

Centerville Planning Commission
Work Session
Tuesday, April 9, 1996

Mr. Stone called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.

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

Tower Heights Middle School - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the options that Planning Commission could take regarding the Special Approval application for Tower Heights Middle School which was tabled at the previous regular meeting. He stated that the thirty (30) day review time period would expire April 12th without a time extension. He reviewed the possible actions the Planning Commission could take:

1. Approve.
2. Approve with Conditions.
3. Deny.
4. Refer application to City Council.

Mr. Alan Schafer, Attorney for the School District, read a prepared statement regarding the Planning Commission review process as it applies to Tower Heights Middle School. He addressed the specific issues raised at the last Planning Commission Meeting.

1. Entry treatment - Mr. Schafer stated the building entry treatment as proposed is the best possible treatment for school purposes.
2. Gym height - Mr. Schafer stated that lowering the gymnasium would be cost prohibitive as bedrock is too close to the surface.
3. Copper mansard roof - Mr. Schafer stated that to extend the copper mansard roof treatment into the addition would be cost prohibitive.
4. Brick banding - He stated that the use of banding on the building walls as shown will break up the monolithic massing of building.
5. Parking lot location - Mr. Schafer stated that relocating the parking lot to the east is not a good option because this is the area to be used as a play area. He further stated that the area proposed would be the least obtrusive.

Mr. Schafer concluded by stating that the five (5) issues were not significant and would not adversely impact the neighborhood.

Mr. Stone stated that at the last Planning Commission Meeting, the Architect, Mr. Larry Richter stated that the Centerville City Schools would be willing to go to a Work Session with the Planning Commission. The purpose of the Work Session is to consider alternative plans to be submitted by Centerville City Schools that address the concerns of the Planning Commission raised at the last meeting. He asked Mr. Schafer if there were any alternative concepts at this time.

Mr. Thomas Dugan, Centerville City Schools, stated that the project design is complete with construction drawings. He stated the project was placed out for bid and the bid opening is to be held tomorrow. He apologized to the Planning Commission for not submitting their application sooner in their review process.

Mr. Hanford asked if any test soil bores had been taken.

Mr. Larry Richter, Architect for the project, Stated that they have taken 7 test bores showing a shallow depth to bedrock ranging from 4 to 7 feet.

Mr. Hansford asked if the parapet wall could be reduced to help lower the overall height of the building.

Mr. Richter stated that was possible and suggested relocating the air handling unit to a location on the roof where, if the parapet wall were lowered, it would not be visible.

Mr. Dugan stated that this would be a possibility but would need to check the cost of moving the air handling units.

Mr. Stone suggested the application be referred to Council for their consideration.

Mr. Hansford, upon reviewing the grading plan in the construction drawings questioned whether the land east of the building was unsuitable as a playground area.

Mr. McMahon stated that the parking lot is mislocated and should this application be forwarded to the City Council, it should be by appeal where a public hearing is required. He stated that if the parking lot is to be located close to the residents to the south, those residents should have input and be made aware of the proposal.

The Planning Commission adjourned the Work Session at 7:30 pm to Conduct their Regular Meeting. The Planning Commission reconvened the Work Session immediately after the Regular Meeting.

Satellite Dish Antenna Ordinance

Mr. Schwab suggested that the Satellite Dish Antenna Ordinance not be made a separate ordinance and it should be included in the Zoning Ordinance as a part of the antenna section. Mr. Schwab stated that the Federal Communications Commission directive does not allow satellite dishes to be subjected to more regulation than other types of antennas. The members of the Planning Commission agreed with making the regulation of Satellite Dish Antennas a part of the zoning ordinance regulations.

Tree Protection Ordinance

Mr. Schwab presented a draft tree preservation ordinance. He stated that in the proposed ordinance, a tree survey must be completed to establish a baseline as to what trees are existing on a property. The proposed ordinance requires a licensed surveyor, engineer or landscape architect to certify that the tree survey is accurate. The proposed ordinance would regulate the way in which a tree could be removed, replaced, etc. This proposal is modeled after the Charleston, SC, ordinance which tries to keep a certain number of significant trees on a site. The process of reviewing requests of property owners wanting to remove trees is an involved administrative process. There is also a provision where the developer has to provide detailed plans on how trees will be protected during construction and that an occupancy permit cannot be obtained if these standards are not met. If the opening of a project takes place during a non-planting season, a performance bond must be posted to assure completion of the landscape work. The ordinance will provide substantial penalties if the standards are not met.

Mr. Durham suggested that no blanket exemptions based on lot size be included in the ordinance and any exemption occur only by variance. The other members of Planning Commission agreed with this standard. He stated that any lot less than one (1) acre should be exempt except that acreage which is a part of a major use zoning approval must meet the standards in the ordinance.

Mr. Stone stated that a provision needs to be included in the ordinance giving the City the right to plant trees if the developer does not complete his job and assess the cost of the work.

Mr. Schwab stated that some standards contained in the draft ordinance might make some projects very expensive.

Mr. Feverston presented a draft change to the zoning ordinance creating additional bufferyard requirements. He stated the proposed bufferyards work within the existing building and parking and paving setbacks now required for the various zoning

April 9, 1996

PC

Page 4

districts. The proposal provides increased buffering or landscaping utilizing a combination of plantings, mounding, fences and/or walls depending upon the use and the yard where the buffer is to be located.

Mr. Durham stated that the draft bufferyard requirements is consistent with current with literature and the discussions of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Durham asked staff to prepare a cost estimate to compare what is required now in terms of landscaping, screening, etc., not by ordinance but by conditions places on the approval, and what will be required as a result of the new standards in the proposed ordinance for the buffer areas.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

Robert Durham
5/14/96