

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, June 24, 1997

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

Attendance: Mr. Scot Stone; Chairman; Mr. James Durham; Mr. Patrick Hansford; Mr. Richard Tompkins; Mr. Arthur Foland.
Absent: Mr. Jack Kostak; Mr. Richard Pluckebaum; . Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney; Mr. Mr. Norbert Hoffman, City Engineer; Mr. F. William Stamper, Economic Development Coordinator.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to excuse Mr. Kostak and Mr. Pluckebaum from the meeting as each gave prior notice to the Planning Department. Mr. Durham seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Approval of minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 27, 1997, Regular Meeting, as written. Mr. Durham seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mr. Stone abstaining from the portion he was not present.

MOTION: Mr. Tompkins moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of June 10, 1997, Work Session, with the following change:

Page 3, Paragraph 5 should read as follows:

Mr. Hansford suggested the applicant discuss the matter of the fire lanes directly with the Fire Department. The applicant should ask the Fire Department to clarify whether the 17 ft. fire lanes are a requirement of the Ohio Fire Code or based upon a vehicle turning radii for fire equipment. Mr. Hansford stated if it is not a fire code issue, Planning Commission in the past has referred vehicle turning radii to the City Engineer.

Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mr. Stone abstaining from the portion he was not present.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Routsong Funeral Home - Variance/Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Variance and Special Approval applications submitted by Routsong Funeral Home, 81 North Main Street. The front two-thirds (2/3) of the property is zoned Architectural Preservation District, APD, and the remaining one-third (1/3) is zoned R-1c, Single-Family Residential.

Three (3) variances are being requested which include driveway spacing of 50 feet rather than the required 105 feet; parking lot landscaping of 3% of the interior parking lot rather than the required 5%; and front and side yard parking that is prohibited in the APD.

Mr. Feverston stated that this particular property is unique in that it has three (3) frontages which face North Main Street, West Ridgeway Road and Lyons Drive. The fourth (4th) property line is adjacent to Ashland Oil which establishes a side yard. The applicant has indicated that a future expansion of the building on the west elevation will occur in the future to satisfy the growing needs of the business.

In review of the requested variances, staff recommended to deny the request for reduced driveway spacing and parking lot landscaping as the property had no unique circumstance to justify the granting of a variance. The City Engineer recommended against the access along North Main Street as it would present a traffic hazard; however, if the applicant had an independent do a study to satisfy the safety concern, he indicated he would reconsider the proposal. The staff analysis of the front/side yard parking issue included the following points:

1. The grade of this property is lower than the Ashland Oil property to the north. There is a retaining wall along the north property line that is situated on the Ashland Oil property.
2. This lot abuts a public street on three (3) sides creating three (3) front yards one (1) side yard and no rear yard making this parcel unique.
3. Parking is permitted only in the rear yard for a business property in the APD.
4. The uniqueness of this property and locational requirements for parking the APD create a hardship on this property.

Based on that analysis, staff recommended to approve the variance for front/side yard parking subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed parking lot shall not encroach into the R-1c, Single-Family Residential zoning district portion of this site.

2. The western portion of this site, including the proposed retaining wall and the landscape island situated at the northwest corner of the parking lot shall be intensively screened with a combination of evergreen and deciduous trees, shrubs and ivy to conceal this view from residents to the north and west.
3. The proposed grading on the western portion of the site shall be greatly reduced to preserve as many of the existing trees as possible subject to approval by the City Planner. These trees will help satisfy the screening requirement.

Staff recommended approval of the Special Approval application requesting to reconstruct and expand the existing parking lot subject to the following conditions:

1. The Planning Commission must approve a variance to permit any expansion of this parking lot.
2. The approval of this plan, if granted by the Planning Commission, shall be limited to the reconstruction and expansion of the parking lot and any grading or improvements associated with the parking lot. The proposed building addition depicted on the site plan is not approved as a part of this application.
3. The final location and design of the driveway and curb-cut shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer.
4. The rear parking lot shall be regraded to lower the overall elevation and to reduce the height of the retaining wall situated on the northwestern and western edge of the parking lot subject to approval by the City Engineer.
5. All retaining walls shall be constructed with key-stone or other similar concrete product to allow for terracing where appropriate to conceal the height of these walls and to allow for landscape screening to be placed within the terraced areas with the final design subject to approval by the City Planner.
6. A screening plan shall be subject to approval by the City Planner. A double, staggered row of evergreen trees shall be planted along the western edge of the parking lot and shall be spaced a maximum of ten (10) feet on-center and shall have a minimum planting height of five (5) to six (6) feet. Existing trees on the site may also be used to satisfy this requirement.

7. A detailed landscape plan for the entire site must be approved by the Planning Department showing plant species, spacing, planting height and/or caliper to be installed. The landscape plan shall locate and name all existing trees above eight (8) inches in diameter.
8. A detailed, exterior lighting plan shall be submitted and subject to the approval of the City Planning Department.
9. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer.

Mr. Stone opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tommy Routsong, applicant, made a slide presentation outlining their business and what their future needs will be to service their clients. He stated that they need to improve the physical barriers on the site which include parking and number of access locations, as well as the installation of a traffic signal at North Main Street and West Ridgeway Road to remain competitive with other providers. He stated that the average number of cars for a funeral service is between 150 and 250 cars and the site only provides 52 parking spaces. He stated that without improvements made to the Centerville location, clients will select another provider.

Ms. Gwen Mooney, Routsong Funeral Home, stated that her job is to meet with pre-need clients. She stated that some of these clients have made comments and are concerned with a lack of parking and the high volume traffic along North Main Street. She stated that there is further complication with the restricted hours of left-turn movements from West Ridgeway Road. Ms. Mooney stated that they are concerned that someone not familiar with the area will be seriously injured as a result of an accident at the North Main Street intersection.

Mr. Routsong stated that there is no need to add stress to the families of the deceased with a lack of traffic control. He suggested some alternatives to consider include a traffic signal at the intersection, a traffic policeman stationed at the intersection, extend an driveway from the funeral home behind the Ashland Oil to the north to create a traffic pattern which would utilize the existing signal at Iron Gate Park Drive, relocate the funeral home, or permit the access along North Main Street as proposed.

Mr. Thomas Routsong, Routsong Funeral Home, stated that there will be a great need for their services in Centerville in the near future. He stated that one of the problems they did not see years ago was the traffic problems to be created.

Mr. Robert Perkins, 32 West Ridgeway Road, stated the funeral home has always been a nice neighbor keeping their property well-maintained. He stated even though that is the case, he felt constructing a curb cut along North Main Street would create a safety problem especially with cars existing the property directly to the north.

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

Mr. Durham asked what the parking requirement would be with the future building addition as it should be considered during this process.

Mr. Feverston stated that without specific information for the addition, he could not calculate the parking accurately.

Mr. Durham asked Mr. Hoffman if the installation of a traffic signal at West Ridgeway Road was a possibility.

Mr. Hoffman stated that traffic counts of vehicles on East and West Ridgeway would not warrant a traffic signal. He stated, however, there is no question a lot of accidents occur at that intersection.

Mr. Durham stated that he could support the front and side yard parking based on the property's three (3) front yards; however, he could not support the extension of the parking into the R-1c zoned property, the parking landscaping requirement or the driveway spacing.

Mr. Tommy Routsong stated that the landscaping requirement could be eliminated as that requirement could be satisfied.

Mr. Stone suggested a Work Session meeting to discuss the entire improvement of the site to consider how the parking requirement will be affected by a future building addition.

Mr. Durham stated that in preparing a concept for the Planning Commission to review in a Work Session, should the trees be preserved and no disturbance is made to the R-1c zoned area, he would agree that a variance would be justified.

Mr. Tommy Routsong agreed to waive the time period for action on both the Variance and Special Approval applications in order to discuss the project with more information available at a Work Session meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to table the Variance and Special Approval applications submitted by Routsong Funeral Home, 81 North Main Street, to consider the improvement project in its entirety during a Work Session. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Wilmington Dental Center/Manor House Properties - Variance and Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Variance and Special Approval applications submitted for Manor House Properties, 6239 Wilmington Pike, requesting approval to construct a 6,180 sq. ft. dental office. The zoning on the 1.422 acre parcel is O-S, Office-Service. Two (2) variances are being requested which include a rear yard building setback proposed to taper from 45 feet to 50 feet (50 feet is the requirement), and a maximum building ground floor area of 6,180 sq. ft. which exceeds the requirement of 5,000 sq. ft. The 44 parking spaces proposed satisfy the parking requirement.

Mr. Feverston stated that an application was approved previously for this facility which was a 2-story building. The applicant has determined that a 1-story building would better fit the needs of the occupants, however, a building design of this type requires a variance for ground floor area.

Staff recommended to deny the variances based on the following analysis:

1. The site is flat and limited by the location of the stormwater detention basin that is situated on the southeast portion of the site.
2. The building could be reduced in depth by five (5) feet to eliminate the rear yard building setback variance.
3. A development plan that was approved by the Planning Commission to construct a two-story, 10,040 square foot dental office on September 24, 1996.

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

1. Should the Planning Commission deny either the requested building setback variance, the maximum building ground floor area variance or both, a revised site plan shall be submitted, subject to approval by the City Planner that eliminates the variance(s) not approved.

2. The Planning Commission shall approve the architectural design of this building to be architecturally compatible with surrounding buildings and structures. Specifically, the Planning Commission must approve the use of stucco or synthetic stucco on the exterior building walls.
3. The parking and paving setback situated along the western edge of the parking lot shall be increased to 25 feet to match the minimum requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. The parking lot shall be redesigned subject to approval by the Planning Department.
4. A screening plan shall be subject to approval by the City Planner. A double, staggered row of evergreen trees shall be planted along the western edge of the parking lot and shall be spaced a maximum of ten (10) feet on-center and shall have a minimum planting height of five (5) to six (6) feet. Existing trees on the site may also be used to satisfy this requirement.
5. A detailed landscape plan for the entire site must be approved by the Planning Department showing plant species, spacing, planting height and caliper to be installed.
6. All landscape islands contained within the parking lot shall have a minimum width of five (5) feet.
7. The final design of the dumpster screening subject to approval by the Planning Department.
8. A detailed lighting plan showing all exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
9. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.

Mr. Feverston stated that a revised plan had been submitted which eliminates the rear yard setback variance. With the revised parking lot layout, one (1) additional space is gained for a total of 45 parking spaces. He stated that the revised plan would require only the variance for maximum ground floor building area.

Mr. Stone opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jim Keyes, applicant, stated that the property is unique since it is situated on the same parcel as the Ebenezer Andrews House. He stated that the Historical Society was not enthused about the construction of a 2-story building adjacent to the landmark. He stated that the redesign to a 1-story building was the result of that concern maintain the character of the area. The overall development would preserve the stand of trees to the west. Mr. Keyes stated that he had reviewed the recommendations of staff and had no objection to any of those conditions. Further, he stated that the revised plan would not require a variance for rear yard setback and, therefore, withdrew the variance request for rear yard setback.

Mr. Ben Monnig, representing St. Francis of Assisi Church, stated that they did not oppose the plan, but were concerned with the possibility of an additional curb cut directly across from the site.

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

Mr. Durham stated his concern was that Council adopted a policy for smaller buildings to be constructed in the O-S zoning districts. He stated two (2) buildings could be built on this site rather than one (1) as proposed, however, it would create more clutter. In addition, the proposal would preserve green space and trees on the site. He asked the applicant if he would agree to a condition which would restrict any disturbance of the trees located to the west of the parking area in exchange for the variance.

Mr. Keyes stated that the only problem would be if the owner of the BP Property sold that property and the new owner withdrew the easement agreement for access to Clys Road. This would force the applicant to create their own access to Clys Road.

Mr. Farquhar stated that the approval could be conditioned with an exception that should the owner of the BP Property force the issue, disturbance of that portion of the site could only occur to create access to Clys Road.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to approve the Variance to allow a ground floor area not to exceed 5,880 sq. ft. for the building on the revised plan received June 24, 1997, subject to the following condition:

1. No construction and no parking in the area labeled on the plan as existing trees, or more particularly the area west of the line that establishes most of the western boundary of the parcel. The only exception to this condition, to be drafted by the City Attorney and to be entered into by the landowner, shall state that if the owner of the adjoining B-2 zoned land forces the applicant to have their access through said area, they may construct parking lot access in a manner that minimally disturbs the existing trees and still meets the access.

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

Mr. Durham stated that he did not feel the dryvit-type material proposed for the building was appropriate in this particular location. He stated that this building should be all brick to fit the character of the site.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted for Wilmington Dental Center, 6239 Wilmington Pike, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Planning Commission approval pertains to the revised site plan dated June 24, 1997, that eliminates the setback variance which has been withdrawn by the applicant.
2. The architectural design of this building shall be architecturally compatible with surrounding buildings and structures. Specifically, the building shall be constructed of all brick, and the use of stucco or synthetic stucco on the exterior building walls shall be prohibited.
3. The parking and paving setback situated along the western edge of the parking lot shall be increased to 25 feet to match the minimum requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. The parking lot shall be redesigned subject to approval by the Planning Department.

4. A screening plan shall be subject to approval by the City Planner. A double, staggered row of evergreen trees shall be planted along the western edge of the parking lot and shall be spaced a maximum of ten (10) feet on-center and shall have a minimum planting height of five (5) to six (6) feet. Existing trees on the site may also be used to satisfy this requirement.
5. A detailed landscape plan for the entire site must be approved by the Planning Department showing plant species, spacing, planting height and caliper to be installed.
6. All landscape islands contained within the parking lot shall have a minimum width of five (5) feet.
7. The final design of the dumpster screening subject to approval by the Planning Department.
8. A detailed lighting plan showing all exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
9. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.

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

PRD Corporation - Appeal of Planning Department Interpretation

Mr. Hansford removed himself from the meeting at this time, due to a possible conflict of interest.

Mr. Feverston stated that the Planning Commission serves as the Board of Zoning Appeals when conducting a public hearing regarding an Appeal petition.

Mr. Feverston stated that the PRD Corporation filed an appeal with the City regarding an interpretation by the Planning Department on the calculation of required parking for a day care. This interpretation increased the required parking for the proposed day care determination and a variance of the parking requirement would be required to develop the site at 232 North Main Street. He stated that a time limit was established in the Zoning Ordinance to regulate the re-hearing of the same type of variance for a period of twelve (12) months. An application for a parking variance was denied by the Planning Commission on April 29, 1997. Based on the standard in the Zoning Ordinance, the application was returned to the applicant.

Mr. Feverston stated the Zoning Ordinance requires a school, day care, kindergarten or nursery to have one (1) parking space per employee plus one (1) space for every five (5) children at capacity.

Mr. Feverston stated that on May 5, 1997, during a meeting between staff and the applicants, Mr. Richard Pavlak and Mr. Matt Foster, the issue of capacity for the proposed building was mentioned by the Mr. Foster. He indicated that even though the license was being sought for 125 children from the State of Ohio, the proposed building was of a size that could be licensed for up to 150. Mr. Feverston stated that based upon this new information, he instructed the applicant to submit a floor plan of the proposed building detailing the size, number of children for each classroom, and number of employees in order to determine the basis for the parking requirement when a new application was submitted. He stated when speaking with the State, he was informed that when a license is re-evaluated, since the building was approved for construction by each municipality, it is assumed the use and maximum occupancy are permitted. Should an increase in students be requested and the size of the building permit such an increase, the State would simply issue the license without any knowledge to that municipality. The Zoning Ordinance requires a parking standard to be maintained for maximum capacity of a building which was determined, in this case, to require a parking variance. As a result of that determination and since a similar variance cannot be requested for one (1) year, the Planning Department returned the Special Approval application and filing fee to the applicant with a letter explaining the Planning Department interpretation. The applicant has appealed this interpretation.

Mr. Stone opened the public hearing.

Mr. Richard Pavlak, applicant, stated that the meeting of May 5, 1997, was an attempt to find the requirements necessary to meet the standards in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that the operators of the day care intend to provide a quality facility with adequate space and do not intend to seek a license based on the maximum capacity of the building. He stated that they are merely asking that they be treated fairly, as other facilities of this kind in the City do not provide parking to satisfy the parking requirement.

Mr. Matt Foster, operator of the day care, stated that intensity of the facility was reduced to meet the parking requirements. He stated that the interpretation of how the parking requirement is determined seems to have changed over a period time. He stated he was confused as to whether the number of spaces was based on the the number of students or the square footage of the building.

Ms. Heidi Miller, 59 Bradstreet Road and representing the neighborhood, stated that they still strongly oppose the project. She stated that the parking requirement should be based on the maximum capacity of the building as interpreted by staff.

Mr. Tim Trick, 50 Bradstreet Road, stated that even though the intent is to provide a facility for 125 students, the parking requirement has still not been satisfied. Should ownership change it some point in time, an increase in licensing could occur which would create a parking problem among other issues. He stated that the applicant has indicated several times that the parking requirement can be satisfied, however, Mr. Trick stated that they have yet to see such a plan.

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

Mr. Durham stated that the question of the Planning Commission is how the interpretation pertains to capacity of the building.

Mr. Foland reiterated that the Planning Commission was acting as the Board of Zoning Appeals in this case.

Mr. Durham asked if there would be any way that if the Planning Commission accepts what the applicant has proposed as a maximum of number of students rather than what the State would interpret as maximum, could that number be enforced as stated by the applicant.

Mr. Farquhar stated he did not feel that the capacity could be enforced after action had been taken by the City.

Mr. Durham stated that the applicant could have all the good intentions in the world, but if a new owner were to increase the number of students, it could not be controlled by the City.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to affirm the decision of the Planning Department regarding the application submitted by the PRD Corporation for property located at 232 North Main Street. Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Stone advised Mr. Pavlak of his right to appeal this decision to Council within 15 days.

Mr. Joe Willhoite, 225 Linden Drive, asked if that would be the last appeal hearing.

Mr. Farquhar stated that should the applicant appeal to Council, the losing party could appeal that decision to the Common Pleas Court within 30 days.

Mr. Hansford returned to the meeting at this time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Rite Aid Corporation - Variance of Front and Side yard Setbacks/Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Stone left the meeting at this time due to a possible conflict of interest.

Mr. Durham asked if the any variances remained a part of the proposal.

Mr. Barry Weaver, representing the applicant, stated that all variances for this site were withdrawn.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to remove the Special Approval application for the Rite Aid Corporation from the table. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the revised plan submitted as part of the Special Approval application for the Rite Aid Corporation for property located on the northeast corner of South Main Street and Spring Valley Road. The zoning on the 1.674 acre parcel is B-2, General Business. The request is to construct a new 10,750 sq. ft. building for a Rite Aid Pharmacy.

Some of the comments made by the members of Planning Commission during their Work Session regarding this project were to break up the building mass particularly on the front entrance and the northeast corner of the building. Further, windows were to be added on the elevations and do something with the brick to create a foundation and treat the brick with some kind of brick capping element on the top of the building wall to reduce some of the appearance of the mass of the structure.

The revised plan proposes a red brick building with the main entry doors situated on an angle to emphasis that architectural element on the building. A turned-metal roof has been used treatment has been used to further break up the building mass. This revised site plan eliminates the need for any variances as originally requested. The driveway along Spring Valley Road has been shifted slightly to the east to line up with the driveway on the opposite of the street. All parking will be located to the front of the building with a separate structure to be constructed for the drive-thru area. The dumpster has been located to the eastern side of the site with an access straight through the property to properly service the dumpster.

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

1. The final design of the driveway and curb-cut to Spring Valley Road shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer.
2. A raised curb shall be installed at the perimeter of the parking area and surrounding all landscape islands subject to approval by the City Planner.
3. The planter located on the south side of the building shall extend to the east to provide landscaping in front of the dumpster enclosure.
4. The walkway located on the west side of the building shall have a minimum width of 6.5 feet.
5. The parapet wall or roof system shall have a sufficient height to mask and conceal the mechanical, HVAC, and other systems that may be attached to the roof subject to approval by the Planning Commission.
6. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.
7. A stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineer 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.
8. The landscaping plan shall be submitted to provide low mounding, about 2.5 feet in height and low landscaping, where the parking lot is adjacent to South Main Street and Spring Valley Road subject to approval by the City Planner.
9. A detailed exterior lighting plan shall be submitted and subject to the approval of the City Planning Department.
10. No sign shown on the plans shall be approved as a part of this application. The signs shown greatly exceed the minimum requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
11. The final design and screening of a dumpster area shall be subject to approval of the City Planning Department.

12. The Planning Commission shall approve the architectural design of the proposed buildings to assure the materials, shape and architecture create a unified design on the premises and shall be visually compatible with the surrounding buildings. Specifically, the Planning Commission must approve the use of Dryvit as an exterior siding materials. The Planning Commission has reviewed the architectural design of the proposed building in Work Sessions and Regular Meetings with the applicant. The following design elements were requested to be incorporated into the building to break the mass of the building, create a unified design and be visually compatible with surrounding buildings:
- a. The turned-metal roof shall extend below the top of the parapet (recommend 4 feet).
 - b. Split-face concrete block, 3 or 4 courses in height, be used to create the appearance of a foundation.
 - c. A cornice shall be constructed along the upper edge of the parapet.
 - d. Project the dryvit "columns" out from the building wall a few inches to provide relief.
 - e. Keep a single brick color (reddish in tone).

Mr. Barry Weaver, representing the applicant, stated he was concerned with the width of the walkway on the west side of the building. He stated that if the parking stalls could be striped 16.5 feet rather than 18 feet, it would be acceptable.

The members of Planning Commission agreed that would be acceptable and the striping should be approved by staff.

Mr. Weaver stated that the extension of the parapet, as proposed by staff, would directly affect the wall sign for the facility. He stated that they would most likely do something architecturally to delineate the amount of area on which the sign would be located in order to meet the standards in the Sign Ordinance. The redesign of that portion of the building would be revised to place the sign on the wall, but would be a sensible, appealing space between the bottom of the turned-metal roof and the bottom of the siding panel itself. He stated that all other issues were acceptable as conditions for approval.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted by the Rite Aid Corporation for property located on the northeast corner of South Main Street (SR 48) and East Spring Valley Road subject to the following conditions:

1. The final design of the driveway and curb-cut to Spring Valley Road shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer.
2. A raised curb shall be installed at the perimeter of the parking area and surrounding all landscape islands subject to approval by the City Planner.
3. The planter located on the south side of the building shall extend to the east to provide landscaping in front of the dumpster enclosure.
4. The walkway located on the west side of the building shall have a minimum width of 6.5 feet.
5. The parapet wall or roof system shall have a sufficient height to mask and conceal the mechanical, HVAC, and other systems that may be attached to the roof subject to approval by the Planning Commission.
6. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.
7. A stormwater drainage plan shall be approved by the City Engineer 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.
8. The landscaping plan shall be submitted to provide low mounding, about 2.5 feet in height and low landscaping, where the parking lot is adjacent to South Main Street and Spring Valley Road subject to approval by the City Planner.
9. A detailed exterior lighting plan shall be submitted and subject to the approval of the City Planning Department.
10. No sign shown on the plans shall be approved as a part of this application. The signs shown greatly exceed the minimum requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
11. The final design and screening of a dumpster area shall be subject to approval of the City Planning Department.

12. The following shall be considered guidelines for the applicant to redesign portions of the building, and final approval of architecture, building materials, color, etc., shall be granted by the City Planner:
- a. The turned-metal roof shall extend below the top of the parapet (recommend 4 feet).
 - b. Split-face concrete block, 3 or 4 courses in height, be used to create the appearance of a foundation.
 - c. A cornice shall be constructed along the upper edge of the parapet.
 - d. Project the dryvit "columns" out from the building wall a few inches to provide relief.
 - e. Keep a single brick color (reddish in tone).

Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS

South Metro Industrial Park, Sec. 2 - Record Plan

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Record Plan for South Metro Industrial Park, Sec. 2, located west of Bigger Road, south of I-675 and north of Thomas Paine Parkway. The zoning on the 11.27 acre parcel is Industrial Planned Development, I-PD, and Business Planned Development, B-PD. A Major Use Special Approval application was approved several years ago for this site. Section 1 is almost built out and Section 2 proposes two (2) lots for future development which will be subdivided to suit the needs of each individual client.

Staff recommended approval of the Record Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer in accordance with the approved Major Use Plan.
2. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to recording of the plat, a performance bond in an amount acceptable to the City Engineer shall be posted by the developer with the City of Centerville.

3. A temporary turn-around shall be constructed at the terminus of South Metro Parkway. The design shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Department. The turn-around shall be removed when South Metro Parkway is extended.
4. All landscape screening shall be installed in accordance with the approved Major Use Plan.
5. The plans for water lines and fire hydrants shall be subject to the approval of the Washington Township Fire Department.

Mr. Tom McDougall, representing the applicant, stated that he had reviewed the staff recommendations and did not object to any of those issues. He asked if the landscaping would be required to be installed up front or as each site develops.

Mr. Feverston stated that would be the option of the developer.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to recommend approval of the Record Plan for South Metro Industrial Park, Sec. 2, subject to the following conditions:

1. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer in accordance with the approved Major Use Plan.
2. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to recording of the plat, a performance bond in an amount acceptable to the City Engineer shall be posted by the developer with the City of Centerville.
3. A temporary turn-around shall be constructed at the terminus of South Metro Parkway. The design shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Department. The turn-around shall be removed when South Metro Parkway is extended.
4. All landscape screening shall be installed in accordance with the approved Major Use Plan.
5. The plans for water lines and fire hydrants shall be subject to the approval of the Washington Township Fire Department.

Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0.

The Estates at Silvercreek, Sec. 2 - Record Plan (Corrective Plat)

Mr. Feverston reviewed the request for approval of a Corrective Plat for The Estates at Silvercreek, Sec. 2, which is an extension of Spring Valley Pike, east of Washington Church Road and west of Yankee Street in Washington Township. He stated the purpose of this corrective plat to amend the building setbacks, particularly the side and rear yard setbacks on each lot, to be in accordance to the approved zoning plan by Washington Township. The township approved a zoning plan with specific setbacks which were in error on the original plan that was reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission last year. This plan simply corrects those setback standards.

Mr. George Reinke, Reinke and Associates, was present to review the request. He stated that this plat has three (3) different size lots requiring different setbacks. He stated that the error was discovered when they attempted to site a house on one of the lots. Mr. Reinke stated that their attorney felt the best way to resolve the error was to submit this corrective plat.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to approve the Record Plan/Corrective Plat for The Estates at Silvercreek, Sec. 2, as requested. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

John H. Howard 7/29/97

