

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MEETING
Tuesday, January 29, 1991

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

Attendance: Mr. Arthur Foland, Acting Chairman; Mr. Scot Stone; Mr. Peter McMahon; Mr. Stanley Swartz; Mr. James Durham. Absent: Mr. Robert Hosfeld; Mr. Bernard Samples. Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Steve Feverston, Assistant City Planner.

Ronald D. Goenner, DDS - Discussion of Rear Yard Parking/Paving Setback Variance

Mr. Schwab stated that the purpose of the review of this item was the applicant's request to reconsider a variance denied by the Planning Commission in February, 1990, concerning a parking and paving setback along the east property line. He stated that the Zoning Ordinance does not allow an applicant to apply for the same variance within a one (1) year period unless the Planning Commission agrees to allow the resubmission.

Dr. Ronald D. Goenner, applicant, and Mr. John Koverman, attorney representing Dr. Goenner, and Mr. Pat Kelly, Kelly Landscaping, were present to discuss their proposal concerning the property located at 7244 North Main Street.

Mr. Koverman distributed a proposal by his client to allow the reduction of the 25 ft. rear yard parking/paving setback line along the east property line to 10 ft. He stated that by approving the parking/paving to encroach into the 25 ft. setback area would allow a 4 ft. green space separation to be created between the building and the parking area. The applicant feels that this would be more aesthetically pleasing than constructing the asphalt immediately next to the building. Mr. Koverman stated that they believe the quality of the buffer area is more important than the depth of the area and proposed to plant a more intense buffer in exchange for the reduction in area. The plantings would actually screen the residential properties to the east rather than just obscuring the site. He indicated that Dr. Goenner had spoken to the residents in the area and they have no objection to this proposal.

Mr. Kelly reviewed three (3) different planting schemes for the site.

In working with the City in the past, he stated the emphasis has always been on the height of the plantings. Therefore, with the 10 ft. area proposed, the simple solution would be to plant white pine, austrian pine or scotch pine, or norway spruce, 6 ft. on center.

At some point in time, those trees will mature and extend into the parking area. He stated that a design could be done which would be nicer; however, this is the first option.

To give more green space, the parking lot would extend to a green lawn area, to an edge affect. This edge would again be 5 to 6 ft. in height using possibly an arborvitae, ketlerai juniper plant, 3 ft. on center. Some deciduous trees can be added (marshall ash, locust, pear) with a height above the hedging to give the buffer area some color most of the year. This particular scheme would not extend onto the parking area or the residential properties to the east because these plant materials only mature to approximately 4 ft. in width.

The other idea is to remove the deciduous trees from option #2, leaving the hedging of arborvitae and incorporating a few spruce or pine trees on the corners of the property.

Mr. Foland asked what was actually considered and approved as a result of the original variance application.

Mr. Schwab stated that parking and paving were requested for the north and east property lines which are required to be 25 ft. The north property line was approved at 15 ft. and the east property line variance was denied and was to be maintained at 25 ft. Parking setback variances were also requested for the north property line required to be 50 ft. and a variance was approved to allow a 43 ft. setback. All variances approved as a part of the original variance application were for the north property line only.

Mr. Schwab pointed out that the approved plan shows and is required to have a row of evergreen trees along the east property line within the 25 ft. setback. He stated that the proposed plan, with the reduction in the rear setback, also shows an increase in parking spaces from 15 to 20 spaces.

Mr. Stone stated that the 4 ft. green space around the building could be accomplished by simply moving the parking area 4 ft. to the east and not the requested additional 15 ft.

Mr. Schwab stated that moving the spaces 4 ft. to the east would eliminate 2 parallel spaces which would not satisfy the parking requirement.

Dr. Goenner stated that he really preferred to get additional parking spaces for the site.

Mr. Durham stated that the existing garage on the property was removed and a portion of the new building was built on the exact location. In that sense, this situation is a self-created hardship. He stated that he did not feel that the variance should be granted, and if Council feels that a 10 ft. parking/paving setback is adequate, the standards should be changed in the Ordinance. The Council adopted the 25 ft. standard for the aesthetics to residential property abutting the site not, for the aesthetics to the dental office from the residential sites.

Mr. Swartz stated that he felt that increasing the landscaping in a 10 ft. area would be more appealing to the adjoining residential properties than would a 25 ft. area with less plantings that would take years to fill in the open areas.

Mr. Foland suggested that 1.5 ft. of green space be added at the back of the building with a 12.5 ft. setback along the east property line providing the plantings maintain an instant screen for the benefit of the residential properties that abut the site in question.

Mr. Kelly stated that 2 ft. at the rear of the building would be a minimum area necessary to plant a material that would generate some interest.

Mr. Stone stated that he would be willing to grant the variance provided an instant screen was the result to the adjoining properties. He stated he preferred providing some green space around the building for aesthetic reasons.

Mr. Swartz agreed, stating that he preferred plantings rather than a wooden fence. He asked if a lighting plan had been submitted for approval.

Mr. Schwab stated that it had not been submitted for approval at this time.

Mr. Foland stated that he would agree to allow Dr. Goenner to submit a variance application based on the intense screening to be planted along the east property line. He pointed out, however, this would require another public hearing at which time the neighboring property owners would be permitted to speak on the subject.

The majority of Planning Commission agreed to allow Dr. Goenner to resubmit a similar variance application for the rear yard parking/paving setback, property located at 7244 North Main Street.

Mr. Koverman and Dr. Goenner left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Foland stated that the other issues on the agenda should be delayed until all members of the Planning Commission could be present.

Discussion resumed concerning Dr. Goenner's variance application request.

Mr. Durham stated that this whole issue has not been about landscaping, but rather getting additional parking spaces on the site. He felt that if staff viewed the site, the chances would be very good that the parking lot area has already been staked at 10 ft. from the property line.

After reviewing the proposed plan, the members of the Planning Commission discussed that if 4 spaces were gained in the rear parking area, the 4 parking spaces originally approved in the front yard should be deleted from the plan. A general concern of the members was that if this lot has a variance granted for rear yard setback, the lots to the north and south will request the same consideration.

Further, the members discussed that Council should consider changing the requirements to allow a decrease in setback area based on certain performance standards being added to the screening requirements.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

approved R. J. Hatfield
2/26/91