fully authorized by the owner to make this submission.

I certify that statements made to me about the time it takes to review and process this application are general. I am aware that the City has attempted to request everything necessary for an accurate and complete review of my proposal; however, after my application has been submitted and reviewed by City staff, it may be necessary for the City to request additional information and clarification.

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury, that all the information provided on this application is true and correct.

Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent

30 MAY, 2018

Date

Kurt M. Ziessler

Print Name of Owner or Authorized Agent

Departmental Use Only

Form of Payment <input type="checkbox"/> Cash <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ck <u>1225</u> <input type="checkbox"/> CC _____	Application Fees Application Fee: <u>\$400 pd</u>	Review Authority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning Commission <input type="checkbox"/> Board of Arch. Review
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved with Conditions	Staff Signature _____ Date _____



May 30, 2018

City of Centerville
100 West Spring Valley Road
Centerville, Ohio 45458

Development Plan Application Narrative
Project 18010 – Compassion First, Care Center Veterinary Hospital

To Whom it may Concern:

This letter is in response to the Narrative required by the Development Plan Application.

The project is for a new 14,190 square foot Veterinary Hospital at the corner of Bigger and Cloy Roads. The project is combining two existing parcels and has been previously approved for up to 15,000 square feet. Part of that approval included that the new building be set into the building setbacks in the Southwest corner of the site. The total site is 2.17 acres or 94,525 sf. The impervious surfaces, including building, sidewalks, and parking areas amount to 40,500 sf. The impervious surface ratio then being 42.8%

The Care Center currently operates in the building on the adjacent site to the East and will be relocating to this site and selling/leasing the existing building. The new site is accessible off of Cloy at the entry into the existing daycare center; it will cross over the existing Care Center site then onto the new site. A new curb cut is being provided onto Bigger at the North end of the property. Easements are being provided to allow the adjacent sites to have access to the Bigger Road access.

The building occupancy is listed as "office", but in actuality is not an office or a typical veterinary center. Vets send their clients to this center for specialty treatments. After diagnosis animals may receive MRI's, CAT scans, Oncology diagnosis, ultrasound treatment, x-rays among other diagnostics. There are operating rooms, isolation rooms, critical care units and emergency rooms, much more like a hospital than an office. There will be a generator on the North side of the building to allow for continual patient service during power outages. The patients are animals versus people. The building operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. There are approximately 25 people as a maximum staff and 30 clients.

The current site is relatively flat with deeper swales along the West and South property lines between the building setbacks and the R.O.W. An existing swale in the Northeast corner is being recontoured to allow for onsite detention. The North edge of the site is wooded. Most utilities will enter from the South side of the site except for electric service will come from the North. The parking area is drained into the detention pond (normally dry). The building downspouts will tie directly into the storm water system.

The building itself is mainly brick with a base color and an accent color. There are cast stone accents above and below the banded windows. The base building is a hip roof system with additional hip roof accents at the corners. At the Southwest corner the roof area is elevated to provide an identifiable architectural element for the public to find in emergency situations. Wall signs are on each corner and upper windows will provide an indirect glow for ease of identification. The roof will be 3-dimensional asphalt shingles throughout. In order to reduce the building height and to hide mechanical equipment, there is a depression in the middle of the roof to allow for the equipment to be located off the ground and out of site. Each corner has siding accents (cement fiber board), that will provide some additional interest to the building façade. The siding will also provide



additional color to the building. There is a "carport" type structure on the North end of the building, adjacent to the Bigger Road setback. This provides the function of housing the company transport van and allows for covered and somewhat hidden deliveries. The carport also provides visible shielding of the outside dog walk area and the electrical transformer and generator.

The wall signage on the building is being provided on two sides of the higher corner element facing Clio and Bigger. Additional wall signage is located at the North end of the building. The two on that side are less than 50% of the total. In lieu of a ground sign there is signage on the East façade above the entry. The total amount of signage is less than allowable.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with the City as the project moves forward.

Sincerely,
Luminaut, Inc.



Michael J. LeVally
Sr. Project Manager

