

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session
Thursday, June 2, 2011

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order in the Law Library at 7:30 p.m.

Attendance: Mr. Paul Clark, Mr. Jeffrey Gammell, Mr. Jim Briggs, Mr. Jim Durham, Mr. Jim Brunner. Absent: Mr. Bill Etson. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. John Sliemers, Assistant City Engineer; and Mrs. Julie Weaver, Clerk.

The purpose of the meeting was to familiarize Planning Commission with progress on the Preliminary Development Plans for Cornerstone North and South and continue to discuss issues with the Oberer team since the Planning Commission will vote on a recommendation for the City Council at the Planning Commission Meeting on June 14, 2011. The role of the Planning Commission is to interpret the UDO, not to act as a negotiator.

Mr. Feverston stated that the critical component to the whole plan is the traffic study. Mr. Sliemers agreed that the traffic study will present the data on how much traffic the development will generate and how much right of way will be needed, which in turn, dictates placement of infrastructure on the property. He pointed out that some of the drawings were not to scale.

Mr. Smith with Cornerstone Developers presented a colored scaled drawing of Cornerstone North. The plan showed the developer's best guess concerning what would be needed with current right of way estimates. Mr. Greg Smith noted that the Wilmington Pike/Feedwire intersection is the area most subject to change. The majority of the right of way will come from the site, except at Feedwire Road and Wilmington Pike where Cracker Barrel and some other businesses will be impacted.

Mr. George Oberer, Jr., President and CEO of Cornerstone Developers, asked Mr. Feverston about public dedication of the streets for the ring road and main entries. Mr. Feverston replied that any City participation in costs would be dependent upon what happens with the TIF. Mr. Smith stated that the infrastructure will be done in phases.

Trees were the next topic of discussion, since they have been part of the "iconic" identity of the property. The overlay of the current stand of trees on the map showing the probable right of way was difficult to decipher because of the shadows from the trees. Mr. Siebenthaler, arborist for the Siebenthaler Company, had done additional investigation of the corner since the last meeting. He itemized the location of some (predominately maple) trees about ninety feet inside the southeast corner of the property that would need to be supplemented with transplants. All trees would be limbed for visibility of the shopping area. Mr. Oberer noted that root systems of these trees could be damaged by the roadway work. There was discussion of drainage and grading; the assumption is that the immediate corner would be left undisturbed as much as possible, with grading starting at the parking areas with walls being built as needed to protect the trees. Mr. Siebenthaler stated that there was no tree or group of trees that could be used as a centerpiece for

the village center to help to tie the areas together. Placement of buildings on the outlots, signage, circulation patterns and general appearance were discussed. Said to be desirable for fronting on Wilmington Pike and Feedwire were "four-sided buildings" designed with a finished architectural look on all faces and screening of all mechanicals. Other expected elements include landscaping with a rhythm of clustered four to six inch diameter trees, shrubs, stone walls and low ground signs. Discussion followed concerning the appropriate size for trees transplanted to the site with Mr. Siebenthaler stating that 4 to 6 inch trees transplanted reasonably, while Mr. Costandi, landscape architect, noted that smaller trees often do better in the long run. Mr. Feverston asked for hardwood trees. Mr. Conley verified that parking on the sides of the buildings would be permitted for businesses pushed toward the street as long as there is variety in the placement of these areas. Ground signs could be permitted along Wilmington Pike for outlots south of the main entrance.

Mr. Feverston showed slides of the Polaris Mall at Westerville as an example of a style the staff would find acceptable. Even the big box Meijer store was redesigned to be compatible with the village center architecture of the center.

Mr. Conley shared the latest rendition of the plans for the area north of the main entrance from Wilmington Pike. Mr. Feverston felt that the orientation of Main Street through the village center area was improved as was the placement of the hotel and four corners area. He liked the connection of the ring road all the way to Brown Road. Mr. Feverston noted that the parking fields were much larger than are required by our code. He suggested the addition of two buildings along the east side of the ring road. Mr. Conley of the Oberer Realty group voiced concern about the number of spaces some businesses demand, visibility for small shop owners and the distance patrons would have to walk to reach the nicer restaurants in the area. Mr. Feverston stated a concern for cohesiveness and unity as well as interest and variety for the entire length of the street. Mr. Smith noted that there were many ways to create unity and define space: sidewalk treatments, width of sidewalk, lighting, street furniture, etc. Mr. Costandi felt that such details as the extra buildings belonged in the final development plan, once tenants were known, more than preliminary. Mr. Feverston pushed for as much detail as possible with the preliminary plan. Retail, offices, hotels, banks, and restaurants (but not fast food) were named as possible uses for the northwest corner of the property. Mr. Durham was concerned about the label "outlot" on the area at the corner of Wilmington Pike and Brown Road. The common area will be relabeled.

Mr. Durham said that the role of the Planning Commission is to define items of consensus. When asked about the possibility of saving the trees along Wilmington Pike, the members expressed consensus in their belief that there was nothing significantly usable along Wilmington Pike once the right of way is cleared, except near the corner of Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road. In the past few weeks, one or two of the members had walked the area. The Planning Commission concurred that large, 4-6 inch caliper trees be planted along Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road in a quantity to re-establish the wooded character of the property.

Planning Commission members expressed agreement with the Westerville look with buildings that camouflage the back side and have high pitched roofs, screening of mechanicals on all four

sides, clustered trees, low shrubs, and ground signs. Mr. Gammell expressed the importance of tying together the components in various sections of the development. Mr. Durham asked Mr. Oberer if it was his intention to have a single ownership/responsible party in some form for the common areas and perimeter landscaping. Mr. Oberer answered in the affirmative. Mr. Feverston asked for uniformity of signage. Mr. Conley stated that it was the intention of Cornerstone Developers to provide the base and the individual tenant would complete the sign within some general specifications. Mr. Oberer stated that he liked the Westerville compromise for its visibility.

Mr. Siebenthaler left at this time.

The discussion turned to the village center. Mr. Feverston noted that buildings should be oriented toward Main Street or, with four-sided architecture, the outlots south of the village center should be pushed toward Wilmington Pike as had been discussed. There was discussion of a variety of positioning for the buildings, ways to shield neighbors from headlights, and phasing of the project. Mr. Durham brought up that all the monument signs need not be identical. Some variety of materials and placement on the property would be more interesting.

Upon question about concerns, Mr. Conley asked whether two buildings could still be pushed closer together on the outlots along Wilmington Pike. Mr. Feverston replied in the affirmative, if the drive aisles and parking were properly located and variety in general placement of buildings was maintained.

Mr. Sliemers expressed deep concern over the lateness of the traffic impact study. He felt that the roadway recommendations were the foundation of any plan for the property and was frustrated to see so much effort going into details before the most critical element was defined. Unless staff would get the traffic impact study in time to analyze the recommendations in a thorough manner he did not see June 14 as a realistic date for engineering to recommend approval.

Mr. Smith said that some placements could change slightly with greater knowledge, but he did not see major change. Mr. Feverston broached the subject of the possibility of doing an amendment of the Preliminary Development Plan if the trip generation study shows that the entrances need to be moved more than a few feet. He emphasized the need to get the trip generation and distribution figures to the Engineering Department as soon as possible.

Mr. Durham stated that the staff recommendation for the approval of the Preliminary Development Plan is subject to the approval of the City Engineer for traffic issues and the approval is therefore subject to the applicant satisfying the City Engineer. Mr. Sliemers did not like putting the Engineering Department in the position where there could be pressure to hurry the process or change standard procedures. He asked why the intersection at Feedwire Road and Wilmington Pike had been changed since the previous rendition, if the traffic studies were not available.

Mr. Feverston advised the applicant to get the traffic study to the City Engineer as soon as possible. In order to keep the application moving forward, the Preliminary Development Plan will be conditioned subject to the approval of the City Engineer. Mr. Smith asked for language in the recommendation that Cornerstone Developers could give to buyers. Mr. Conley assured the group he would be pursuing the traffic study immediately. Mr. Durham said that the final deadline for the traffic study to be submitted would be June 10, 2011.

When asked about his concerns, Mr. Oberer stated that he was not comfortable with putting two more buildings on the Preliminary Development Plan as the Planning Department memo suggested because the extra density would not allow the visibility necessary for interior users. Definition of various areas could be done with textured pavement or colored asphalt. Mr. Feverston stated that even an architectural feature such as a clock, decorative fencing and columns would be helpful for balance and interest.

Mr. Sliemers said, if the internal streets are public and include asphalt with special effects, the City would not want to be responsible for plowing snow from textured pavement or for maintaining colored asphalt.

Cornerstone South was discussed briefly. For the Cornerstone South Preliminary Development Plan, Mr. Sliemers stated that sight distance for the street terminating at Possum Run Subdivision is important. Landscaping will need to be controlled carefully because of the curve in Clyo Road.

Mr. Durham stated his understanding of the need for flexibility in the lot sizes for Cornerstone South and the fluid nature of the plan. He asked about the building standards and was told that they had not changed from those presented in the booklet of May 2, 2011. Mr. Durham requested written building standards' comments on Cornerstone South from staff. Mr. Feverston gave a general description of the buildings as two or three stories with brick, stone and glass.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

