

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
Tuesday, January 31, 1995

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

Attendance: Mr. Scot Stone, Chairman; Mr. James Durham; Mr. Jack Kostak; Mr. Peter McMahon; Mr. Stanley Swartz. Absent: Mr. Robert Hosfeld; Mr. Arthur Foland. Also present: Mr. Alan Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Steve Feverston, Assistant City Planner; Mr. Greg Horn, City Manager (where noted).

Motion to excuse:

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to excuse Mr. Hosfeld and Mr. Foland as each gave prior notice of their absence to the Planning Department. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Approval of minutes:

MOTION: Mr. McMahon moved to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes of January 10, 1995, as written. Mr. Durham seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mr. Swartz abstaining.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Schwab stated that a letter had been received from the Duncan Oil Company representing the Union 76 station located on the northeast corner of Spring Valley Road and South Main Street. The existing freestanding sign is legally-nonconforming in size, height and the fact that it rotates. He stated that the modifications to this site are brought about by a revision necessary to the underground storage system, via the new environmental regulations. At the same time these modifications are being done, the owner desires to do a facelift to the site in terms of canopy and signage changes to the station to try to update its image. The owners want to update the signage on the corner, however, due to the traffic box at that location and the right-of-way existing back to the asphalt edge where the current sign is located, it is not possible or practical to use that same location because it is in the public right-of-way and if it is installed to be a conforming ground sign it would be partially blocked by the signal control box.

The proposal is to remove the price signs and lights at the driveways. The owner feels that the lights installed as a part of the South Main Street project gives enough light to those driveway areas. The price signs will come down and would need a variance to allow a ground sign with a couple of feet additional in height that would project over the existing foundation out over the right-of-way toward the corner. The City Engineer has indicated that he does not have a problem with a sign that would project out over the right-of-way based on additional right-of-way being purchased by the City in that area prior to the improvement of South Main Street. There are major telephone lines that cross this area that

would make a new foundation somewhat controversial if they were if it were extensively put in this area, if not impossible. The canopies proposed would be of identical styles with a vertical facade rather than the mansard facade which is currently on the Spring Valley Road canopy. The applicant is only bringing these items before the Planning Commission at this time because the environmental issues must be completed before the end of March, 1995. The freestanding sign will be approximately 8 ft. in height rather than the 6 ft. with a single post over the right-of-way with some pricing information and eliminate the individual pricing signs at the two driveways. The 32 sq. ft. sign area per side would be met as according to zoning regulations.

The only issue before the Planning Commission at this time is permissions to move ahead with the canopy change with the vertical facade on both canopies.

Mr. John Knapke, Duncan Oil Company, stated that they are excited about the modifications and the beautification of the site which will take place.

Mr. Durham stated that he would like to see the proposed sign layout on a site plan. He stated that he did not object to the vertical facade on the canopies.

The other members of the Planning Commission concurred and gave Duncan Oil Company permissions to move forward with the canopy improvements.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS

##### Ben Franklin Crafts - Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request by Ben Franklin Crafts for a sign variance for their facility located at 101 East Alex-Bell Road in Cross Pointe Centre. The permitted wall sign area is based on 1.5 sq. ft. per linear foot of frontage which calculates to 95 sq. ft. of signage. Currently in place is 88 sq. ft. of wall signage and the request is to allow 257 sq. ft. of wall signage. Ben Franklin Crafts is the first tenant to occupy this particular store space since the shopping center was built. Mr. Schwab stated that signage is also in place on the back wall facing I-675 by virtue of a previously granted variance. Signage is also in place on the freestanding on the northeast corner of North Main Street (SR 48) and Alex-Bell Road (SR 725). Signage is also on the freestanding sign at the signalized entrance to the shopping center on Alex-Bell Road.

In reviewing the standards for granting a variance in the Zoning Ordinance, staff could find no justification for the variance with the information that was submitted by the applicant. It was, therefore, the recommendation of staff to deny the application.

Mr. Stone opened the public hearing.

Mr. Raymond Gordnier, 117 Cushwa Drive, stated that his home is directly across the street from the entrance to the shopping center. He stated that the existing sign, in his opinion, is large enough as he can see it from his house. Secondly, these signs provide a lot of residue light in the evening which shines onto the front of his home. He stated that while he does not object to the existing sign and understands the need for it, the proposed sign would be much too large from the need at this time.

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

Mr. Stone stated that he agreed with Mr. Gordnier that there seems to be no need for this sign as well as it does not meet the criteria for granting a variance.

Mr. Swartz and Mr. Kostak asked if any additional information was submitted with the application such as the design of the proposed sign should the variance be granted.

Mr. Schwab stated that no drawings were submitted with the application.

MOTION: Mr. McMahon moved to deny the Variance application submitted by Ben Franklin Crafts, 101 East Alex-Bell Road, as requested. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

#### NEW BUSINESS

##### Nestle Creek III - Record Plan

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Record Plan for Nestle Creek III located east of Bigger Road and north of Alex-Bell Road (SR 725). This single-family residential development proposed 21 lots on 12.038 acres of land, one lot of which is an existing single-family historic home. There would be a fee-in-lieu of parkland dedication as well as money required to be placed in escrow for the widening improvements to Alex-Bell Road. This plan does conform to the approved residential cluster plan approved by the Planning Commission.

The staff recommendation was to approve the Record Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. A condition be placed on the record plan stating that Lot Number 21 cannot be subdivided unless specifically approved by the City of Centerville.

2. The developer shall place money in escrow with the City in an amount equivalent to the value of constructing an additional lane of pavement, sidewalks, curb and storm sewers along Alex-Bell Road, less any temporary improvements required by the City. The design of these temporary improvements, including stormwater drainage improvements and a temporary sidewalk, shall be subject to the approval by the City Engineer. The escrow money shall be used for the future widening of Alex-Bell Road.
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. Prior to recording the record plan, the developer shall pay a fee-in-lieu of dedicating parkland in accordance with the provisions of City Ordinance 15-86, The City Parkland Dedication Ordinance.
5. A 15 ft. triangle of right-of-way be shown on the record plan located on the northeast corner of Alex-Bell Road and Bigger Road.

Mr. Tom McDougall, representing the developer, stated that this record plan does comply with the approved residential cluster plan and also incorporates input from the City staff during the preparation of the plans. He stated further that there is no objection to any of the conditions recommended by staff.

Mr. Durham asked about the mound located in the center of the cul-de-sac as discussed by the Planning Commission previously.

Mr. McDougall stated that the plans submitted were in error and that area would be amended prior to recording the plan with the County to show that area as a reserve area to be maintained by the Homeowners Association.

Mr. Durham asked if the bend in the roadway design was considered as discussed at the previous meeting.

Mr. McDougall stated that a design change was considered, however, with the existing residence and how it relates to the street, there were basically no alternatives to the street layout which provided advantages to the plan.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to recommend approval of the Record Plan for Nestle Creek III to Council subject to the following conditions:

1. A condition be placed on the record plan stating that Lot Number 21 cannot be subdivided unless specifically approved by the City of Centerville.
2. The developer shall place money in escrow with the City in an amount equivalent to the value of constructing an additional lane of pavement, sidewalks, curb and storm sewers along Alex-Bell Road, less any temporary improvements required by the City. The design of these temporary improvements, including stormwater drainage improvements and a temporary sidewalk, shall be subject to the approval by the City Engineer. The escrow money shall be used for the future widening of Alex-Bell Road.
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. Prior to recording the record plan, the developer shall pay a fee-in-lieu of dedicating parkland in accordance with the provisions of City Ordinance 15-86, The City Parkland Dedication Ordinance.
5. A 15 ft. triangle of right-of-way be shown on the record plan located on the northeast corner of Alex-Bell Road and Bigger Road.
6. The landscaped island in the bulb of the cul-de-sac shall be indicated on the Record Plan as a reserve area for maintenance to be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association.

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

Yankee Trace, Sec. 3 - Record Plan

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Record Plan submitted for Yankee Trace, Sec. 3, located on the west side of Yankee Street south of Silvercreek Drive. The developer has proposed 49 single-family lots on the 20.5744 acre tract of land zoned R-1c, Single-Family Residential.

Staff recommended to approve the Record Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The City receive from the developer and approve a detailed plan for the skin improvements (mounding, white horse park fencing, entranceways, limestone walls, landscaping, etc.) along the west side of Yankee Street adjacent to this plat.
2. If required by the City Engineer, the developer shall submit plans approved by the City Engineer and construct a temporary left turn lane and/or walkway(s) along Yankee Street at the entrance road to this plat.
3. The design of the intersection of Heritage Lake Drive and Yankee Street must be approved by the City Engineer.
4. The design of the cul-de-sac at the end of Gatekeeper Way be changed to incorporate a pavement width of 95 feet back-of-curb to back-of-curb with a roadway having a cross-section width of 21 feet back-of-curb to back-to-curb. The center island of this cul-de-sac must be shown as a reserve area on the record plan.
5. The 8 feet wide hiker-biker trail shown on the Park (Reserve "O") shall be extended across the entire frontage of the property.
6. Lot numbers 48, 49, 53 and 54 shall be reduced in an amount of land approved by the City Engineer to accommodate the hiker-biker trail within City owned land and to provide access to the irrigation lake to the south for maintenance. The developer must deed this land to the City. The City in return will apply as a credit the amount of land deeded to the City to the next real estate purchase by the developer from the City.
7. Detailed plans for the hiker-biker trail must be submitted to and approved by the City Engineer.
8. The building setback shown on the record plan for lots 56 through 62 shall be changed to show a 25 foot building setback from the eyebrow access easements.
9. The City Engineer may require a slope easement to lots 53, 54 and 55 for the future improvement of Yankee Street.
10. Protective covenants that pertain to the ownership and maintenance of the reserve areas shall e listed or referenced on the record plat subject to approval by the City Attorney.
11. The City Attorney must approve the easement designation and maintenance language for the common access easements shown on lots 56 through 62.

12. Detailed design of stormwater drainage system for this plat including grading shall be approved by the City Engineer.
13. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to the 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 and a subdivider's agreement entered into with the City by the developer.

Mr. Durham asked that since the eyebrow areas will appear to be part of the public street, why they were not being dedicated as part of the public street.

Mr. Sean Boyd, Project Manager for Yankee Trace Development, stated that the intent is to create two model parks for the builders. Those private drives give additional off-street parking and also allows you to break up the aesthetics of that area. There is no intent to curb those driveways, but to build those as purely private driveways. It will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association to maintain those drives and not the individual owners.

Mr. Durham asked if rolled curbs were used throughout the development.

Mr. Schwab stated that rolled curbs were used with the exception of a raised curb along Watersedge Drive in Section 1 where there was a concern of safety in the area of the lake.

Mr. Durham asked how the developers would feel about dedicating those driveway areas.

Mr. Boyd stated it would depend on the widths of the driveways and would just be a matter of adding expense for curbing.

Mr. Schwab stated that 16 ft. of pavement was being used with an 18 ft. easement. Those areas can be done public or private--it's just a question of maintenance. He stated that if the City would be responsible for maintenance, we would want a rolled curb as a guideline for snow removal, etc.

Mr. Durham stated he felt there will be on-street parking in this area and it would be advantageous due to the narrow widths of the streets. This would alleviate those problems in the long run. Mr. Durham suggested that ribbon curbs be used on the private streets to give them a more finished look.

Mr. Boyd stated that the maintenance of the hiker-biker trails will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association. The only problem that the developers may have in the future is regarding the trail on Lot #48 which when incorporated with the building setback, will make that lot unbuildable without a variance to allow the hiker-biker trail to be constructed in an easement.

Mr. Durham asked how much of an easement would be needed for the hiker-biker trail.

Mr. Boyd stated they would need 10 ft. He stated that they would not be willing to lose a lot to accomplish a trail around the entire lake.

Mr. Durham stated that the lot should be made more shallow and as the developer or builder is working with the lot, if a variance is needed for the house to accommodate the trail, then they should come back to the City and request a variance.

Mr. Schwab suggested that with the information available at this time, we try to accommodate the hiker-biker trail with whatever setback configuration makes sense, easements, etc., and finalize that prior to action being taken by the City Council. This would avoid having to review this situation at a later time.

Mr. Boyd stated that the plans for the skin improvements would be submitted to the City by the end of the week.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to recommend approval of the Record Plan for Yankee Trace, Sec. 3, to Council subject to the following conditions:

1. The City receive from the developer and approve a detailed plan for the skin improvements (mounding, white horse park fencing, entranceways, limestone walls, landscaping, etc.) along the west side of Yankee Street adjacent to this plat.
2. If required by the City Engineer, the developer shall submit plans approved by the City Engineer and construct a temporary left turn lane and/or walkway(s) along Yankee Street at the entrance road to this plat.
3. The design of the intersection of Heritage Lake Drive and Yankee Street must be approved by the City Engineer.
4. The design of the cul-de-sac at the end of Gatekeeper Way be changed to incorporate a pavement width of 95 feet back-of-curb to back-of-curb with a roadway having a cross-section width of 21 feet back-of-curb to back-to-curb. The center island of this cul-de-sac must be shown as a reserve area on the record plan.
5. The 8 feet wide hiker-biker trail shown on the Park (Reserve "O") shall be extended across the entire frontage of the property. The Homeowners Association shall maintain all hiker-biker trails.



6. Lot numbers 48, 49, 53 and 54 shall be reduced in an amount of land approved by the City Engineer to accommodate the hiker-biker trail within City owned land and to provide access to the irrigation lake to the south for maintenance. The developer must deed this land to the City. The City in return will apply as a credit the amount of land deeded to the City to the next real estate purchase by the developer from the City.
7. Detailed plans for the hiker-biker trail must be submitted to and approved by the City Engineer.
8. The building setback shown on the record plan for lots 56 through 62 shall be changed to show a 25 foot building setback from the eyebrow access easements.
9. The City Engineer may require a slope easement to lots 53, 54 and 55 for the future improvement of Yankee Street.
10. Protective covenants that pertain to the ownership and maintenance of the reserve areas shall e listed or referenced on the record plat subject to approval by the City Attorney.
11. The City Attorney must approve the easement designation and maintenance language for the common access easements shown on lots 56 through 62.
12. Detailed design of stormwater drainage system for this plat including grading shall be approved by the City Engineer.
13. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to the 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 and a subdivider's agreement entered into with the City by the developer.

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

#### Proposed Changes to Parking Requirements

Mr. Schwab stated that some months ago, the Planning Commission asked staff to review the parking standards in the Zoning Ordinance, for shopping centers and whether or not there would be any justification for reducing those requirements because of the tremendous amount of land that they consume, their appearance and the environmental aspects. Mr. Schwab stated that review has been made. The current standard is 5.5 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area (GFA) based on the 1965 Urban Lane Institute (ULI) recommendation which was part of a thorough study done at that time.

The Zoning Ordinance was revised in 1986 and that requirement was incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance. The ULI updated their study in 1982 and found that 4 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. was an adequate parking requirement for less than 400,000 sq. ft. shopping centers. For the 400,000 sq. ft. to 600,000 sq. ft. range, they recommended a linear proportion of 4 to 5 spaces at either extreme. In shopping centers over 600,000 sq. ft., they found 5 spaces of 1,000 sq. ft., as a recommended minimum parking requirement.

Mr. Schwab stated that he felt comfortable with recommending the standards suggested in the 1982 ULI study which is a dramatic reduction compared to our current standard. Cross Pointe Centre, for example, would generate 4 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. rather than the 5.5 spaces as required as the time of development.

Mr. Durham asked if the parking requirement were reduced, if that would produce more buildable area for Cross Pointe.

Mr. Schwab stated that would be a possibility without any additional restrictions put in the ordinance.

Mr. Schwab stated that there has been interest in property in the City to be developed as a movie theater; however, interest is limited in one fashion and that is our parking requirements which are one (1) space per 2.5 seats in a theater. That is the requirement used for Showcase Cinemas. The potential developers feel the City's parking requirement is too restrictive, from their experience, which would result in an uneconomical situation for constructing their facility. It is far in excess of what they would like for parking at any mini-cinema with staggered starting times in today's market. He stated that in looking at many cinema sites in the area and observing those sites, he would agree that 1 space per 4 seats is a reasonable requirement. In conclusion, it is staff's opinion that there is a tremendous oversupply of parking spaces for Showcase Cinemas.

Mr. Durham asked if a cap should be placed on the number of parking spaces required.

Mr. Schwab stated that caps are an option, however, communities normally set minimum standards and not maximum standards.

The members of Planning Commission felt that increased landscaping in the parking area should be incorporated into the standards as a trade-off.

Mr. Durham stated that the more green space required, the more green space is preserved as well as trees.

Mr. Horn stated that he wants the City to adopt a tree preservation ordinance and to re-examine our screening situation as far as front yards, distancing of parking lots, mounding to hide bumpers, etc., and this would be a good time to do these things in concert with each other.

Mr. Swartz stated that preserving trees is very difficult and requiring green space allows what the City wants to accomplish at an easier level.

Mr. Durham stated that if green spaces areas are increased, then the placement of parking on a site is given more thought to preserve those areas in question.

The members of Planning Commission stated that they would like to see some information reviewed that would consider a cap on the parking requirement.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

*Paul Stant*  
Chairman 2/14/95

