

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, September 24, 2002

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

Attendance: Mr. James Durham, Chairman; Mr. Joe Weingarten; Mr. James Briggs; Mr. Patrick Hansford; Mr. Paul Clark; Mr. Rand Oliver. Absent: Mr. Robert St. Pierre. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Briggs moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of September 10, 2002, as written. Mr. Weingarten seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 11-86, The Zoning Ordinance Of The City Of Centerville, Ohio To Amend Section 23, The Sign Section Of The Zoning Ordinance In Accordance With The Provisions of Chapter 713 Of The Ohio Revised Code.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the proposed amendment to the Sign Ordinance which is Section 23 in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that based on the desire to update the standards in the Sign Ordinance concerning some of the issues that have been discussed previously by the Planning Commission, the changes generally are to regulate the time, location, and manner in which signs can be displayed.

The members felt the proposed ordinance contained some vague wording which should be revised to avoid future conflict. For example, illumination of temporary signs should state that it "shall not be added" to a temporary sign. Further, the members were not comfortable regulating the number of temporary signs, more specifically political signs, on individual properties. Some regulation discussed included spacing of political signs to avoid clusters of signs in one area.

Mr. Durham suggested a chart be made to show the changes in the ordinance that are to be considered for the policy the City is trying to achieve. At that point, the wording could be drafted to regulate those policies.

Other comments included political signs (classified as temporary signs) should have at least five (5) days to be removed after an election date since most are removed by volunteers that are not available until the weekend after election day.

Mr. Weingarten stated at the end of each paragraph describing types of signs, a notation should be made as to whether a permit is required.

The members discussed the possibility of reworking the sign section to also be contained in the individual sections of the districts in the Zoning Ordinance to state what regulations must be followed in order to achieve "one stop shopping" for the user of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Durham stated it would be repetitive, however, it could be considered.

Mr. Durham opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, Mr. Durham asked for a motion to table this issue.

MOTION: Mr. Oliver moved to table the Ordinance. Mr. Weingarten seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No.11-86, The Zoning Ordinance Of The City Of Centerville, Ohio IN accordance With The Provisions Of Chapter 713 Of The Ohio Revised Code.

Mr. Feverston stated this amendment is being considered as a result of vagueness in the Office-Service, O-S, Neighborhood Business, B-1, and Light Industrial, I-1, sections of the Zoning Ordinance as to there permitted ad conditional uses.

The members felt that when listing uses in the different district sections, the wording "not limited to" should be added to avoid confusion in the future. Rather than group the types of uses as proposed, the members felt the uses should be listed as they are now in the existing Zoning Ordinance and not be broken down in categories.

Mr. Hansford stated he did not disagree with breaking down the types of uses, but it should be consistent throughout the entire Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Durham stated that by listing a contractor's office as a permitted use with specific standards in the O-S section, it would become problematic.

Mr. Hansford stated it would allow a smaller scale contractor to be a permitted use with the warehousing of parts.

After further discussion, the members felt the uses should be reviewed with the existing Zoning Ordinance to comprehend what the overall uses will entail.

The members agreed the conditional use special approval for a contractor's office in an O-S zoning district would be appropriate and directed staff to strike it from the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Durham suggested the existing O-S and B-1 uses in the City be cataloged and then review those uses to determine whether those uses are appropriate and zone out those that are not appropriate. The existing uses in the O-S and B-1 districts would be protected by the grandfather clause.

The members felt this would be a good approach to review all non-residential uses in the Zoning Ordinance and determine where they should be permitted.

Mr. Durham opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, Mr. Durham asked for a motion to table the ordinance.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to table the ordinance. Mr. Oliver seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

A work session will be scheduled to discuss these ordinances in the near future.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Feverston reviewed the upcoming agenda items for the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Briggs advised the members he would not attend the regular meeting on October 29, 2002.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.