

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, February 11, 1997

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

Attendance: Mr. Scot Stone, Chairman; Mr. Jack Kostak; Mr. Patrick Hansford; Mr. Arthur Foland; Mr. Timothy Shroyer; Mr. Peter McMahon. Absent: Mr. James Durham. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to excuse Mr. Durham from the meeting as he gave prior notice to the Planning Department. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Approval of minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of January 28, 1997, Regular Meeting, as written. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 with Mr. McMahon abstaining.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Feverston stated that the American Planning Association (APA) Conference will be held in San Diego this Spring and members interested in attending should advise staff within the next week.

NEW BUSINESS

Stuart, James/Patios Unlimited, Inc. - Rear Yard Setback Variance

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Variance application submitted by Patios Unlimited, Inc., for property located at 6598 Hollowview Trail owned by James Stuart. The zoning on the property is R-1c, Single-Family Residential. The request is to reduce the existing 25 ft. rear yard setback to 14 ft. in order to allow construction of a patio enclosure on an existing concrete pad. Mr. Feverston stated that this particular lot is a part of the Nestle Creek subdivision which was approved by the City as a Residential Cluster Development. As a result of that approval, lot sizes and setback standards were reduced to provide additional parkland dedication and green space throughout the subdivision. The lot in question abuts the Reserve Area to the east and was approved with a reduced rear yard setback of 25 ft. rather than the 50 ft. standard setback requirement. The construction of a structure would obstruct an existing utility easement as well.

Mr. Feverston stated this Variance would be one of convenience rather than of hardship based on the following analysis:

1. The existing lot is a typical lot within the Nestle Creek subdivision.
2. This lot is generally flat and has no limitations within the required setbacks established for this lot.
3. The lot is bounded to the rear by a common area, Reserve Area K, for the Nestle Creek neighborhood.
4. The requested variance encroaches into a utility easement, fifteen (15) feet in width, along the rear lot line.

Staff, therefore, recommended to deny the variance application as submitted.

Mr. Stone opened the public hearing.

Mr. Pat McGowen, Patios Unlimited, was present for the review of application. He asked for an explanation of the second item in the staff analysis.

Mr. Feverston explained that the buildable area on this lot had no physical limitations and the house was constructed to cover the entire buildable area on the site at the time of the original construction.

Mrs. Clare Kern, 2229 Briggs Road, stated that her concerns included if proper notification was given to surrounding property owners, if granting of this variance would set a precedent and the fact that Nestle Creek had no architectural control board as that established by the Homeowners Association in the abutting Cheltenham subdivision.

Mrs. Marla Wilson, 6536 Atterbury Court, stated that her property abuts the Nestle Creek subdivision and is concerned with the potential architecture of future structures of this type.

Mrs. Marsha Heben, 6509 Atterbury Court, stated she lived directly behind the lot in question and was concerned with the view and how it affects the reserve area.

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

Mr. Stone stated that the burden of providing the names and mailing addresses of the property owners is the responsibility of the applicant.

Mr. Feverston stated that in speaking with Mrs. Kern earlier this date, it was determined that two (2) property owners were not included on the list submitted as a part of the Variance application.

Mr. Foland stated that the property owner made the decision to construct a house on this particular lot using all the buildable area and should have considered any possible additions to the property at that time.

Mr. Foland and Mr. McMahon agreed that they could not support the Variance as it was not unique to the neighborhood and it encroached into the utility easement.

Mr. Hansford stated that the easement acts as a swale as well, and would create additional drainage problems to the surrounding properties.

Mr. Kostak asked if the side yard could be used for the patio enclosure.

Mr. Feverston stated an additional may be constructed on the south elevation, however, a minimum of 20 ft. would be required to be maintained between buildings.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to deny the Variance application submitted for James Stuart by Patios Unlimited, Inc., as submitted. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Mr. Stone advised the applicant of his appeal rights to Council. He stated further that should this decision be appealed to Council, the applicant would be responsible for a revised list of property owners.

NEW BUSINESS

Encrete Investment - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Special Approval application submitted for Encrete Investment to be located on South Metro Drive across from PC Plus. The zoning on the 1.713 acre parcel is Industrial Planned Development, I-PD. The request was to construct a new 14,624 sq. ft. office-warehouse building. The applicant has proposed 38 parking spaces to satisfy the parking requirement for the project. Mr. Feverston stated that the majority of the rear property line on this parcel abuts the existing Thomas Paine Condominium project. The developer, as a part of the overall industrial park plan, is required to install additional mounding and buffering to screen the adjoining residential community.

Some additional detention will be provided within the 100 ft. buffer strip as well. The proposed building is a combination of split face block for the north and south elevation, passage doors and metal panel material on the west elevation, and metal panel and overhead doors located on the east elevation.

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

1. The Planning Commission shall approve the architectural design of this building to be architecturally compatible with surrounding buildings and structures. Specifically, the Planning Commission shall approve the use of split-face concrete block and metal panels as exterior wall materials.
2. A detailed lighting plan showing all exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
3. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.
4. A stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineering Department showing stormwater drainage calculations and incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction in accordance with the provisions of the City Stormwater Drainage Control Ordinance.
5. The location, design and screening of any dumpster on the property is subject to the approval of the City Planner.

Mr. Gary Woodley, developer of South Metro Park, stated that the proposed building will be beige in color with a blue mansard roof. Landscaping will be added to the mound area and a wood fence will be constructed to provide added screening from the Thomas Paine neighborhood. Shrubs will be planted in front of the fence line to break the fence mass.

Mr. Shroyer asked if the fence would prohibit the opposite side of the property from being maintained.

Mr. Woodley stated that the fence would not be continuous to allow access for maintenance from the front parking area.

Mr. Shroyer asked what type of lighting was proposed for the site.

Mr. Woodley stated that wall packs would be used on the back of the building and carriage lights would be used on each individual unit on the front of the building.

Mr. Feverston stated that wall packs are not permitted in commercial and industrial zoning districts. Down-directed lights are to be used to avoid any light spillage onto adjoining properties.

Mr. Woodley stated they would submit a lighting package to the City that would meet all lighting standards.

Mr. Hansford was concerned with the proposed metal panels for the building stating that their appearance over a 10 to 15 year period would be a potential problem.

Mr. Foland stated that he felt the proposed building materials were compatible with the surrounding properties and did not object to the project as proposed.

Mr. Shroyer stated he would prefer brick and split-face block to the metal panels, however, it would not keep him from voting to approve the project.

Mr. Kostak agreed that he did not object to the use of metal panels on this particular project.

Mr. Hansford asked staff to review the final parking layout to be certain appropriate handicapped spaces are included on the plan.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Special Approval application for Encrete Investment subject to the following conditions:

1. A detailed lighting plan showing all exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
2. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.
3. A stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineering Department showing stormwater drainage calculations and incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction in accordance with the provisions of the City Stormwater Drainage Control Ordinance.
4. The location, design and screening of any dumpster on the property is subject to the approval of the City Planner.

5. Landscaping and screening shall be installed as submitted as well as in accordance with the overall approved landscape and screening plan approved for the South Metro Industrial Park project.

Further, the Planning Commission found the architectural design of this building to be architecturally compatible with surrounding buildings and structures. Specifically, the Planning Commission approved the use of split-face concrete block and metal panels as exterior wall materials.

Mr. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1 with Mr. Hansford voting no.

Landscape Ordinance

Mr. Feverston stated that staff should have a Landscape Ordinance to Planning Commission for their review by May 1, 1997.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

S. J. Stut
Chairman 2/25/97