

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
Tuesday, July 8, 1997

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

Attendance: Mr. Scot Stone; Chairman; Mr. Richard Tompkins; Mr. Arthur Foland; Mr. Jack Kostak; Mr. Richard Pluckebaum; Mr. Patrick Hansford (where noted). Absent: Mr. James Durham. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner.

Mr. Durham gave prior notice to the Planning Department of his absence.

PRD Corporation - Concept Plan

Mr. Feverston reviewed the concept plan submitted by the PRD Corporation for a proposed day care to be located at the rear of 232 North Main Street. In previously reviewing this plan, Mr. Feverston stated that some of the same issues exist on this plan as existed on the original plan denied by the Planning Commission. Those issues included access, drop off area for students, the use of shared parking spaces between the property in question and 264 North Main Street which are both owned by Mr. Richard Pavlak.

The existing curb cut on North Main Street is approximately 80 feet wide which is too wide for good access control. The concept plan indicates egress from the property with a left-turn lane and a right-turn lane out from the property. There is an access easement along the eastern edge of the corner property.

Mr. Stone asked if there had been an attempt to create a circular traffic flow between the three (3) properties.

Mr. Hoffman stated that there has always been an attempt to correspond the parking between the three (3) lots, however, the property owner of the front portion of the property has been less than enthusiastic in this design according to the applicant.

Mr. Feverston stated that tenants at 264 North Main Street have indicated that the rear of the building provides the delivery area for their businesses. He stated that as that area is to be used for access to the day care facility, it should be marked on the plan to not be considered a delivery area for the existing businesses.

Mr. Feverston stated that the issue of parking will be further effected by the creation of a drop off area which the proposal currently lacks. He stated that the five (5) shared parking spaces shown on the concept plan cannot be calculated to

satisfied the parking requirement. He stated that the existing building at 264 North Main Street is deficient in parking based on the square footage shown on the concept plan. Mr. Feverston stated only one (1) space could be calculated as shared parking. He stated that two (2) spaces shown on the concept plan are not workable based on the current layout of the site. He stated that in order to meet the parking requirement, the building will have to be shifted back on the site which may not allow adequate room to construct the facility at the size necessary.

Mr. Pavlak stated that the existing building at 264 North Main Street is not as large as Mr. Feverston calculated to figure the parking requirement for the building.

Mr. Feverston stated that he based that figure on the information provided on the concept plan.

Mr. Foland stated that it would be necessary to determine the exact size of that building in order to calculate the parking requirement for the entire project.

In reviewing the other aspects of the plan, it appeared that no variances would be necessary. The Planning Commission felt that if the parking could be worked out, the plan would meet the other Zoning Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Foland pointed out that appropriate parking must be made available for the transportation vans to be used by the day care.

Mr. Stone stated he had a concern with the screening of the project from the residential property as well as the Benham's Grove facility to the south.

Mr. Matt Foster, administrator of the proposed day care, stated that it is their intent not to disturb the existing tree line along the south property line.

Having discussed their concerns of the concept plan, Mr. Pavlak and Mr. Foster left the meeting.

Commercial Entertainment

Mr. Feverston reviewed the proposed ordinance to be considered for changes in regulating commercial entertainment. This ordinance would permit indoor commercial entertainment in the B-PD, Business Planned development zoning district only and eliminate these uses from the B-2 zoning district. Locational requirements are established by this ordinance requiring a minimum separation of 500 feet between the property where a

indoor commercial entertainment use is proposed and the property of a church or a school and a minimum building separation of 1,000 feet between these uses.

The Planning Commission agreed that they liked this approach for regulating commercial entertainment and to move forward with the public hearing at the next regular meeting.

Minor Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Feverston stated that the main purpose of this "cleanup" ordinance is to address issues that are vague in their restriction as well as to include new issues such as big box developments, architectural standards for commercial buildings, etc.

Mr. Hansford arrived at this time.

Mr. Feverston stated that a provision is being considered to allow development of a church site requiring a minimum of 10 acres which must be located at the edge of a neighborhood.

Another issue was that of building height in a residential district which was changed to require a maximum building height of 35 feet rather than 2.5 stories or 35 feet.

Planning Commission agreed that the minimum floor area of a single-family dwelling required more revision.

Mr. Feverston stated that the Planning Commission should consider the setback requirements for monopoles and if it should be less restrictive. He stated that as a part of the landscape ordinance, landscaping would be required for these types of developments.

Mr. Hansford asked if the permitted chain link fencing material could be required to be PVC coated on the telecommunication sites.

Mr. Feverston stated that it could be stated as a requirement. He stated further that a provision is being proposed for co-locators to restrict the number of monopoles to avoid visual clutter.

Mr. Feverston stated that as a result of remodeling projects in residential districts, a provision for a dumpster to be located in the front yard had been proposed.

The members felt a period of up to 14 days would be appropriate.

The members agreed an increase in the number of days to review an application should be made to allow more time for the review process rather than require a time extension from each individual applicant should their application be affected.

Further, a provision was included to allow an applicant to submit a maximum of one (1) application per property for development consideration. No additional application could be submitted by that applicant until a decision by the appropriate board or commission would be rendered.

Mr. Feverston stated that a change to appeal applications was made to require the applicant to submit the names and addresses of all property owners within 500 feet of the property in question as a part of the application.

Mr. Feverston stated that additional issues will be drafted for consideration by the Planning Commission to be included in this Zoning Ordinance amendment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

S. A. Stur
Chairman 8/12/97