

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, April 25, 2000

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. Richard Pluckebaum. There are currently two (2) vacancies on the Planning Commission. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner; Mr. Norbert A. Hoffman, City Engineer; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of March 28, 2000, as written. Mr. Kindler seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mr. Pluckebaum abstaining.

COMMUNICATIONS

Buckingham Financial - Minor Modification

Mr. Feverston reviewed the request for a Minor Amendment to the approved Special Approval application for Buckingham Financial located on the west side of Clyo Road at Millerton Drive. The zoning on the 1.62 acre parcel is Light Industrial, I-1. Although the site plan and building footprint have not changed, the applicant is proposing the second floor, the covered drop-off area, and the exterior fireplace to be deleted from the original plan approved by the Planning Commission on February 29, 2000.

Mr. Pluckebaum asked since a reduction in floor space would reduce the parking requirement, if spaces would be deleted as well.

Mr. Feverston stated the applicant is designing the parking area to accommodate a future expansion of the building in the future. The second story of the building only generated approximately two (2) parking spaces and would not make a great difference.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the Minor Amendment for Buckingham Financial to allow the second floor, the covered drop-off area, and the exterior fireplace to be deleted from the original plan approved by the Planning Commission on February 29, 2000. Mr. Pluckebaum seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Durham asked if it was necessary to remove most of the trees from the site.

Mr. Hoffman stated that after staking the building location on the site, each individual tree was inspected and none were worth preserving.

PUBLIC HEARINGSCenterville City Schools (Magsig Middle School) - Sign Variance

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Sign Variance application submitted by Centerville City Schools for Magsig Middle School located at 192 West Franklin Street. The zoning on the property is R-1d, single-family residential. The four (4) variances requested include a proposed sign area of 32 square feet per face which is double the 16 square feet standard in the ordinance; to allow a plastic sign face which is a prohibited material; to allow internal illumination of the sign which is prohibited; and, to allow a changeable copy sign face which is prohibited as well.

The proposed 4 ft. by 8 ft. double-faced sign structure is to be mounted on a stone base, with a plastic cover to protect the changeable copy messages on the sign, and be internally illuminated.

Mr. Feverston explained that Section 23.I of the Zoning Ordinance requires nonresidential uses located in residential zoning districts to conform to the sign requirements of the Architectural Preservation District. The intent of this provision is to restrict the nature of such signs and mitigate their impact on neighboring residential properties. In the case of Magsig Middle School, however, all of the properties that would be affected by the sign are nonresidential uses or are zoned to permit nonresidential uses. With the exception of Franklin Street Baptist Church, the blocks to the east and west of the school are zoned O-S, Office-Service, which permits the type of sign Magsig Middle School is requesting. The School District feels these features are necessary to reasonably advertise important school and community information. The City Council has reviewed the sign section of the Zoning Ordinance as it applies to this situation and agreed to amend the Ordinance to permit the sign area, illumination and changeable copy characteristics that are requested by the applicant by right.

Staff recommended the Variance application be approved as requested.

Mr. Durham opened the public hearing.

Ms. Michele Dickbowski, PTO member representing Magsig Middle School, stated the existing sign is in a very bad state of deterioration and needs to be replaced as soon as possible. The proposed sign is much like the sign at Stubbs Park, however, the stonework will be done on a smaller scale.

Mr. Jim Reppert, 61 Glencroft Drive, stated perhaps even though it was announced that Council is considering a change in the Sign Ordinance, when it is seen in the light of day by the public, it will not be approved. He stated he would not count on it necessarily being approved just because we have a staff member who thinks it will. He stated a couple of questions the Planning Commission should ask itself is, if a business were located across the street in the Architectural Preservation District (APD) and the business owner said his livelihood depended on having that sign, would the Planning Commission approve it? He stated that the fact that the property is

contiguous with O-S zoning and the church property is irrelevant. If the rules call for the school to have a 16 square foot sign, that is what it should have. Most messages on school signs are not really a good means of communicating to the parents--they can do that through their children and school bulletins. He stated that as a member of Council, he reluctantly approved the internally lighted sign for the high school only because the school district does serve as a meeting place for more than just school activities. Mr. Reppert stated that none of what Ms. Dickbowski said justified an internally illuminated sign. He stated that he recalled not too long ago the difficulty Mr. John McIntire, business and property owner in the APD, had using a shiny piece of background material for his sign and he did not even ask for it to be internally illuminated.

Mr. Kindler agreed with Mr. Reppert stating that internal illumination of the sign would ruin the ambiance of the AP District.

Mr. Hansford stated that the proposed sign is the same in sign area and currently has a changeable copy letters. He indicated it would seem appropriate to allow the plastic face to cover the letters, however, agreed that internal illumination should not be permitted. He stated that the sign can be illuminated with an external source to be more characteristic of the AP District.

Mr. Oliver stated the situation, for the most part, already exists. The school would simply be taking a nonconforming sign and improving its appearance.

Mr. Pluckebaum stated his only real issue of concern was that of internal illumination.

Mr. Durham stated that he did not feel a variance was justified to make reasonable use of the property and he would not support it.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the Variance application submitted by Centerville City School for Magsig Middle School located at 192 West Franklin Street as follows:

1. Permit each sign face to be a maximum of 32 square feet in sign area;
2. Allow a plastic sign material to cover the face of the sign;
3. Allow changeable copy on the sign face.

Mr. Kindler seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-2 with Mr. Pluckebaum and Mr. Durham voting no.

Holiday Inn Express - Building Height/Sign Variance and Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Variance and Special Approval applications for Holiday Inn Express proposed to be located on the southwest corner of Whipp Road and Wilmington Pike directly west of the existing Bob Evans Restaurant. The zoning on the 1.79 acre site is Business Planned Development, B-PD. The request is to construct a 70 unit hotel, which is permitted use, on the site. Seventy-three (73) parking spaces are proposed to satisfy the requirement for this project.

The two (2) variances requested include a proposal for a second wall sign on a second building elevation in lieu of a ground sign; and a proposed building height of 51 feet rather than the permitted height of 45 feet.

Concerning the request for a second wall sign, the Zoning Ordinance permits a business to display a ground sign in the front yard of a property adjacent to a public street. Wall signage is permitted only on one (1) building wall; either the wall where the main entrance is located or the elevation that faces a public street. The Holiday Inn Express site does not have frontage onto a public street and is set back approximately 445 feet from both Wilmington Pike and Whipp Road. The remote location of this property creates a practical difficulty for the property owner to adequately sign the property. Permitting wall signage on the east building elevation in lieu of a ground sign does provide relief from this hardship. Wall sign area equal to one and one-half (1.5) times the length of the east building elevation and is the minimum variance necessary to accomplish this purpose.

The applicant is also requesting a Variance to allow a gable roof on the proposed 3-story hotel building to extend above the 45-foot height limit required by the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance contains architectural design provisions which are intended to reflect the residential character of the community. One feature that establishes this residential character is a pitched roof. The proposal of Holiday Inn Express to construct a pitched roof on their building satisfies the intent of the Zoning Ordinance to make commercial buildings residential in character. There exist practical difficulties in designing the pitched roof within the 45 foot height requirement and also maintaining a proper roof-to-building proportion. The applicant has lowered the finished elevation by 2.5 feet from their original submission to reduce the overall height of the building. It is staff's opinion that a height variance of 6 feet, as requested by the applicant, is the minimum variance necessary to accomplish this purpose.

Staff recommended approval of the Sign Variance subject to the following conditions:

1. The wall sign area on the east side of the building shall not exceed one and one-half (1.5) times the length of the east building elevation.
2. Signs on the north and west building elevations are prohibited.

Staff recommended approval of the Building Height Variance subject to the following condition:

1. The Variance shall be limited to the roof structure as indicated on the proposed building elevations, and shall exclude any habitable space.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the architecture of the building stating it is fairly residential in character with the pitched roof, a combination of face brick on most of the building walls and split face block on the main level, and all windows for the rooms facing north and south.

At one time, Planning Commission suggested a mound be created at the rear of the property to screen headlights and activity from the Fox Run Condominiums located immediately west of this project. He stated that in order to create such a mound, the 100 foot buffer strip would have to be encroached as much as 40 feet. Staff felt a 6 foot brick wall would be more effective.

Staff recommended approval of the Special Approval application subject to the following conditions:

1. An easement shall be recorded that guarantees cross access between this lot and the adjacent lot to the north, subject to approval by the City Attorney.
2. The access lane at the rear of the property shall be extended to the northern lot line and a temporary turn-around constructed in this location for emergency purposes, subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.
3. A final grading and stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineering Department.
4. The final landscaping and screening plan for the entire site including the 100 foot bufferyard shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department. This plan shall include a minor encroachment into the 100 foot bufferyard for purposes of grading and stormwater drainage. A grading limit shall be established within the bufferyard prior to construction. Any disturbed area within the buffer shall be replanted in accordance with the Landscape, Screening and Bufferyard Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to approval by the Planning Department. If the proposed mound is not feasible, a brick wall six (6) feet in height shall be constructed at the eastern edge of the bufferyard to shield vehicle headlights to Fox Run Condominiums, subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted by the developer for all landscape, screening, or bufferyard improvements required by the Zoning Ordinance subject to approval by the City Engineer. This bond or guarantee shall be in accordance to the Guarantee of Construction and Installation of Improvements; Inspections Section of Part Twelve, Title Four of the Code of Ordinances.
6. A detailed exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
7. The dumpster screening shall be faced with brick to match the building, subject to approval by the Planning Department.

8. The Planning Commission shall approve the architectural design of the proposed building to assure the form, massing, and materials create a unified design that is compatible with the surrounding properties. Specifically, the building elevations shall be modified to reflect the following:
 - A. Brick or concrete sills shall be added beneath all windows;
 - B. The split-face stone block base shall be lowered to the bottom of the first floor windows; and
 - C. The canopies shown with E.I.F.S. shall be changed to brick with quoins to match the building.

Mr. Durham opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Kingston, architect for the project, stated that the request for the building height variance was an attempt to make the building fit into the residential character of the area and was simply for those aesthetic reasons. He stated that the request for a second wall sign was a trade off for a ground sign that would be totally ineffective on this particular site.

Mr. Lee Hall, 2591 Old Whipp Court, stated that he was notified by staff of this application because of his interest expressed in previous projects reviewed by the City. He indicated that none of his neighbors received notices and felt that this was in error.

After review of the application submitted, Mr. Feverston stated that it did appear the residential properties along Old Whipp Court were not included.

Mr. Farquhar stated that issue did not negate the public hearing and the Planning Commission could proceed.

Mr. Hall stated that he was a firm believer in the integrity of the Zoning Ordinance and the 6 foot building height variance was not needed. He stated there was no unique circumstance since the building could still be constructed and used for its purpose.

Mr. Jim Price, Fox Run Condominium resident, stated he did not object to the sign variance, however, he was concerned that if the building height variance was granted, developers on the remaining properties would request the same.

There being no other speakers, Mr. Durham closed the public hearing.

The members of Planning Commission agreed that they had worked with the applicant to make a building more architecturally pleasing to the surrounding neighborhood. Even though the building could be constructed without the height variance, they felt in this particular case, it was in the best interest of the neighborhood to allow a variance that would create a more residential architectural design.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the Building Height Variance of fifty-one (51) feet for Holiday Inn Express to be located south of Whipp Road and west of Wilmington Pike subject the following condition:

1. The Variance shall be limited to the roof structure as indicated on the proposed building elevations, and shall exclude any occupiable space.

Mr. Pluckebaum seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

MOTION: Mr. Oliver moved to approve the Sign Variance for Holiday Inn Express to be located south of Whipp Road and west of Wilmington Pike subject to the following conditions:

1. The wall sign area on the east side of the building shall not exceed one and one-half (1.5) times the length of the east building elevation.
2. Signs on the north and west building elevations are prohibited.

Mr. Pluckebaum seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

The Planning Commission discussed the Special Approval application for the project and how to provide the best screen to the neighbors to the west. They felt that a double row of staggered evergreen trees would be more effective and appropriate than a brick wall.

Mr. Durham questioned how emergency access should be addressed.

Mr. Feverston stated that the property owner, Bob Zavakos, has indicated to the City that either the turnaround or access easement can be accomplished.

In reference to the architecture, Mr. Hansford felt the split stone block base should remain as proposed to create a shorter building height that if it were constructed with more brick material. He stated that keeping the E.I.F.S. on the canopy as proposed makes it appear smaller and lighter than if it were done in brick.

Mr. Alfred Dexter, 5831 Overbrooke Road, was concerned with possible noise levels and complained of outdoor speakers at the SuperAmerica on the northwest corner of Whipp Road and Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Kingston stated no outdoor speakers would be installed on this site.

MOTION: Mr. Pluckebaum moved to approve the Special Approval application for Holiday Inn Express to be located south of Whipp Road and west of Wilmington Pike subject to the following conditions:

1. An easement shall be recorded that guarantees cross access between this lot and the adjacent lot to the north, subject to approval by the City Attorney.
2. The access lane at the rear of the property shall be extended to the northern lot line and a temporary turn-around constructed in this location for emergency purposes, subject to approval by the City Engineering Department and City Attorney.
3. A final grading and stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineering Department.
4. The final landscaping and screening plan for the entire site including the 100 foot bufferyard shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department. This plan shall include a minor encroachment into the 100 foot bufferyard for purposes of grading and stormwater drainage. A grading limit shall be established within the bufferyard prior to construction. Any disturbed area within the buffer shall be replanted in accordance with the Landscape, Screening and Bufferyard Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to approval by the Planning Department. If the proposed mound is not feasible, a double staggered row of evergreen trees shall be planted, subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted by the developer for all landscape, screening, or bufferyard improvements required by the Zoning Ordinance subject to approval by the City Engineer. This bond or guarantee shall be in accordance to the Guarantee of Construction and Installation of Improvements; Inspections Section of Part Twelve, Title Four of the Code of Ordinances.
6. A detailed exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
7. The dumpster screening shall be faced with brick to match the building, subject to approval by the Planning Department.
8. The Planning Commission shall approve the architectural design of the proposed building to assure the form, massing, and materials create a unified design that is compatible with the surrounding properties. Specifically, the building elevations shall be modified to reflect the following:
 - A. Brick or concrete sills shall be added beneath all windows.

Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

E.R.T.H. Systems - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Special Approval application submitted for E.R.T.H. Systems, 8001 South Suburban Road, requesting approval to construct a 3,388 square foot building addition to their existing facility. The zoning on the .96 acre parcel of land is Light Industrial, I-1. The proposed addition would have standing seam metal panels which matches the existing building.

Staff recommended approval of the Special Approval application subject the following condition:

1. The Planning Commission shall approve the architectural design of the proposed addition to assure the form, massing, and materials create a unified design that is compatible with the surrounding properties. Specifically, the Planning Commission must approve the use of metal panels as an exterior siding material.

The members of Planning Commission felt the building materials for the addition were compatible with the existing building on the site and the plan satisfied the standards in the Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted for E.R.T.H. Systems, 8001 South Suburban Road, to construct a 3,388 square foot building addition as requested. Mr. Kindler seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Automatic Car Wash - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Special Approval application proposed construction of an Automatic Car Wash to be located along South Main Street south of Centerville Lanes. The zoning on the 1.56 acre parcel is B-2, General and B-PD, Business Planned Development. Two (2) building schemes were submitted for this project. Scheme "A" proposes a gabled roof at the front entrance of the facility and a flat roof on the remainder of the building. Scheme "B" proposes a gabled roof over the entire facility.

As a part of this development, the right-of-way along the access road will have to be dedicated and improved. The City has agreed to contribute one-half of the road improvement costs for the entire roadway project.

Staff recommended approval of the Special Approval application subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall dedicate to the City forty (40) feet of right-of-way along the western portion of this parcel.

2. The access road traversing through the western edge of the applicant's property shall be redesigned and improved to include a reconfiguration of the existing pavement, pavement widening, curb, gutter, and sidewalk. These improvements shall be constructed by the applicant in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineer. The City shall contribute one-half the cost of this roadway improvement.
3. A final grading and stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineering Department showing stormwater drainage calculations and incorporating detention and/or retention and erosion control during construction in accordance with the provisions of the City Stormwater Drainage Control Ordinance.
4. A detailed exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. The dumpster screening shall be faced with brick to match the building, subject to approval by the Planning Department.
6. The final landscape plan shall be subject to approval by the City Planning Department.
7. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted by the developer for all landscape, screening, or bufferyard improvements required by the Zoning Ordinance subject to approval by the City Engineer. This bond or guarantee shall be in accordance to the Guarantee of Construction and Installation of Improvements; Inspections Section of Part Twelve, Title Four of the Code of Ordinance.
8. The Planning Commission approve the architectural design of the proposed building to assure the form, massing, and materials create a unified design that is compatible with the surrounding properties. The Planning Department recommends scheme "B" modified to include a hip roof that extends over the entire building to satisfy the roof proportion requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission must also approve the use of metal for the building cap.
9. The walkway along the parking stalls south of the building shall be 6.5 feet in width.

Mr. Erick Heppner, architect for the project, stated that concerning condition #8, the applicant preferred Scheme "A". He stated he prepared the second scheme upon the recommendation of staff, however, the applicant does not wish to construct Scheme "B". Mr. Heppner stated staff was concerned with long blank walls, however, it is intended to plant intense landscaping and the visual impact will not be a factor.

Mr. Stan Haper, Stonebridge Circle, stated he was part owner of the proposed facility. He questioned why they would be responsible to pay for part of the road along the access road.

Mr. Durham stated that was a matter that would have to be appealed to Council.

Mr. Heppner stated they may wish to enlarge the size of the equipment room and the members of Planning Commission agreed to allow the equipment room to double in size subject to staff approval.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the Special Approval application for the Automatic Car Wash, Scheme "A", to be located along South Main Street south of Centerville Lanes subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall dedicate to the City forty (40) feet of right-of-way along the western portion of this parcel.
2. The access road traversing through the western edge of the applicant's property shall be redesigned and improved to include a reconfiguration of the existing pavement, pavement widening, curb, gutter, and sidewalk. These improvements shall be constructed by the applicant in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineer. The City shall contribute one-half the cost of this roadway improvement.
3. A final grading and stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineering Department showing stormwater drainage calculations and incorporating detention and/or retention and erosion control during construction in accordance with the provisions of the City Stormwater Drainage Control Ordinance.
4. A detailed exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. The dumpster screening shall be faced with brick to match the building, subject to approval by the Planning Department.
6. The final landscape plan shall be subject to approval by the City Planning Department.
7. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted by the developer for all landscape, screening, or bufferyard improvements required by the Zoning Ordinance subject to approval by the City Engineer. This bond or guarantee shall be in accordance to the Guarantee of Construction and Installation of Improvements; Inspections Section of Part Twelve, Title Four of the Code of Ordinance.
8. The walkway along the parking stalls south of the building shall be 6.5 feet in width.
9. The building footprint shall be modified to allow the equipment room to double in size with architectural features subject to approval by the Planning Department.

Mr. Kindler seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



