

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Work Session

Tuesday, July 10, 2007

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

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

Electronic Message Board Signs - Draft Ordinances

Mr. Feverston reviewed the two draft ordinances prepared by staff to either regulate electronic message board signs or prohibit them in their entirety. There are about 5 LED signs and 27 changeable copy signs located within the City and prohibiting them would classify those signs as legally-nonconforming.

Mrs. Meininger arrived at this time.

Mr. Feverston stated many years ago staff was told you cannot ban particular signs, but you can ban specific sign characteristics of the sign. He stated these LED signs will most likely reduce the number of temporary signs within the business districts because the permanent sign with changeable copy would be used.

Mr. Brunner stated he felt the electronic signs are not only unattractive and difficult to read with the number of colors, but create a safety hazard to traffic trying to read them as they drive past.

Mr. Feverston stated the number of background colors could be regulated.

Mr. Durham stated the City Attorney has given an opinion that the issue would be easier to defend if the signs were prohibited.

Mrs. Meininger stated the electronic message board signs do not represent a residential-type community.

Mr. Gammell stated regulating the electronic signs could create an unmanageable situation for staff.

Mr. Briggs stated it might be the right thing to do in prohibiting the electronic signs.

Mr. Leonard stated there have been strong enough statements to support the alternative to prohibit the signs.

It was the recommendation of the members to prohibit electronic message boards signs.

Additional issues discussed included possible regulations of vehicle-mounted signs that travel through areas promoting specific advertisers. A possible regulation would be to limit the sign area not to exceed coverage on more than 25% of the vehicle. Identification signs for residential areas should be externally illuminated with the fixtures screened to avoid any spillage onto adjoining properties.

Mr. Briggs suggested provisions be included in the Sign Ordinance to address sign maintenance.

Mr. Feverston stated sign maintenance is contained in the Property Maintenance Ordinance.

Mr. Briggs stated it could be included in the Sign Ordinance as well.

Unified Development Ordinance

Article 5

Mr. Feverston stated Council reviewed Article 5 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) at their last work session. They agreed the Planning Commission should have final action on Conditional Use and Major Use Special Approval application. The Council will have the right to request a review of any project and will act on all Appeal applications. A major variance shall be reviewed and action taken by the Planning Commission. A minor variance shall be reviewed and action taken by the City Planner.

Mr. Durham asked staff to define a minor variance.

Mr. Feverston stated the definition of a minor variance will be contained in Article 9 which the City has not received at this time.

Mr. Durham stated he felt any variance request needs to have the appearance of due process which would only be possible if reviewed by the Planning Commission. Further, property owners within the 500 foot radius notification area of a major variance would have no input. The appearance of a variance procedure is important to the public.

The members agreed the decision to separate variances into different categories was not a good idea and all variances should be determined by the Planning Commission.

Article 7

A list of all zoning districts will be included in Article 7 of the UDO. The zoning map, current at that time, will be adopted into the UDO as well.

The existing R-1d Single-Family Residential classification will not be used as it currently is because most of the small lots are zoned as R-1d and are nonconforming. The R-1d classification will be used for new construction on lots that meet that zoning criteria.

Mr. Durham stated the Residential Lifestyle Community should be moved to the overlay districts section.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the areas to be included in the overlay districts. He stated the owners of properties located within the overlay districts could apply specific standards in turn to utilize development variances.

Article 9

The members stated they want to meet in a joint work session with Council to review Article 9 once it is received by the City and reviewed by staff.

There being no further business, the meeting 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".

