

**CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Tuesday, October 26, 1999**

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

Attendance : Mr. James Durham, Chairman; Mr. Jack Kostak; Mr. Patrick Hansford; Ms. Cheri Williams; Mr. Richard Pluckebaum. Absent: Mr. Richard Tompkins; Mr. Rand Oliver. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney.

Motion to Excuse:

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to excuse Mr. Tompkins from the meeting as he gave prior notice to staff. Mr. Pluckebaum seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Pluckebaum moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of October 12, 1999, Regular Meeting, as written. Mr. Kostak seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Feverston reminded members interested in attending the annual Zoning Workshop, to be held on December 3, 1999, to inform staff as soon as possible.

Mr. Feverston stated that no formal applications have been filed for the November 9, 1999, regular meeting. The last meeting of the year will be held on December 14, 1999.

Mr. Feverston stated that a draft of the proposed changes to the Sign Ordinance to provide identification signage to residential neighborhoods will be discussed by Council at their November 8, 1999, Work Session. Further, Council has scheduled a Public Hearing to be heard on November 18, 1999, to consider the procedural changes proposed to the Architectural Preservation Ordinance.

NEW BUSINESS

Sutherland Fine Homes - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Special Approval application submitted by Sutherland Fine Homes for the property located at 43 West Franklin Street in the Architectural Preservation District (APD). The purpose of the improvements to the structure is to convert the existing residence to an office use. The request is to remove existing outbuildings on the property; construct a 168 ft. rear building addition; replace existing windows and roof shingles; add a pitched roof to the

eastern addition constructed previously; and approval of a new building color scheme. In addition, an extension of the existing driveway would be extended to the rear yard of the property to satisfy the 10 space parking requirement.

The southeast portion of the structure has an existing enclosed porch area to which a second story addition is proposed. This addition will be located above as well as outward to the north. An existing brush and treeline are located along the north property line, and depending how much of this vegetation is located on the subject property, it could be included as part of the screening requirement.

The Board of Architectural Review reviewed the architectural elements of this application and recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The removal of the existing outbuildings is approved as the request meets the following criterion for Demolition or Moving of Buildings in the Architectural Preservation District section of the Zoning Ordinance:

- 4) Detriment to Community  
The retention of the building (on the site) would not be in the interest of the community as a whole as is determined by the BAR.

The applicant is working with members of the Centerville-Washington Township Historical Society to find a new home for the outhouse and, therefore, it will not be demolished. The chicken coop is in disrepair and is of little architectural or historical value and may be demolished. It is not possible to develop this property without removing both outbuildings.

2. All additions and modifications to the existing principal building shall result in a balanced, unified appearance. New siding, windows, doors, roof materials, etc., shall be consistent with those on the existing building.
3. The existing wood siding and window casings shall be permitted to be removed, if necessary. The wood siding must be replaced with a duplication of the original siding material.
4. The final design of the windows and doors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. The building color scheme shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.

In addition, staff recommended approval of the Special Approval application subject to the following conditions:

1. 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.
2. A final screening plan shall be submitted and subject to approval by the City Planning Department.

Mr. Pluckebaum asked how the proposed parking area for this property would affect a future parking plan proposed for the northwest corner of the APD to possibly be considered by Council at some point in time.

Mr. Feverston stated that should a parking plan be located along the rear of properties located along West Franklin Street, the subject parking area could be incorporated into a future plan.

Mr. Hansford asked for clarification of the proposed elevations as they did not coordinate with the site plan. He stated that the elevation, as submitted, suggests an addition would be constructed on the east side of the building which would encroach 4 feet into the driveway. The two (2) windows proposed for the rear of the building are round top, double hung windows spaced together. This type of window as well as the spacing are not indicative of the APD and, should be pulled apart.

Mr. Durham noted that the south and west elevation have fish scales on the gables, not none are shown on the east elevation.

Mr. Jeff Sutherland, applicant, stated that no addition is being made to the east elevation.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted by Sutherland Fine Homes for property located at 43 West Franklin Street subject to the following conditions:

1. The removal of the existing outbuildings is approved as the request meets the following criterion for Demolition or Moving of Buildings in the Architectural Preservation District section of the Zoning Ordinance:
  - 4) Detriment to Community  
The retention of the building (on the site) would not be in the interest of the community as a whole as is determined by the BAR.

The applicant is working with members of the Centerville-Washington Township Historical Society to find a new home for the outhouse and, therefore, it will not be demolished. The chicken coop is in disrepair and is of little architectural or historical value and may be demolished. It is not possible to develop this property without removing both outbuildings.

2. All additions and modifications to the existing principal building shall result in a balanced, unified appearance. New siding, windows, doors, roof materials, etc., shall be consistent with those on the existing building.
3. The existing wood siding and window casings shall be permitted to be removed, if necessary. The wood siding must be replaced with a duplication of the original siding material.
4. The final design of the windows and doors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. The building color scheme shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
6. 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.
7. A final screening plan shall be submitted and subject to approval by the City Planning Department.
8. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted by the developer for all screening 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.
9. The windows to be installed on the addition to the north elevation shall be separated, subject to approval by the Planning Department.

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

Hickey Development Corporation - Lot Split

Mr. Feverston reviewed the proposed Lot Split submitted by Hickey Development Corporation for undeveloped sections of Springbrooke Condominiums located south of Alex-Bell Road (SR 725) and east of Pelbrook Farm Drive. Council, on October 24, 1994, approved a zoning

master plan to develop the condominium project on the Residential Planned Development, R-PD, zoned land which is a permitted use. The request is to divide the remaining acreage, previously approved as Sections 3 and 4 of the Springbrooke Condominium development, into 2 lots. One lot of 11.3968 acres would be sold to the Karras and Sotiropoulos family, and the second lot of 0.4200 acres would remain as a remnant parcel.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the following points of analysis concerning the history of the development:

1. The City Council approved a zoning master plan to develop a condominium project called Springbrooke Condominiums on 25.564 acres of land which includes the subject property. The master plan was approved for 144 condominium units at a density of 5.63 dwelling units per acre.
2. Springbrooke Condominiums have been developed through Section 2; with Section 2 nearing completion. Section 1 and 2, when complete will have 63 condominium units of 13,5486 acres of land with a density of 4.65 dwelling units per acre.
3. The subject property was approved by the City for development as Sections 3 and 4 of the Springbrooke Condominium project. The City Planning Commission amended the master plan in July of 1997 at the request of the developer for Sections 3 and 4. The amendment changed the 3 and 4 unit buildings to doubles and to reduce the number of units from 81 condominiums to 79.
4. The applicant has stated that the proposed lot split would create, as a remnant, a 0.42 acre parcel that is 40 to 44 feet wide that could serve as a buffer should the Springbrooke Condominium project not be continued as approved by the City. A condominium plat would be recorded to create the buffer.

Based on the following, staff recommended denial of the request:

1. The granting of the lot split would establish a lot that would be below the minimum lot area of 5 acres as required by the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The granting of the lot split would establish a lot that would be below the minimum lot width of 300 feet as required by the Zoning Ordinance.
3. The granting of the lot split would establish a lot that has no frontage to a public right-of-way as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has prepared an instrument to grant an access easement to this parcel through the Spring Condominium development via Brookmeadow Drive, a private drive, to Pelbrook Farm Drive.

4. The Springbrooke Condominium Master Plan cannot be amended or modified without the approval of the City of Centerville. There are no provisions in the approved Master Plan to allow for the Springbrooke Condominium project to be terminated at the end of Section 2; to provide for building setbacks, the buffer area (as mentioned by the developer) or for providing a terminus for Brookmeadow Drive.
5. The granting of the lot split would establish John Elwood Drive as the only means of direct access to the 11.3968 acre parcel. The approved Master Plan prohibits this connection.
6. The granting of the lot split would establish a lot line that would bisect 5 dwelling units and place an additional 2 dwelling units within a required 20 foot building setback in Section 3 of the Springbrooke Condominium project.
7. The granting of the lot split would reduce the maximum number of dwelling units from 79 to 68 should the remaining 11.3968 acres develop separately from the Springbrooke Condominium project.

Mr. James Hickey, applicant, was present for the review of the lot split request. He stated that an agreement has been made to deed back the undeveloped land to the Karras family with the exception of the 0.42 acre parcel. He stated the 0.42 acre parcel could be deeded back as well should Sections 3 and 4 develop as approved. Mr. Hickey stated his purpose of retaining that parcel is to insure the residents of Springbrooke Condominiums have an appropriate buffer to future development should it meet the same standards of the existing project.

Mr. Bob Zvakos, Real Estate Agent for the Karras family, stated that they were not aware of the 0.42 acre parcel to be split from the remaining undeveloped land. He stated that they were opposed to the lot split as it was their understanding the access would be available from Brookmeadow Drive only. A developer has signed a contract with the Karras family to continue the project through to its entirety as approved. It would not be obvious in the appearance of Sections 3 and 4 that another party had taken over the development project.

Mr. Farquhar stated that the transfer of property is strictly a matter between the two property owners and the City cannot become involved. The City is obligated only to determine that the project is being developed as approved. The issues between the property owners is strictly a private matter.

MOTION: Mr. Kostak moved to approve the staff recommendation to deny the lot split based on the findings by staff. Mr. Pluckebaum seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

