

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session
Tuesday, July 15, 2003

Mr. Durham called the Work Session to order at 7:30 P.M.

Attendance: Mr. James Durham, Chairman; Mr. Patrick Hansford; Mr. Joe Weingarten; Mr. Jim Briggs; Mr. Robert St. Pierre; Mr. Paul Clark (where noted). Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Norbert Hoffman, City Engineer. There is currently one (1) vacancy on the Commission.

Centerville Place, Final Phase - Building Architecture

Mr. St. Pierre removed himself from the meeting at this time due a possible conflict of interest.

Mr. Will Kaly, architect, and Mr. Tim Albro, Beerman Realty Company, were present for the review of the revised architecture of the final phase of the strip shopping center located on South Main Street south of Spring Valley Road.

In comparing the original proposal and the revised architectural proposal, Mr. Durham asked why the end cap continued to be more vertical than the rest of the final phase.

Mr. Kaly stated that corner of the shopping center has great visibility from Spring Valley Road and they want to address and articulate the visibility by creating another visual attractive entrance from the north.

Mr. Hansford stated he did not feel the use of the decorative stone material proposed was appropriate on the end cap as it was not used other than on the SteinMart section of the center.

Mr. Clark arrived at this time.

The issues to be discussed included the height of the parapet wall, the arch element used on the original architecture, and the building materials.

The members agreed the height of the parapet wall was acceptable as they understood the architect wanted to create an end cap to define the final piece of the strip center.

Mr. Durham stated he did not feel the partial arch element complimented the arch used on the SteinMart portion of the center and was not consistent in design. He stated the design on the end cap was not symmetrical and was lacking the formality of the overall traditional design.

Mr. Albro stated the design is uniform and the same building materials are used. He stated the arch element is used on a different contour for creativity and does not detract from the existing architecture.

Mr. Briggs stated the partial arch element is not repetitive throughout the center and, therefore, does not fit the design.

Concerning the issue of building materials, Mr. Hansford stated he did not feel the use of the decorative stone was appropriate other than as an accent material. He stated the use of the decorative stone on the center portion of the center was acceptable, however, using it in mass on the end of the building was not compatible. If brick material was used rather than the decorative stone, the elements would achieve everything the applicant wants, but remain consistent with the architecture of the entire project.

The majority of the members indicated they would support the architecture with the use of the brick and foundation material with the exception of the arch element although they understood the applicant's desire to have something unique at the corner of the center.

Mr. Albro expressed his frustration stating he felt the work session would accomplish the issue of the architecture. He stated they could simply take their proposal to Council for their consideration rather than creating a new facade design.

The members stated any decision made by the Planning Commission could be appealed to Council for their consideration should the applicant desire to do so.

With regard to the building materials, four (4) members agreed that the use of decorative stone was acceptable on the north elevation as depicted in the first submission. They concurred that the placement of doors and windows should have a symmetrical location.

Mr. St. Pierre returned to the Work Session at this time.

Far Hills Church - Site Plan Modification

Mr. Feverston stated Far Hills Church, 5800 Clyo Road, is requesting final approval of the roadway access extending from the facility's parking area to Wilmington Pike. He stated the roadway will provide vehicular access from the church building as well as access for emergency equipment to service the ball fields on the southern portion of the site.

Mr. Hoffman stated stakes were located on the site for the roadway and grading had begun on the roadway. Because final approval had not been granted, work was stopped.

Mr. Durham stated parking and paving setbacks must be maintained, and no activity shall be permitted in the buffer area.

Mr. Hoffman stated the Fire Department had concern with some of the sharp curves on the proposed roadway and how difficult it would be to maneuver fire trucks. He stated the curve areas could be widened to accommodate larger vehicles.

Mr. Durham stated the issue of the gazebo could not be addressed as it is shown located within the buffer area and would require a variance. The members agreed they would not support a variance for the proposed location.

Mr. Feverston stated staff had discussed the location of the gazebo with the applicant's representative on more than one occasion to offer alternative locations.

Mr. Durham stated the proposal is the same as outlined in the concept plan that was approved previously by the Planning Commission and as long as it complies with all the ordinance requirements and the engineer's requirements, it is acceptable.

There being no further discussion, the work session was adjourned to a Special Meeting.

Paul Clark

