

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, March 26, 1996

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

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

Approval of minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Shroyer moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of March 12, 1996, Regular Meeting, subject to changing Page 6, Condition #2 to read as follows:

2. The Planning Commission specifically approves the use of split-face block and exterior finish insulation system (dryvit) as siding material for the front building elevation, split-face block on the north elevation and concrete block for the west building elevation.

Mr. Kostak seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0-3 with Mr. Stone, Mr. Foland and Mr. McMahon abstaining.

COMMUNICATIONS

Gordon Food Service - Minor Amendment

Mr. Schwab reviewed the revised site plan submitted by Gordon Food Service to be located on the southwest corner of Wilmington Pike and Whipp Road. He explained that staff had determined since the previous Planning Commission meeting that the parking spaces located at the rear wall of the building could be deleted as the plan did more than satisfy the parking requirement. Gordon Food Service redrew the site plan and has submitted it for consideration as directed by the Planning Commission without needing any type of parking variance. The plan also proposes that the condenser units for the air conditioning be located inside at the rear corner of the building rather than on the roof and some of the paving has, therefore, been eliminated. The revised plan proposes 68 parking spaces which is within the parking standard. The applicant is, therefore, requesting approval of the revised plan based on the Planning Commission discussion at the previous meeting requesting a possible decrease in the parking at the rear of the building which possibly could be viewed from the adjacent residential properties.

Staff recommended approval of the revised plan as submitted.

Mr. Durham asked if the wall height at the rear of the building would be constructed at the same height and with the same coursed brick.

Mr. Schwab stated that was correct.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to approve the Minor Amendment for Gordon Food Service subject to the following condition:

1. The wall extension shall be constructed of the same building material, design color and height consistent with the main building.

Mr. Shroyer seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0-1 with Mr. Foland abstaining.

Mr. Shroyer requested that some deciduous trees be planted at the rear of the building where the parking spaces were to be eliminated as a result of the approved amendment to the plan.

NEW BUSINESS

Waterbury Woods, Section 5 - Record Plan

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Record Plan for Waterbury Woods, Section 5, located south of Social Row Road and east of Yankee Street in Washington Township. the zoning on the 13, 541 acre parcel is WT R-4 on which 18 single-family lots are proposed.

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

1. The roadway easement for the abandoned section of Social Row Road is in the process of being vacated. If the "old" Social Row Road roadway easement is not vacated, this plat shall be revised to show the roadway easement.
2. Lot 74 shown on the record plat shall be renamed as Reserve A. The language of plat covenant number 19 shall also be changed to state that Reserve A shall be maintained by the Waterbury Woods Homeowners Association.
3. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating stormwater retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer.

4. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to recording of the plat, a performance bond in an amount of \$183,810 of which \$21,730 is sidewalks shall be posted by the developer with the City of Centerville and a subdivider's agreement entered into with the City.
5. An inspection fee of \$3,492.39 shall be paid to the City of Centerville.

Mr. Greg Vreeland, developer, was present for the review of the project.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Record Plan for Waterbury Woods, Section 5, subject to the following conditions:

1. The roadway easement for the abandoned section of Social Row Road is in the process of being vacated. If the "old" Social Row Road roadway easement is not vacated, this plat shall be revised to show the roadway easement.
2. Lot 74 shown on the record plat shall be renamed as Reserve A. The language of plat covenant number 19 shall also be changed to state that Reserve A shall be maintained by the Waterbury Woods Homeowners Association.
3. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating stormwater retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer.
4. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to recording of the plat, a performance bond in an amount of \$183,810 of which \$21,730 is sidewalks shall be posted by the developer with the City of Centerville and a subdivider's agreement entered into with the City.
5. An inspection fee of \$3,492.39 shall be paid to the City of Centerville.

Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

Tower Heights Middle School - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Special Approval application submitted by the Centerville Board of Education requesting approval of a building addition to Tower Heights Middle School on North Johanna Drive. The zoning on the property is R-1d, single-family

residential which does allow a school as a permitted use. The proposed building addition would provide a new gymnasium, classrooms and restrooms on the east end of the existing school building.

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

1. The areas proposed to be screened along the north and south property lines shall be modified to provide for two (2) staggered rows of pyramidal arborvitae and a low earth mound, approximately 2.5 ft. in height, subject to approval by the City Engineer.
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. A final lighting plan showing all exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.

Mr. Larry Richter, Edge and Tinney Architects, was present for the review of the application. Mr. Richter stated that their only concern is that of providing a low earth mound. He stated that in talking to the landscape architect for the project, his feeling is that arborvitae may not do well on a mound area as water will drain away from the root system of the trees.

Mr. Hansford stated that he felt the plant material should be changed for something that would be suitable on the mound area. He stated that screening is going to be very important to this project and stated further that he was not happy with the design of the proposed building as it did not fit in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Durham asked what the philosophy of the proposed design in relation to the design of the existing building.

Mr. Richter stated that the brick banding and the height of the new main entrance and classrooms is similar to that of the existing building. The roof proposed is different since the mansard roof design used on the existing building made the new addition look too heavy.

Mr. Durham felt that the height of the proposed building has a negative impact on the adjoining residential neighborhood as well as the windows in the proposed classrooms that will face those same residential properties. Since the existing building does not have windows in the classrooms, it seems that this would be an imposition on the neighborhood.

Mr. Foland stated that he felt that a design should be submitted in a Work Session that would better fit in with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Durham asked why the proposed parking area was located at the south side of the property against the residential properties and not the east end of the property.

Mr. Richter stated that the open area on the east end will be used for play area in conjunction with the new gymnasium.

Mr. Durham stated that there are no doors from the gymnasium to access that play area.

Mr. Shroyer felt that a redesign of the building could easily be done to provide a building that would better fit in the neighborhood. He stated that the parking should be moved to provide better ingress and egress to and from the site.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Richter if a redesign of the building could be done for review at a Work Session.

Mr. Richter agreed that a redesign could be done.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to table the Special Approval application submitted for Tower Heights Middle School for a redesign to be reviewed in a Work Session. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

A Work Session was scheduled for April 9, 1996, to begin at 6:30 P.M., prior to the regularly scheduled meeting.

The members of the Planning Commission felt that the new design should propose the same brick material without the banding, usage of the same copper finish mansard roof, the new entrance should match the existing entrance in height since it is a secondary entrance to the new building, windows should be consistent with the existing windows, etc. The design of the proposed building should be as compatible with the existing building as possible.

March 26, 1996

PC

Page 6

Mr. McMahon stated that he felt that the satellite dish ordinance should be revised.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff would review the new standards and make a proposal to the Planning Commission.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.


Chairman 4/4/96