CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION Work Session Tuesday, January 8, 2002

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

Attendance: Mr. James Durham; Chairman; Mr. Patrick Hansford; Mr. Rand Oliver; Mr. Jack Kindler; Mr. James Briggs; Mr. Joseph Weingarten. There is currently one (1) vacancy on the Planning Commission. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner; Mr. Norbert Hoffman, City Engineer.

Yankee Trace, Parcel 28 (The Erpenbeck Company) - Revisions to Architecture

Mr. Jeff Mike and Mr. Gary Erpenbeck were present for review of the attached units in Yankee Trace, Parcel 28. The number of units has been reduced by two (2) units for a total of 74 attached units. Revisions to the architecture for those four (4) buildings include a 12/12 roof pitch, no covered patios on the back of the units, and the center gable of each building is to be constructed of brick.

Mr. Hansford asked if the garage doors have raised panels.

Mr. Feverston stated some drawings show raised panels and some show flat panels. The panels will be consistent throughout the attached-unit development. He stated staff remain concerned with the lack of architectural balance on the side elevations.

Mr. Oliver stated he felt the revisions have incorporated the elements that were requested by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Weingarten stated landscaping could be located on the sides of the buildings to provide a visual break in the building wall.

Mr. Durham stated he did not like the three (3) car garage units on the end of two (2) of the buildings as the appearance is simply a row of door.

Mr. Oliver indicated the addition of the three (3) car garage units provide some variety to the architectural appearance of the buildings Planning Commission encouraged the applicant to achieve.

The consensus of the members was their concerns were addressed and action on the application would be taken during the regular meeting.

Mr. Feverston advised that Tom Harrigan had met with Council in a work session to discuss a concept for development of property on Loop Road. A Major Use application is expected to be filed in the next few months.

The Work Session was continued until after the Regular Meeting.

Voss Dodge - Concept Plan

Mr. Brad Judge, Mr. Greg Stout, Mr. Dick Lane, Mr. John Voss, Mr. Craig Voss, and Mr. Brad Voss were present for the review of the concept to expand the existing Voss Dodge dealership located at 90 Loop Road.

Mr. Judge stated to construct a building addition and vehicle storage area on the site, the following variances would be necessary for:

- 1. side yard building setback;
- 2. parking and paving setback;
- 3. placement of a detention basin in the 100 foot buffer area;
- 4. elimination of interior landscaping in parking area.

Mr. Hansford stated the Planning Commission must look at each variance on its own merit. He suggested the building be shifted on the site to eliminate the setback variances as there are no practical or physical difficulties on the site to warrant such variances.

Mr. John Voss asked if the lot in question and the lot to the east could be combined to create one (1) lot since he is the owner of both lots.

Mr. Oliver stated that if a replat is done to create one (1) lot, the setback variances would be resolved as they would no longer be necessary.

Mr. Hansford stated if the number of parking spaces was decreased, the interior landscaping could be created and a variance would not be necessary.

Mr. John Voss stated the general purpose of the interior landscape requirement was most likely for a retail facility, not for vehicular storage areas that would create a maneuverability problem to those servicing vehicles.

The members felt the issue of a variance to allow encroachment into the buffer area could not warranted.

Mr. Judge stated allowing encroachment would be beneficial to the adjacent property owners as additional landscaping could be installed on the property. He stated the existing buffer area has few significant trees with a significant amount of honeysuckle and scrub growth. If detention was permitted to be located in the buffer area, it would allow the applicant to provide plantings to the existing buffer.

Mr. Durham stated he felt the applicant is requesting to overdevelop the site. If the project was scaled back, the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance could be satisfied.

Mr. Kindler excused himself from the meeting at this time.

January 8, 2002

Mr. Judge suggested a work session should perhaps be scheduled with Council to consider the variance possibilities.

Mr. Durham suggested the applicant discuss the possibility of a Council work session with the City Manager.

There being no further discussion, the work session was adjourned.

JoSh

.