

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, September 12, 1995

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

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

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to excuse Mr. McMahon from the meeting as he gave prior notice to the Planning Department. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Approval of minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of the August 29, 1995, Regular Meeting, as written. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mr. Kostak abstaining.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Planning Commission Work Session minutes of September 6, 1995, as written. Mr. Hansford seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0-2 with Mr. Kostak and Mr. Swartz abstaining.

COMMUNICATIONS

Zebra Design - Minor Amendment

Mr. Schwab stated that Zebra Design had a Special Approval application previously approved by the Planning Commission which they are now seeking a minor amendment to the architectural design of the building. The location of this project is 6520 Centerville Business Parkway. The change in architectural would include a standing seam metal roof in the center section of the building with glass on the front and back, brick walls with floor-to-ceiling windows, and a flat roof on the sections of the building other than the center section. There are round concrete pillars on the front of the building at the entrance.

Mr. Bob Reed, Design Architect for project, was present for the review of the request.

Mr. Stone asked why a change in the design is being proposed.

Mr. Reed stated that their client was looking for a particular design for the inside of the building which was not being created by the other design. The client wanted a design with more of an open warehouse and non-traditional look. He stated that the basic footprint of the building is the same as previously approved.

Mr. Stone stated that he was trying to understand the major difference between the approved design and the proposed design. He stated that he felt the approved design was more acceptable in its appearance to the surrounding architecture that currently exists. He asked why the approved architecture could not accomplish the warehouse look on the inside of the building.

Mr. Reed stated that the approved design had flat ceilings or slightly cathedral ceilings which is not what the client wanted. The aspect of an open feel with an exposed structure on the inside is what they wanted and the wood frame building that was approved did not satisfy their desire of the interior.

Mr. Durham arrived at this time.

Mr. Hansford stated that there are several different types of architectural designs in the area and this proposed change in design would blend with those existing designs.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to approve the change in building design for Zebra Design as presented. Mr. Kostak seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-2 with Mr. Stone and Mr. Foland voting no.

Parkway Professional Center - Minor Amendment

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

Mr. Schwab explained that this plan, originally approved by the Planning Commission, has been submitted for a minor amendment. The request change would include dividing the single building into two (2) buildings creating a slight rearrangement of the parking along the fronts of the buildings and a second curb cut to the site.

Staff recommended to approve this modification for Phase 1.

Mr. Ken Seidl, architect for the project, and Mr. Dennis Burns, general contractor for the project, were present for the review of the request.

Mr. Seidl stated that the developers have purchased additional property to the north of the original site to allow expansion of the project. This amendment would allow better utilization of the entire site based on the additional acreage.

Mr. Durham asked if more trees would be saved as a result of this proposed site plan.

Mr. Burns indicated that the buildings will now maintain a 50 ft. setback and, therefore, more trees will be saved on the site.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the minor amendment for Phase 1 of Parkway Professional Center, located on the northwest corner of Clyo Road and Centerville Business Parkway. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Kostak returned to the meeting at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Irongate Apartments - Variance of Side Yard Setback Requirement

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Variance application submitted for Irongate Apartments, 128-144 Maple Avenue for a side yard building setback. The applicant is requesting a side yard setback ranging from zero ft. to 2.5 ft. rather than the required 5 ft. setback. This project has received approval from the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) for the architectural aspects of the project, however, the Planning Commission must review the proposed setback issues. The proposed building would provide garage/storage spaces for the existing apartments. The building is proposed to develop in 3 phases. The first phase would meet the 5 ft. setback requirement; the second, or middle section of the building, would require a 2.5 ft. setback; and the third and easternmost section, would require a zero ft. setback from the side property line.

Mr. Schwab stated that the plan submitted for the architectural review by the BAR had been modified in the size of the building, thus requiring a variance.

Mr. Schwab stated that in reviewing the standards contained within the City Zoning Ordinance required to be met before a variance is granted, staff found that the only standard that was met was that a use variance was not involved. The adjacent property owner to the south of a portion of this property has built a similar building in compliance with the required 5 ft. building setback. The requested variance seeks to maximize the use of the apartment property.

It was, therefore, the staff recommendation to deny the variance requested. If this variance is granted, the Planning Department recommended that the minimum variance be 1.5 ft. so that the roof overhang approved by the BAR not overhang the adjacent property.

Mr. Stone opened the public hearing.

Mr. Irv Harlamert, applicant, and Mr. Brad Lennon, architect for the project, were present for the review of the request as well as Mr. and Mrs. Stevens, building managers.

Mr. Lennon stated that the design of this building would provide just 3 entry doors for the 60+ storage units to make it more aesthetically pleasing to the surrounding neighbors. He stated that the BAR seemed pleased that the owner went to this additional expense to dramatically reduce the number of entry doors to the building. Their review was done prior to the completion of the survey which revealed that the lot line is somewhat tapered. Mr. Lennon stated that the proposed variance would allow this building to be constructed with each section in a tapered-back fashion and would give more area to landscaping. He stated that justification for this variance has been the appearance as what it is going to look like to neighbors and passersby in the area.

Mr. Harlamert stated that it is his intent to provide the storage space for his tenants, however, he would like it to be as attractive as possible by placing landscaping on the site and not pushing it up on the parking area as would be required if the setbacks were satisfied. He stated that the placement of the building, as proposed, could be better maintained because the area created without the variance would be a maintenance problem. He stated that the adjoining property owner to the south had no objection to the variance request.

Mrs. Stevens stated that their residents continually ask for storage space and felt that a hardship for the residents was being created should this building not be provided.

Mr. Stevens stated that 2 of the garage spaces would be occupied by his equipment used for maintenance of the apartment complex.

Mr. Lennon stated that the overhang on the south side of the building would be deleted should the variance be approved to eliminate an overhang of the building onto another property.

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

Mr. Stone stated that the problem he saw with the project is that the proposed building is being shoved onto a space that is too small. He stated that he felt that a smaller building could be constructed on the site that would provide the space for the residents, however, it would maintain the setback standards. Mr. Stone stated that the situation now is that the buildings would be 10 ft. apart, however, if the building on the adjoining property were removed and reconstructed at the current zoning standards, those 2 building would be 5 ft. apart. Mr. Stone stated that the Planning Commission must look at these situations and how they could affect the future as well as the present.

Mr. Durham stated that he appreciated the work that was put into the architecture of the proposal, however, he felt that the building should be a narrower width along Maple Avenue to maintain the building setbacks.

Mr. Harlamert stated that should the variance not be approved, he would have to determine whether the project should be done at all.

Mr. Swartz suggested that the building be located 5 ft. to the north by relocating the existing parking area. He stated that it would be more expensive to do so, however, this arrangement would allow the setbacks to be maintained.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff would be more than willing to look at that situation and determine whether it would be feasible.

Mr. Harlamert stated that the reason for the original placement of the building was because the setback will create wasted land.

Mr. Hansford stated that if that were the case, then all the space between building in the APD would be wasted space because those building have tight setbacks also. He stated that he felt that in an APD, those tight lot lines add a certain character to the district and to the center of town--whether it is back on Maple Avenue between 2 sets of garages is a moot point--it still sets a character.

Mr. Swartz stated that if the land were not available, it would be a different situation. He stated that the setback would also be needed to maintain the building without trespassing on adjoining property.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to table the application for Irongate Apartments until staff could investigate the option suggested by Mr. Swartz.

The motion was not seconded.

MOTION: Mr. Hansford moved to deny the Variance application submitted for Irongate Apartments. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1 with Mr. Kostak voting no.

Mr. Stone explained to the applicant his right to appeal the decision of the Planning Commission to Council.

The public hearing for All-Seal was delayed as the last order of business in order to review the Variance application and the Special Approval application in tandem.

NEW BUSINESS

Yankee Trace, Sec. 5 - Record Plan

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Record Plan for Yankee Trace, Sec. 5, located north of Social Row Road and east of Yankee Street. Fifteen (15) lots are proposed for this 7.7020 acre parcel zoned R-1c, Single-Family Residential. Mr. Schwab stated that this plan is the next section of the concept reviewed previously by the Planning Commission.

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

1. The City shall receive from the developer and approve detailed plan for the skin improvements (mounding, white horse park fencing, entranceways, limestone walls, landscaping, etc.) along the east side of Yankee Street adjacent to this plat.
2. Detailed design of the stormwater drainage system for this plat including grading shall be approved by the City Engineer.
3. 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. The private streets within this plat shall be required to be part of the performance bond and subdivider's agreement because of the individual platted lots incorporated within the plat.

Mr. Jim Obert, Great Traditions, was present for the review of the project.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to recommend approval of the Record Plan for Yankee Trace, Sec. 5, subject to the following conditions:

1. The City shall receive from the developer and approve detailed plan for the skin improvements (mounding, white horse park fencing, entranceways, limestone walls, landscaping, etc.) along the east side of Yankee Street adjacent to this plat.
2. Detailed design of the stormwater drainage system for this plat including grading shall be approved by the City Engineer.
3. 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. The private streets within this plat shall be required to be part of the performance bond and subdivider's agreement because of the individual platted lots incorporated within the plat.

Mr. Durham seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

All-Seal Home Improvement - Front Yard Setback Variance/Special Approval

Mr. Kostak removed himself from the meeting as this time due to a conflict of interest.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to remove the Special Approval application from the table. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Variance application submitted for All-Seal to be located at 252 West Franklin Street. The zoning on the property is Office-Service, O-S. The applicant is requesting a front yard building setback to West Franklin Street from the required 50 ft. to 20 ft.

Staff felt that this lot is unusually shallow in depth in the north-south dimension considering the required 50 ft. building setback from West Franklin Street and the 50 ft. side yard building setback required to the south property line. The slope of the land to the south on this lot and the nearness of the existing house on this lot (proposed to be demolished) and the location of the existing houses both east and west of this lot much closer to West Franklin Street than the required building setback make reasonable development of this property difficult without the requested variance.

It was, therefore, recommended by staff to approve the Variance as requested.

Mr. Stone opened the public hearing.

Mr. William Stacey, All-Seal, and Mr. Ken Seidl, architect, were present for the review of the applications.

Mr. Stone asked if any of the surrounding owners had contacted the Planning Department concerning the proposed variance.

Mr. Schwab stated that no persons had contacted the Planning Department concerning this matter.

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

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to approve the Variance application submitted for All-Seal as requested. Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Seidl stated that the architecture of the building will have a green color dryvit band and then a white dryvit band around the limestone foundation of the building. A green standing-seam metal roof will be used as previously proposed, however, the storefront will be blue-green.

Mr. Durham stated that the windows on the rear of the building are different than originally proposed.

Mr. Seidl stated that the windows on the rear of the building are a storefront system that is a paned window.

Mr. Durham stated that he felt that the new proposal was more acceptable as that elevation will face those residential properties to the south and this window treatment has more of a residential character.

Mr. Stone stated that the metal roof should have more narrow seams as suggested by Mr. Hansford previously.

Mr. Seidl stated that was the intent and the design could be submitted to staff for approval.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted for All-Seal Home Improvement subject to the following conditions:

1. A concrete sidewalk 4 feet wide shall be constructed on the west side of Gershwin Drive across the entire frontage of this project on Gershwin Drive. The City Engineer must approve the design of this required sidewalk.
2. The final grading plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.
3. A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City Planning Department. The location and preservation of significant trees on the site shall be made a part of the landscaping plan. This plan shall preserve existing trees to the extent practical adjacent to the single-family residential house south of the site and add evergreen landscaping to meet the screening requirements of the City Zoning Ordinance. Low mounding and/or low landscaping about 2.5 feet high shall be required where a parking lot is adjacent to a public roadway.
4. 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.
5. Detailed plans for the dumpster including location, design, materials and screening must be approved by the City Planning Department.
6. Detailed plans for the exterior of the buildings, including colors and materials, must be approved by the City Planning Department. The Planning Commission approved the use of the exterior finish insulation system (dryvit) on exterior building walls.
7. Exterior lighting shall be approved by the City Planning Department.
8. No sign shown on the plans shall be approved as part of this application.

9. The construction and design of the standing-seam metal roof shall be approved by the Planning Department.

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

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

Sat A. Star
Chairman 10/31/45