

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Work Session

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

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

Attendance: Mr. Paul Clark, Chairman; Mr. Jim Brunner; Mr. Jim Briggs; Mr. John Palcher; Mr. Jim Durham. Absent: Mr. Mark Leonard; Mr. Jeff Gammell. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Doug Spitler, City Engineer.

Mr. Gammell and Mr. Leonard both informed staff of their absence for this meeting.

Overview of Application Review by Staff and Planning Commission

Mr. Clark explained he wanted to review the process of application review beginning with what staff does to prepare an application for a meeting and how the application review process proceeds to each member of the Planning Commission once an information packet is received prior to meetings.

Mr. Feverston used an example of a shopping center development to explain the process of a project to go to the Planning Commission for their review. He stated staff first interprets if the zoning use is permitted using an example of the All Seal building on West Franklin for an art gallery. The zoning on that property is Office Service, O-S, which does not permit retail as a principle use so the scope of the retail activity needed to be determined. Staff requested a written summary to be submitted to determine if the proposed use was an appropriate use for the zoning classification. Standards in the new Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) will require a pre-application meeting to address issues that would not meet those standards and how to avoid variance situations. Mr. Feverston stated we currently encourage a pre-application meeting, but it is not required. He stated Centerville Mill is being required to place the uses of their building on Compark Road building labeled to determine if those uses are permitted. Once an application is filed, staff checks it for full completeness it is reviewed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) at which sometimes the applicant attends as well. If variances are shown on the plan, the applicant is required to revise the plans to eliminate them to make it comply with the Zoning Ordinance standards. If they are not willing to do so, they must file a variance application. If staff determines the variance is simply a variance of convenience, staff tries to discourage the request. After action has been taken on an application, there is a 15 day waiting period to allow appeals to be filed. Council can also request to review an application during the waiting period. As no permits can be issued until after the 15 day waiting period. All interested parties of an application are told of the appeal process at the conclusion of the application review.

After approval, construction drawings are filed for a permit, with engineering sets that are modified to the conditions of the PC approval. Staff reviews the plans to be certain they are in accordance with the conditions of approval of the Planning Commission and Council. At that point, the plans are sent to the Inspection Department.

Mr. Clark then asked Mr. Durham to explain how he reviews the applications contained in the PC packet delivered prior to the meeting.

Mr. Durham stated he first begins with the locations of projects as indicated on the meeting agenda. He stated he liked to have an idea of the context of the request by reading the applications and staff recommendations. He stated he looked for elements that are required for consistency, the use of materials, and if the building materials are modern enough. He then stated he tries to get an idea of how the site plan flows how the buildings are situated on the property to assure good curb appeal. The architectural elevations are then reviewed to be sure there is 4-sided architecture. There is also an aesthetic judgement as to how it fits in with surrounding buildings by allowing creativity, but still maintain architectural consistency.

Mr. Feverston stated there are sections in the Zoning Ordinance that are created to allow Planning Commission discretion in decisions that are compatible, but maintain standards.

Mr. Durham referred to Heartland Federal Credit Union which is located adjacent to residential and commercial uses. The credit union wanted a very modern architecture and the Planning Commission worked with them to create residential on the residential side, but allowed the corporate branding on the commercial side.

Mr. Clark stated he wanted to hear more dialog from the members when reviewing applications during the meetings. He stated the applicant needs to know what others are thinking during the review to get an idea of how the decision is going to be determined.

Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)

The members had no comment on Article 1 which establishes a purpose for the UDO; repeals all existing ordinances that pertain to land use, subdivision regulations; establishing the Planning Commission, parkland dedication, fees, etc., and has the UDO take their place by incorporating them within one (1) document.

Article 3

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) will be formalized in Article 3. At the City Planner's discretion, the TRC will convene to review applications that are necessary to require input from the other members.

Mr. Briggs stated he did not see any language in Article 3 that directed the duties of the Planning Commission to act as the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). He suggested in Section 305A, language be added to state the Planning Commission also functions as the BZA.

The members discussed the procedure of Public Hearings and if people should sworn in to formalize the issue should it be appealed to the Common Pleas Court.

Mr. Durham stated when voting to deny an application request, the procedure should include the rationale as to how the decision was determined.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the possibility of a consent agenda as Council has adopted. The members felt a consent agenda did not fit the needs of the Planning Commission as the issues of their consent agenda would be to approve applications that have already been approved by staff. Those items should be handled simply as communication items on the agenda.

Mr. Clark stated the Planning Commission is now reviewing redevelopment and infill development issues on a regular basis. He suggested there be some type of policy in place to make citizens aware of projects to be reviewed by the Planning Commission that are not specifically noticed to property owners as a public hearing.

The members suggested signage be posted on subject properties to inform the public.

Mr. Feverston stated the rezoning signs used some years ago were vandalized or stolen so signage may not be effective. He stated staff would work on various applications of notification and present them to the members for their consideration.

The next Work Session was scheduled to be held on May 6, 2008, beginning at 7:00 P.M. to discuss Articles 5 and 7.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

Paul Clark

