

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session
Tuesday, June 10, 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; Mr. Mark Leonard; Mr. John Palcher. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Ryan Lee, Planner; Nathan Cahall, Economic Development Administrator; Greg Horn, City Manager; Scott Liberman, City Attorney.

Kroger Marketplace – Major Use Special Approval

Mr. Clark stated he had asked staff to provide an introduction to the applications for a proposed Kroger Marketplace scheduled to be heard by the Commission at their June 24, 2008 meeting. Mr. Feverston provided a brief introduction to the three (3) pending applications for the proposed Kroger at the northwest intersection of Sheehan Road and State Route 48, which is currently the Elder-Beerman department store, Grismer Tire, and a vacant grocery. There are applications pending; a Major Use Special Approval, Variance application for Building and Parking setbacks, and a Record Plat. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing Elder-Beerman retail store and vacant grocery along Sheehan Road to construct a 134,000 square foot Kroger Marketplace on the site. The principle building being proposed is a brick and stone building equipped with drive-thru lanes for pharmacy and bank usage. The applicant is also proposing a fueling center to be located along State Route 48 north of the Grismer Tire outlot, which is to remain at its existing location. Mr. Feverston described the material palette for the proposed architectural elevations and indicated that it would be primarily brick with a combination of stone and EIFS embellishments. The parapet on the fueling center is intended to match that of the Marketplace building.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the proposed Variance requests for a decrease in side yard parking and paving setback as well as a separate request for the reduction of building setback requirements. The current code requires a minimum of a ten (10) foot parking and paving setback of which the applicant is requesting a zero (0) foot parking setback variance. Additionally, the applicant is requesting a reduction in the required building setback of twenty (20) feet, to a reduced setback of ten (10) feet from the northern property line.

Mr. Durham stated that the current lot line along the northern portion of the property would create hardships for the applicant concerning the parking and paving setback variance. However, he raised some concern for the reduction of the building setback requirements.

Mr. Feverston indicated that staff had begun the initial review of the application and that the finding of fact will occur during the regular meeting at the end of the month. He indicated that the fluctuation of the northern property line and the slope of the land along Sheehan Road do present difficulties for the applicant.

The Planning Commission members expressed concerns for some architectural elements proposed for the Kroger Marketplace principle building. The Commission felt that elements

such as the building base and cap should be established and articulated on all four building elevations. They also expressed concerns with the visibility of rooftop mechanical units off premise as the vertical elevation of Sheehan Road is higher than that of the finished floor of the proposed building.

Mr. Feverston stated that staff would review the application for architectural compatibility and work with the applicant to provide the architectural embellishments onto all four building walls. This would also include the addition of a curtain wall to screen the view of proposed loading docks to match the materials specified for the building walls.

Mr. Durham expressed concern for the proposed location of the fueling center along State Route 48. He asked staff why it was located in this position as opposed to a Sheehan Road frontage.

Mr. Feverston stated that locating the fueling center along Sheehan Road would be more of a negative impact on the existing single-family residences along Sheehan Road. Additionally, the best location for the fueling center would be at the intersection of Sheehan and State Route 48, which is the location of the existing Grismer Tire building. It is staff's opinion that the State Route 48 location is the best fit for the site.

Mr. Durham addressed his concern with the length of frontage that the fueling center utilizes along State Route 48. He also stated that the fuel center canopy roof color may be an issue as well as the lack of architectural elements on the canopy face and kiosk.

Mr. Feverston stated that rotating the fueling center would have a negative impact on the layout of the site regarding parking layout. This would also affect connectivity of the access road tying the eastern Sheehan Road access point to the existing access road within the remainder of Centerville Place shopping center. He indicated that the applicant is proposing the installation of mounding to soften the impact onto State Route 48. He stated that it is staff's opinion that the fueling center should incorporate architectural base and cap elements from the principle building to better integrate the character of the proposed buildings.

Mr. Clark asked whether a left turn lane is required on Sheehan for the western entrance onto the property.

Mr. Sliemers indicated that the traffic impact study does not warrant a left turn lane.

Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)

Mr. Feverston updated the Commission on the progress of updating the previous Articles of the UDO. He stated that the changes have been made by staff and that a final draft copy will be dispensed to the Commission.

Mr. Durham asked that staff provide the Commission with copies showing the highlighted changes within the text as it had been some time since the Commission has reviewed

the Articles.

Mr. Feverston stated that staff will provide drafts of the articles with strike outs on the removed text and italicized font type for the proposed changes.

The Planning Commission began review of Article 9 of the UDO. Section 9.05 A. 3. was moved to page 9-4 and tables 9.0 and 9.1 were moved behind these provisions for the ease of navigation for the base zoning district portion of Article 9, Part 1. It was decided by the Commission to change the page numbering to include the specific part number of the Article.

The Planning Commission debated the minimum floor living area of a dwelling unit for the R-1e district. It was decided to increase this number to allow for a minimum of 1,400 square foot floor area of a dwelling unit.

Mr. Durham asked staff if the intent was to allow for an increase in building height for the B-PD, Business Planned Development district, from the existing maximum height of forty-five (45) feet.

Mr. Feverston stated that the existing measurement establishing maximum height for buildings has changed in that it is now measured to the mean height of the roof pitch, as opposed to the highest point of the roof, which allows for increased overall height. He also discussed how the intent of the optional overlay district standards allow for increased height through incentivizing additional form-based initiatives.

The Planning Commission discussed changes to Table 9.1, which lists the accessory, permitted, and conditionally permitted uses by zoning district. Clarification of uses such as senior citizen residential community and other uses were discussed as to their meaning and placement within Table 9.1. The Commission noted that Adult Oriented Businesses were not currently permitted within any district on the chart and that it needs to reflect the standards of the current Adult Oriented Business Ordinance. The addition of the R-1e district was noted as not being located on the table as well.

Mr. Feverston gave an overview on the proposed changes to restaurant use definitions and how staff has reviewed ordinances to incorporate updated definitions to adequately regulate the difference in uses between restaurant types. He indicated that drive-thrus will now be conditionally permitted in certain districts.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.



