

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Work Session

Tuesday, May 29, 2007

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order at 9:15 P.M.

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

Unified Development Ordinance

Article 1

Mr. Feverston reviewed the draft of Article 1 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) which includes the basic organization of land regulation codes and consolidating them into a single document to streamline the review process; set forth the establishment of fees; the relationship to the Comprehensive Plan; the Ordinance effective date, etc.

Article 3

Mr. Feverston stated the draft of Article 3 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) designates the roles and responsibilities of the City Council, Planning Commission, Board of Architectural Review, and City Planner concerning the workings of the UDO. A Technical Review Committee will be established consisting of staff personnel to review development plans submitted to the City. The enforcement and penalties of the regulations contained in the UDO are also established in Article 3.

Mr. Brunner stated on Page 4, paragraph 3, Terms of Office, and paragraph 5, Vacancies, have a conflict in the number of years to be served by each member.

The members suggested a provision be made to stagger the terms of office with a 3 and 4 member group breakdown with the same yearly start dates, and the term of each member in each of the two (2) groups be a 4-year term. Further, they recommended the vice-chairman be selected by the chairman on an annual basis becoming effective on June 1st of each year.

Mr. Feverston stated that on page 5, paragraph G, Consent Agenda, a new provision much like that of Council to approve items such as minutes, etc. If any member of the Planning Commission would wish for an item to be pulled from that consent agenda, the item would go forward to the regular meeting for discussion.

Mr. Brunner asked, concerning page 4, paragraph 13, Conflicts of Interest, is a member could still participate in discussion of an item on the agenda as a citizen rather than a Planning Commission member.

Mr. Durham stated that as long as the member removed him or herself from the membership and addresses the Planning Commission from the podium, it would not be an issue.

On page 5, paragraph B, Duties and Powers of the BAR, Mr. Brunner stated that in subparagraph 1, reference was made to the APD. He asked if the term "APD" was defined in the document.

Mr. Feverston stated the term "APD" should be defined in the paragraph as well.

Mr. Durham stated that concerning the consent agenda, minor amendments to an approved plan can be placed on that agenda, but can be pulled by any member should they determine they want to discuss it further.

Mr. Feverston stated a provision can be added to page 8, paragraph B.9, to place all minor amendment requests on the consent agenda.

The creation of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) is actually being utilized at the present time. Mr. Feverston stated there are enough active projects occurring that staff has continued to meet on a weekly basis to discuss those projects.

The members agreed to schedule a Work Session to be held on June 12th to discuss Article 5 of the UDO as well as a concept plan for the Bear Creek development site at Wilmington Pike and Feedwire Road.

There being no further discussion, the Work Session was adjourned.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Paul Clark". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P" and "C".