

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Work Session

Tuesday, July 8, 2008

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

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

Article 9 - Part 1

Pages 9-11:

Mr. Feverston explained the overlay districts are base districts with additional restrictions which would allow certain amenities to the streetscape with incentives such as building height. The overlay concept would re-classify many of the existing developments as being legally conforming rather than defined as having variance elements. He stated there will mandatory as well as optional overlay restrictions.

Mr. Durham stated the overlay district would provide flexibility as well as eliminating some variances as they can be arbitrary.

Pages 9-43:

Mr. Feverston stated areas labeled as a "downtown district" should be deleted and "neighborhood conservation" be changed to "residential conservation".

Pages 9-44:

Tables about different kinds of uses. Gives text examples, etc.

Mr. Gammell asked if the setback variance for Kroger could have been avoided if the overlay districts currently existed.

Mr. Feverston stated the standards for connecting internal drives through shopping centers with multiple owners is not addressed, but should be built into the UDO to create a flexible standard. The requirement for an internal drive should be only for retail developments.

Pages 9-58:

Mr. Feverston stated areas labeled as a "downtown district" should be deleted and "neighborhood conservation" changed to "residential conservation". Different kinds of streets will be included in the overlay districts.

Article 9 - Part 2

The standards in Part 2 are existing in the current standards. The only exception is 29.6-side yard along a street line should be deleted.

Mr. Brunner stated the definition of a "block" is not contained in the document.

Mr. Feverston stated the definition of “block” and “block face” needs to be added to the document.

Article 9 - Part 3

Part 3 is designated to the site design and improvements of undeveloped land as well as the redevelopment of existing sites within the City.

The landscape and bufferyard requirements currently existing in the Zoning Ordinance will be maintained as part of the UDO.

Lighting standards will be maintained with the existing soft, subdued, etc., lighting levels currently in the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, the new standards will establish light levels, pole height, etc.

Page 91 - Mr. Feverston stated the correct measurement of .25 footcandles should replace the blank space.

Mr. Feverston pointed out the Comprehensive Plan mandates a periodic review of the UDO standards to assure the requirements contained in the document are updated in a timely manner.

The subject of “sunsetting” was raised as a way to control recreational vehicles on residential properties. Mr. Feverston stated the Ohio Supreme Court does not allow sunsetting and the City Attorney, Mr. Liberman, has indicated it is his opinion you cannot use it as an option.

Jim Durham stated in the long run, recreational vehicles will disappear without more regulations than what are existing.

Page 92 - The off-street parking requirements are the same as the current Zoning Ordinance standards.

Pages 102 to 108 - Mr. Feverston stated in order to make the parking standards more user friendly, they have been incorporated into a table layout with no written text.

Page 115 - trees are encroaching into the public right-of-way.

On Page 118, Mr. Feverston stated the Division of Planning should read as “Planning Department” here and throughout the document.

Page 122 - Mr. Feverston stated the storm sewer and drainage requirements are contained in the existing ordinance for stormwater control and will be maintained in the UDO document.

Article 9 - Part 4

Mr. Feverston stated the Supplemental Standards will contain the Landmark Preservation Ordinance and Fee Ordinance which are currently separate ordinances.

Page 165 - Mr. Feverston stated a new provision should be added between #9 and #10 stating that no more than one (1) accessory use/building can be located on a property. All single-family properties will be addressed as a code enforcement issue.

Pages 167 thru 169 - Mr. Feverston stated Mr. Sande Heck, Code Enforcement Officer, requested a graphic be included in the Code to address buffers and fences for swimming pools.

Mr. Feverston stated the section referring to decks and balconies, the standard under "A" should be changed to any deck over 12 inches in height. Also, under "C", the setback standard should be changed from 3 feet to 5 feet from the rear property line.

Page 171 - Mr. Feverston stated in Part E 3., concerning vehicles/boats it should indicate any such vehicles or boats must be in operating condition. Further, it should be referenced to the Property Maintenance Ordinance rather than duplicating the standards in the document.

Mr. Feverston stated antenna structures will maintain the same standards as those in the current code.

Mr. Clark asked how the UDO will address AT&T cabinets which are now being installed at many locations within the community.

Mr. Feverston stated the AT&T equipment cabinets are considered accessory uses on a property. The City is currently requiring them to be landscaped. As a part of this new technology, some communities have very restrictive standards which seem unreasonable. He stated staff is comfortable with how we are currently handling the process.

Mr. Feverston stated the Landmark Ordinance and Parkland Ordinance will remain intact with the only changes being those of formatting.

Page 179 - Mr. Feverston stated the reference to an historic overlay should be deleted as it no longer exists.

Page 183 - Mr. Feverston stated there are many references to the Park Plan created by the Centerville/Washington Park District.

Mr. Durham suggested a study be done to determine the individual impact on the public use of parks within new residential developments. Rather than using a general population figure, perhaps it should be determined how many people live in each specific single-family dwelling



within that development. Since there is little area left to be developed, the method of determining how much parkland needs to have a base. Perhaps the number of bedrooms in a building or the average number of bedrooms in a residential development could be used or it could be based on the size of the lot. He stated if the formula remains with population, those average figures need to be updated.

Page 206 - Mr. Feverston stated the current standards for sign regulations will apply in the new document.

Page 223 - Mr. Feverston stated the architectural standards in the Supplemental section of the Zoning Ordinance from the current code will apply in the new document. He asked if the commission was comfortable with the architectural standards created in the Big Box Ordinance or should they be re-worked.

Mr. Durham stated the current standards work well with the characteristics as they relate to adjacent residential area. He stated the standards to be capable of being appropriate for other users since things will change over time.

Page 228 - Mr. Feverston stated the Architectural Preservation District (APD) will remain as a base zoning district.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

*Paul Clark*