

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Work Session

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

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

Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)

The Planning Commission reviewed Article 5 of the UDO. Section 5.03 A. 3 was modified to include the City Planner or designee appointed by the City Manager. Mr. Feverston stated that Section 5.05 is new limiting the number and type of applications that may be filed. 5.05, 1 was modified to read: A conditional use along with a Development Plan or Major Site Plan. Section 5.07 D. 4 was modified to require the City Clerk of Council instead of the City Planner to schedule a public hearing. Notification to property owners was modified in Section 5.07 D. 4 to require written notice for any parcel instead of 10 or fewer parcels. Section 5.07 E. Submittal Requirements was modified to insert the phrase "the names and mailing addresses of" in requirement 7 behind the word list. Requirement 10 was modified to read "Electronic files of all developments, plans, subdivisions and other required information in a format defined by the City Planner.

The Planning Commission debated Section 5.09 H. Minor Modifications. The Commission concurred that this section be changed. The last two sentences should read as follows. "The City Planner shall review such amendments to a major site plan if the change involves 25 percent or less of the original gross floor area or lineal dimension, not to exceed 1,000 square feet. Amendments to a major site plan greater than this requirement shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Feverston stated that in Table 5-A: Development Approvals, Variance, Major was changed to Variance and Variance, Minor was deleted. A new category, Ordinance Interpretation, has been inserted. This category requires a Certificate of Zoning Compliance and is reviewed and decided by the City Planner. Appeal of this decision would be to the Planning Commission. A second appeal would be to the City Council.

Requirements b. and c. were modified in Section 5.09 N. Site Plan – Major. Requirement b. reads as follows: "Commercial, office, industrial and all other non-residential buildings and structures including principal and accessory structures". Requirement c. reads as follows: "Additions greater that 25 percent of the original floor area or 1,000 square feet; whichever is less".

The Planning Commission debated Section 5.09 O. Site Plan - Minor. The Commission concurred that this section be deleted as written and the following be added: "Approval of a Site Plan is required for zoning approval prior to construction. The City Planner shall review any

application for a Minor Site Plan in accordance with the Standards for Approval contained in Section 5.09 N. Site Plan – Major of this UDO”.

Mr. Feverston stated that Section 5.09 T. Variance – Major was changed to Variance and rewritten as follows: “Variance: A Variance involves permission to depart from the literal requirements of the UDO. A Variance includes a change that results in 20 percent or more of the quantifiable provisions of the UDO. The Planning Commission shall consider and decide on any Variance of this UDO. The procedures for considering a Variance are included in Section 5.17”. Section U. Variance – Minor has been deleted.

Mr. Feverston stated that Paragraph 7, Section 5.11, C. is a new requirement that limits the time an application may be tabled or continued on the Planning Commission agenda to a maximum of 60 days without the concurrence of the applicant. In Section 5.11 D, Floodplain Permit Procedure, all references to the City Planner shall be changed to City Engineer.

Mr. Feverston stated that Section 5.13, 2, Final Development Plan, 3. Effect of Approval is a new provision. Final development plans in planned development or overlay districts that are approved by the Planning Commission would be considered an amendment to the Zoning Map. This provision would make our PD district true Planned Development Districts. There is also an expiration of two years if no Certificate of Zoning Compliance is sought and approved by the City. The Commission modified the last sentence of this provision to read “Unless the required Certificate of Zoning Compliance is properly submitted and approved within the two-year period, the approval shall be voided and the land shall revert to its last previous zoning district, unless an application for time extension is submitted and approved pursuant to Section 5.09 H. of this UDO”.

Mr. Feverston stated that Section 5.13, 2, Final Development Plan was modified to add standard “t.” to include Parkland Dedication or Fee-in-Lieu of Parkland Dedication as stated in H, Final Plat.

The Commission modified 16. Park Fee: in Section 5.13 H as follows: “Parkland Dedication: The proprietor of each new residential subdivision in the City, as a prerequisite to the approval of the Final Plat thereof on behalf of the City, shall dedicate parkland or pay a fee in-lieu of parkland dedication to the City, in accordance with the provisions of Section 9.47”.

The Commission removed references to plans “prepared by a landscape architect” be deleted in Sections 5.13 J, Landscape Plan - Major and K, Landscape Plan – Minor.

Mr. Feverston stated that Section 5.13 M. Lighting Plan was rewritten as follows: “A preliminary or a final Lighting Plan shall be provided at the time of submittal of any Development or Site Plan. The plan shall be submitted along with other required site information to the City Planner to coordinate review by City departments. A final Lighting Plan must be submitted to the City Planner subsequent to approval of any Development or Site Plan and prior to applying for CZC”.

Mr. Feverston stated that Section 5.13 N. requires a sign plan to be submitted as a part of a development plan. He explained that this is a new requirement as signs now are typically not reviewed by the Commission or BAR. The Commission modified requirement 3 under Sign Plan

to read as follows: "Clear and legible drawings showing the location of the sign(s) that are subject to the permit including the sign's location with respect to existing right-of-way; and property lines and all other existing signs that are on the same premises; and".

Mr. Feverston stated that the titles for paragraphs 7 through 10 in Section 5.13 Q. Subdivision – Major were modified to include the words "final plat".

As a part of the Commission's review of 5.13 S. Temporary Use members concurred that a definition for a temporary use be added to Article 11, Definitions and it include both seasonal and repeated uses.

Mr. Feverston stated that references to Section 9.45, Designation of a Landmark will be included in 5.13 T, Landmarks.

The Planning Commission reviewed Article 7, Zoning Districts of the UDO. Mr. Feverston stated that the rules for determination of a zoning district boundary have been modified in Section 7.03 F to allow a zoning district boundary to follow the right-of-way of a public street.

Mr. Feverston gave an overview of Sections 7.05 through 7.15 establishing the Base Zoning Districts. The Commission discussed the establishment of a new R-1e Zoning District. Mr. Feverston asked the Commission to re-evaluate this district since the non-conforming lot size and setback issues in and around have been addressed with the modifications to the R-1d district and the establishment of the overlay districts around the downtown area. The Commission decided to keep the R-1e district for properties such as the tract of land at the intersection of Sheehan and Social Row Roads. Mr. Feverston also stated that Multi-family buildings in the R-3 are limited to a maximum of 8 dwellings per building.

Mr. Feverston also reviewed the provisions that establish both the mandatory and optional Overlay Zoning Districts. Establishing the Lifestyle Community District as an Optional Overlay District is the only substantive change to these sections.

The next Work Session was scheduled to be held on June 10, 2008, beginning at 7:00 P.M. to discuss Article 9.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.



