

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Tuesday, April 26, 2011

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mr. Paul Clark, Chair; Mr. Jim Briggs, Mr. Jim Brunner, Mr. Jim Durham, Mr. John Palcher and Mr. Bill Etson. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Nathan Cahall, Economic Development Administrator; Mr. Scott Liberman, Municipal Attorney; Mr. Greg Horn, City Manager; Mr. John Sliemers, City Engineer; and Mrs. Julie Weaver, Clerk.

EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS

MOTION: Mr. Briggs moved to excuse Mr. Gammell and Mr. Etson who had notified Mr. Feverston that they would be absent. Mr. Palcher seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0. Mr. Etson is expected later in the evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No changes were suggested for the minutes of March 29, 2011.

MOTION: Mr. Briggs moved to approve the Planning Commission Meeting minutes of March 29, 2011, as distributed. Mr. Brunner seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Application P 2011-0066 - John Kopilchack, Meyer, Boehmer & Reis Funeral Home – Amendment to the Approved Major Site Plan, 6661 Clyo Rd.

In giving the staff report, Mr. Feverston reminded Planning Commission that Mr. Reis had already obtained approval for a Major Site Plan retrofitting the Sears Building at 6661 Clyo Road as a funeral home. The Reis's hired architect John Kopilchack, who suggested additional changes to the front and rear elevations that require the approval of the Planning Commission. Mr. Kopilchack changed the main entry to the rear of the building, reduced the number of entrances, added a gabled covered porch, and changed the type of decorative banding around the building. Mr. Feverston recommended approval of the amendment, subject to three new conditions with all the former conditions remaining in place (as Condition 1). Mr. Briggs questioned the statement related to banding on the east façade of the building. Mr. Feverston clarified that the intent was to have the banding extend the entire length of the east wall. Planning Commission concurred that the word "onto" should be deleted from Condition 2.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved for approval of Application P 2011-0066, an Amendment to the Approved Major Site Plan at 6661 Clyo Road, subject to the conditions noted in the discussion. Mr. Brunner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 5-0, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of a Zoning Certificate, all previous conditions approved through application # P-2010-0014 shall be satisfied subject to approval by the City Planning Department.
2. The EIFS accent banding shall wrap the east elevation wall subject to approval by the Planning Department.

3. The final building material color palette shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
4. Exterior mechanical units shall be screened from view subject to approval by the Planning Department.

NEW BUSINESS

Application P 2011-0058 – Astrum Solar for Donald Terazano.
Permit for Accessory Structure, Solar Panels - 161 Terrace Villa Drive.

Mr. Feverston gave the staff report for the application by Bob Cleland of Astrum Solar for permission to install an array of fifty-three solar panels on a single family tri-level dwelling at 161 Terrace Villa Drive in an area zoned R-1C. UDO Section 9.39 considers raised solar arrays greater than 100 sq. ft. to be an accessory structure that must be consistent with the character of the house and the neighborhood. These numerous black solar panels are to the front and sides of the roof elevations of the house and garage in full view of neighbors. Staff recommended denial of the application because of negative impact in the neighborhood and asked for direction for such applications in the future or possibly consideration of the issue in the next revision of the UDO. No representatives of the applicant came forward for comment.

Planning Commission discussed the matter. Mr. Clark noted that the black solar panels against the light colored earth tones of the home would be obvious. Immediate neighbors with taller houses will look out windows above Mr. Terazano's roof. Many of the dark panels face the street. Mr. Clark also referenced that some fire departments require three feet of roof access around solar panels to provide egress and ingress to the attic in emergencies. This application does not provide such access. Mr. Palcher agreed that the solar panels would not be aesthetically acceptable. Mr. Durham spoke on behalf of the right of the homeowner to use his roof for solar panels. He felt that the energy saving panels could not be limited to those having homes situated so that solar panels would face the back yard. He did not want to deny the application based solely on aesthetics.

Mr. Cahall noted that staff would like guidance on what is considered an accessory use, specifically Article 5.09 of the Code. He asked for definition. Are fifty-three reflective panels still an accessory or incidental use?

Mr. Durham stated that, since the panels are on the same slope as the roof and raised only a few inches, in his opinion they would be a secondary and incidental use. He did not feel the application should be denied.

MOTION: After further discussion of the safety issue and the elimination of south-facing homes from the possibility of having solar panels, Mr. Durham moved for approval of Application P-2011-0058 for Solar Panels at 161 Terrace Villa Drive. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion in order to bring it to a vote. The motion was defeated 1-4, with Mr. Durham voting for approval. The applicant will be notified that he has 15 days to appeal the decision to the City Council.

Application P 2011-0067 - Charles Simms, Simms Development – Amendment to Residential Cluster Development Plan at the Highlands at Yankee Trace, Section 2.

Mr. Feverston explained the application by Simms Development requesting an amendment to the approved Residential Cluster Development Plan to allow the design option of single story attached duplex homes with front-facing garages in Section Two of the Highlands at Yankee Trace off Legendary Way at Sand Wedge Court. The architecture is similar in style to the homes in the area with side-entry garages. Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the development plan.

Mr. Etson arrived at this time.

Mr. Charles Simms of Simms Development, 4739 Farmer Road, stated that the larger footprint of the ranch style homes precludes using side-entry garages on the lots. Originally the front entry garages were to be limited to eight units in the area, but later Planning Commission increased the approval to eleven. This double would be the eighth duplex with front-facing garages. Demand is greater for single-story homes, and the front entry garage design fits the lots better.

MOTION: Mr. Briggs moved for approval of Application P-2011-0067, the Amendment to the Cluster Development Plan for the Highlands at Yankee Trace, Section 2. Mr. Brunner seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0-1, with Mr. Etson abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application P 2011-0063 - George Oberer, Cornerstone North - Preliminary Development Plan

Mr. Feverston gave background relevant to the Preliminary Development Plan for the Dille property, northeast of the intersection of Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road, near I-675. The property is 154 acres currently zoned B-PD and O-PD with a section south of Brown Road that is zoned R-PD. The site is suitable for a large multi-parcel retail and commercial development with areas well suited for offices, a hotel complex and residences. He explained the approval process and the kinds of details that would be submitted to Council with the Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan.

In giving the staff report, Mr. Feverston situated the area on a map and described the current physical features of the land. The Planning Commission studied the parcel in depth as part of Create the Vision Comprehensive Plan, Study Area J; the overarching goals of that study included preserving the open space, improving the economic health of the City, and creating a sense of place. Mr. Feverston detailed the Preliminary Development Plan as submitted on March 23, 2011 including the major access points, signalization, internal roadways and design themes. The plans call for an overlay district for portions of the property which would foster a village center atmosphere. He noted that the BAR, after due process, had determined that the Dille house at 5300 Wilmington Pike did not have landmark potential, clearing the way for a demolition permit to be issued. He pointed out the phases or sub-areas (A-G) within the project which the developer is planning to build out in steps, beginning with the outlots at Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road. A ring road ties internal areas together. A traffic impact study is underway, and the trees on the property are being inventoried, although many of the larger trees on the interior of the property were removed previously.

Mr. John Sliemers, Assistant City Engineer, discussed traffic issues. He noted that the City has been working with the developer's consultant, CESO, on a traffic impact study which quantifies the existing traffic and estimates future traffic with and without the development. Mr. Sliemers stressed that the studies are still preliminary and introduced Mr. Scott Knebel of LJB, Inc, 3100 Research Blvd., Beavercreek, consultant for the City of Centerville for this project. Mr. Knebel

stated that LJB is working to define the numbers of different kinds of trips. The current thinking is that five lanes with a center turn lane will be required with additional lanes at the interstate interchange. LJB currently does not recommend the right-in, right out access and egress. Additional signals will be required. He noted that a long-term solution for the interstate interchange is a critical factor since it is currently very congested in some time periods. ODOT, the Federal Highway Administration and all the local jurisdictions need to be involved in the big picture.

Mr. Feverston discussed the major concerns of staff. Wilmington Pike needs to be studied as a whole corridor; the developer has a responsibility to help with the cost of the required changes including the interstate upgrades. Trees are an issue since the wooded areas have been part of the signature of the property. Some of what the developer is proposing for overlays would require a text amendment of the Unified Development Ordinance and rezoning; those changes would have to be done by Council. A Final Development Plan for each phase will be required.

Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Development Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The Preliminary Development Plan shall be the plans stamped received by the City of Centerville Planning Department on March 25, 2011, except as modified herein.
2. A revised Development Plan Submission document shall be submitted by the Applicant as a part of the Preliminary Development Plan meeting all requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and to include supplemental information providing design theme guidelines for the entire development including development gateways, building architecture streetscape design, and other amenities subject to approval by the City Council.
3. The Preliminary Development Plan shall be revised to properly depict all zoning district boundaries and overlay areas.
4. Prior to the submittal of a Final Development Plan for any portion of the subject property, the applicant shall deed the land where the Brown Road right-of-way easement is situated to the City of Centerville Community Improvement Corporation.
5. The Village Center concept shall be extended to include all outlots along Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road.
6. The outlot situated at the intersection of Wilmington Pike and Brown Road shall be incorporated into the CC Overlay District as a part of Phase 4.
7. Phase 4 and 5 shall be combined into a single development phase.
8. A tree survey shall be submitted as a part of this Preliminary Development Plan that identifies all impacted trees, especially hardwoods, 6" or greater in diameter and noting the health and quality of these trees in accordance with Article 5.13J of the UDO.
9. The applicant shall submit as a part of this Preliminary Development Plan a revised Traffic Impact Study incorporating the City's traffic consultant's recommendations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer for approval by the City Engineer including, but not limited

to right-of way dedication, roadway widening, signalization, access control and addressing both short term and long term impacts to the Wilmington Pike corridor and the I-675/Wilmington Pike Interchange area.

10. Prior to the submittal of a Final Development Plan, the applicant shall submit a revised Memorandum of Understanding incorporating the City's traffic consultant's recommendations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer for approval by the City Engineer addressing all off-site infrastructure improvements, both short term and long for the Wilmington Pike corridor and the I-675/Wilmington Pike Interchange area establishing those improvements that are the responsibility of the Applicant and establishing a phasing schedule.
11. The required bufferyards along Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road shall be platted as reserve areas to provide for common landscaping, irrigation and maintenance by a master owners' association.
12. All regional stormwater management facilities shall be constructed and installed as a part of the first phase of development to include the major detention facilities along the central drainage area of the development site running generally from the northwest corner of the site to its southeastern terminus and the establishment of a common detention facilities for all outlots subject to approval by the City Engineer.
13. All underground utilities shall be placed outside of any area that may be designated for tree conservation subject to approval by the City Planning Commission.
14. No signage is approved as a part of this Preliminary Development plan.

The plan submitted on March 25, 2011, is the plan to which the conditions apply, but some revisions have already been done in order to meet more of the UDO requirements.

Mr. Brunner asked where the bufferyards mentioned in Condition 11 would be required. Mr. Feverston replied that bufferyards with mounding and plantings would separate the RPD from the B-PD zones to protect neighbors and that there would also be bufferyard reserves along Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road. Buffers also will help to create the small village atmosphere.

Mr. Clark asked if comments or recommendations were received from the Fire Departments or governmental entities to which plans were sent. Mr. Feverston stated that Sugarcreek Fire and the Greene County Sanitary Engineer had comments, but that they applied more to the final development plan than to the preliminary one. Mr. Clark then inquired about *progression analysis* as used in the LJB letter. Mr. Scott Knebel explained that progression analysis deals with new signals. The consultants would like to see a model of the corridor that shows the progression of traffic moving through the system as part of the final study.

The Public Hearing began with a PowerPoint presentation by Mr. George Oberer, Jr., the applicant, who is the President and CEO of Oberer Land Development and managing partner for Cornerstone Developers, 9080 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg. Mr. Oberer noted the work that had been done in the evolution of the current Preliminary Development Plan and thanked staff

members for the efforts over the past months, including the three month process whereby the Dille homestead was determined not to be of historical significance.

Mr. Oberer introduced Mr. Robert Siebenthaler, 3206 Suburban Drive, Beaver Creek, who had surveyed 12 plots of trees totaling 200,000 sq. ft. on the property. Mr. Siebenthaler defined the major kinds of trees, as maple (44%), ash (27%), and oak (12%). He discussed the generally mediocre quality of the trees, the young age of the trees, the Emerald Ash Borer, and the poor viability of trees when surrounding ones are cut. He showed photos of sample areas and designated a few limited areas where trees or stands of trees might be preserved. The current plan showed a stand of trees along the swale of the stream for erosion control and a viable block of white pines on the eastern perimeter along I-675. Saving about 10.14 acres of woods could be feasible. Mr. Clark asked if Mr. Siebenthaler had flagged any trees to be saved. Mr. Siebenthaler answered in the affirmative, but that many of them had been on the perimeter. In comparing and contrasting the previous approval, he noted the poor chance of long term survival of trees in the Bear Creek proposal because only narrow band of trees along the perimeter were to be saved. He also noted that Mr. Oberer's plan keeps twice the number of acres of trees as Bear Creek's.

Mr. Oberer continued his presentation using slides and noting the evolution of the development since the original plans were submitted March 25. He passed handouts with updated information. Looking at maps, he explained eight sub areas, the character of each area and the different types of businesses appropriate to each one. The overall density of businesses would be about half the density Bear Creek requested and would therefore generate less traffic. The residential areas were the least defined. He pointed out that Cornerstone Development requests the use of overlay zoning. In the northern section of the R-PD zone, he stated consideration of about ten acres of some type of single family homes that will be for sale rather than for rent. He noted preliminary contact with the Centerville Washington Park District and Sugar Creek Park District concerning maintenance of the green space. Alternately an owners' association could be responsible for the maintenance of green space and/or landscaped areas. It is hoped that stone from the demolition of the house can be used for stone walls and landscaping.

Mr. Oberer introduced landscape architect, Mark Costandi of Costandi Studio, 2151 Sinton Ave. Cincinnati. Mr. Costandi stressed creation of a sense of place and sensitivity to a scale favorable to pedestrians with durable aesthetics having a blend of modern and traditional elements. He showed some slides to clarify his ideas for creating a "comfortable neighborhood feel."

Opening the hearing to the public, Mr. Clark summarized an email from Christina Clemons, Browns Run Road, who expressed concern about multi-family residential zoning along Browns Run Road and the impact on her abutting property.

Michael Clary, 4968 Wilmington Pike, asked for more details on precisely when and where upgrades for the new lanes and signals would be. He also asked how the multiple new lanes would transition into Kettering. His home is at that location. He stated his strong opposition to taking any right-of-way from his yard.

Mr. Sliemers stated that it was too early to know how or where the transition would be made, other than much of the right of way would come from the Cornerstone Development. The goal is to provide for the future traffic needs in the best way possible. The City would try to avoid right of way acquisition.

BJ Moore, 185 Tuxworth, reminded the group that the City has been proactive with recycling and that this was the time to be protective and proactive with high design standards for sustainability, environmental awareness, safe streets, use of local materials and provisions for alternative modes of transportation such as bicycles and buses. She asked that the development be a showcase for Centerville and the environment.

Melanie Granville, 978 Belfast Drive, requested that there be no apartments in the residential zone. She asked that the plan to have homes for sale along Brown Road, rather than for rent, be maintained.

Marty Hickey, 953 Belfast Drive, was glad to see the trees and the landscaping mounds, but wanted to be guaranteed that there would be no apartments in the multi-family area. The residents have come for years to make this request. Mr. Feverston stated that Residential Planned Development zoning legally can have up to six units per acre. The City Zoning Code cannot regulate the type of ownership. Ms. Hickey pressed the issue, saying that the residents had been promised by the previous developer that there would be no apartments. Mr. Clark stated that the plan is not solidified enough at this time to make promises. Ms. Hickey asked for consideration of the residents at the appropriate time.

Paula Hahn, 979 Belfast Drive, asked if there would be buffering along Brown Road as was mentioned for Wilmington Pike. She noted that, of the 150 acres of the development, more than 25% is residential without details on the plan. Mr. Feverston replied that the Unified Development Ordinance requires the same 20 ft. bufferyards along Brown Road and 25 ft. between the residential area and the Brown's Run subdivision. Mr. Clark added that the buffer is usually meandering landscaped mounding.

Joseph Harmon, 531 Willowhurst Drive, Centerville, asked for an objectively verifiable pledge for wetland protection on the site and a conservation easement. He asked what elements were included in the calculation of the green space acreage. He wanted to know who lumbered the trees on the Dille property and when it happened. Mr. Clark stated that he did not believe that Mr. Oberer had anything to do with the logging. He reiterated that, as a group, the Planning Commission has a history of insisting on the preservation of as many trees and other natural environmental elements as possible. Mr. Harmon pushed for the Planning Commission to demand more than the minimum requirements.

Steve Hamilton, 4321 Mantell Court, asked if the City would be widening all of Brown Road. He referred to Condition 4 and asked if the applicant had any responsibility for Brown Road. Mr. Feverston stated that the Dille property goes to the centerline of Brown Road, but the Centerville corporation line only goes to the south edge of the roadway easement. The City is asking that the gap between the two lines be deeded to the Centerville Community Improvement Corporation for roadway purposes. Cornerstone Developers would be responsible for improvements from the centerline south. Multi-jurisdiction cooperation will be needed on Brown Road.

Mr. Hamilton requested an explanation of Community Center zoning. Using a slide, Mr. Feverston pointed out the standard base districts and explained overlay districts with their particular styles and incentives. As submitted, this area should be labeled a Neighborhood Residential Overlay, rather than a Community Center Overlay.

Kathy Bauman, 4259 Sugar Leaf Drive, asked where the two entrances on Feedwire Road would be. Mr. Sliemers pointed them out. She asked how many acres were zoned residential. Mr. Feverston replied that there were about 35 acres with six units per acre maximum. She asked for clarification of services to be provided by various jurisdictions.

Marian Gregor, 3315 Mantell Court, asked if the Planning Commission had the ability to deny the plan and make the applicant guarantee the residents that there would be no apartments. Mr. Clark stated that was not the case. Mr. Durham stated that, as a matter of law, the City does not have the power to restrict the ownership of the housing in the R-PD zone.

Frances Obringer, 5233 Glenmina Dr. noted that traffic on Wilmington Pike is already a huge concern. She felt it would be important to study traffic in the whole corridor south to Alex-Bell Road. She pointed out the need to provide safety for RTA buses and school buses in the area.

Doreen Elliott, 4301 Mantell Ct., asked who decides the need for additional traffic signals. Mr. Feverston said that the City would have jurisdiction, and Mr. Sliemers stated it would be based on the traffic impact study. She declared firmly that she did not want two more traffic signals on Wilmington Pike in close proximity to those already there. She asked if low income housing would be possible in the R-PD zone. Mr. Durham repeated that the Planning Commission cannot regulate what is put in, only density. Ms. Elliott asked if the development was really necessary when whole shopping strips sit empty just up Wilmington Pike.

Robert Maler, 905 Belfast Drive, stated that he was opposed to apartments and asked for due consideration for the residents of his subdivision.

Paul Clark turned to the 14 Conditions and asked if Mr. Oberer had comments. Mr. Durham expressed concern that the Planning Commission had not seen the rendition of the Development Plan shown by Mr. Oberer. He asked Mr. Oberer if he would agree to postpone further discussion to a work session. Mr. Oberer agreed.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to table Application P-2011-0063, the Preliminary Development Plan for Cornerstone North, to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting on May 31, 2011. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed with six ayes. A work session will be scheduled at the convenience of the Planning Commission.

Application P 2011-0065 – Geroge Oberer, Cornerstone South - Preliminary Development Plan

Mr. Feverston gave the staff report on the Preliminary Development Plan noting that this 70.935 acres is zoned O-PD and is situated south of I-675 at Wilmington Pike, being bounded by Clyo Road and Possum Run Road on the south and east. O-PD zoning permits most business, office or professional uses; an overlay district is not requested. In Create the Vision this was Study Area K; the plan meets the spirit of Study Area K recommendations. The Preliminary Development Plan submitted on March 25 shows a network of parcels along Miami Valley East Drive. The major access will be from Clyo Road which is planned to be widened to five lanes. The sizes of the individual lots are expected to change according to the requirements of the businesses interested in the sites. The alignment of Miami Valley Drive with Clyo Road is likely to change as the lots are divided into sites of 3.5 to 8 acres in size. As for Cornerstone North, a traffic impact study is being developed. The City considers the connection of Miami Valley East Drive with Wilmington

Pike to be important. The Planning Department recommends approval of the Major Use Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The Preliminary Development Plan shall be the plans stamped received by the City of Centerville Planning Department on March 25, 2011, except as modified herein.
2. A project phasing plan shall be submitted as a part of the Preliminary Development Plan subject to approval by the City Planner.
3. A Development Plan Submission document for the Cornerstone South development shall be submitted by the Applicant as a part of this Preliminary Development Plan meeting all requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and to include supplemental information providing design theme guidelines for the entire development including development gateways, building architecture streetscape design, and other amenities subject to approval by the City Council.
4. The applicant shall submit a revised Traffic Impact Study incorporating the City's traffic consultant's recommendations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer for approval by the City Engineer including, but not limited to right-of way dedication, roadway widening, signalization, access control and addressing both short term and long term impacts to the Wilmington Pike corridor and the I-675/Wilmington Pike Interchange area.
5. Prior to the submittal of a Final Development Plan, the applicant shall submit a revised Memorandum of Understanding incorporating the City's traffic consultant's recommendations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer for approval by the City Engineer addressing all off-site infrastructure improvements, both short term and long for the Wilmington Pike corridor and the I-675/Wilmington Pike Interchange area establishing those improvements that are the responsibility of the Applicant and establishing a phasing schedule.
6. A Final Development plan for each Phase, as a minimum, must be approved by the Centerville City Council with a recommendation from Planning Commission. A Major Site Plan may be included with the Final Development Plan. Otherwise, a Major Site Plan must be approved by the Planning Commission for each lot prior to construction.
7. The applicant may subdivide the subject property after the Final Development Plan is approved by City Council.
8. The final design of all gateways, public amenities including decorative street lighting, public benches, and street trees, and the proposed General Design Guidelines to create a "campus environment" shall be submitted by the Applicant as a part of their Final Development Plan.
9. A plan for pedestrian walkways shall be submitted with the Preliminary Development Plan for all sidewalks, hiker/biker trails and any walkway outside of a public right-of-way.
10. The required bufferyards along Clyo Road and Possum Run Road shall be platted as reserve areas to provide for common landscaping, irrigation and maintenance by a master owners' association.

Mr. Clark asked about several small streams on the property. Mr. Feverston concurred that there are several small drainage fingers, but only one is substantial.

Mr. George Oberer, Jr., CEO of Oberer Land Developers and managing partner of Cornerstone Development, noted that the south parcel had gone through a number of renditions over the past weeks, and he shared the latest. He said that the environmental study showed only one significant stream. Cornerstone Development plans to build out Cornerstone South in phases, starting in the northeast and working toward Hope United Methodist Church, since Cornerstone does not control the land required for the completion of Miami Valley Drive East. He showed examples of architecture and entrance features that were similar to those of the north parcel. He said that guaranteeing walking trails would be an issue, since walkways destroy vegetation and some of the potential clients have security concerns about random pedestrians behind their complexes. A retention pond would be supplemented with a well and used for irrigation as needed. Phasing the development would reduce initial infrastructure costs.

Mr. Joseph Harmon, 531 Willowhurst Drive, asked for more attention to be focused on environmental concerns and stringent permit requirements. He wanted preservation of the finger streams rather than grading.

Mr. Jeff Matthews, 1422 Possum Run Ct., pointed out the change in the plan puts Miami Valley Drive intersecting Clys Road directly in front of his house. He asked for mounding and protection for his property and his neighbors.

Kathy Bauman, 4259 Sugar Leaf Drive, stated that her biggest concern is protecting the residents along Possum Run Road and Sugar Leaf Drive. She inquired about the buffer. Mr. Feverston stated the requirements for buffering and screening with landscaped mounding. Mr. Durham said that the Planning Commission routinely has tried to be sensitive to what residents face. He suggested that the residents look at the areas around Watson's Pool to get a general sense of what the UDO requires when businesses abut residences. Access for the area will be considered as part of the plan.

MOTION: Because of the late hour and the new version of the of the Preliminary Development Plan, Mr. Durham moved to table Application P-2011-0065, the Preliminary Development Plan for Cornerstone South, until the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission, giving time for a work session. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion to table the matter. The motion passed with six ayes.

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will be May 31, 2011, in the Council Chambers of the Centerville Municipal Building at 7:30 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

