

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
Tuesday, March 12, 1991

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

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

Approval of the Planning Commission Minutes of February 26, 1991:

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Planning Commission Minutes of February 26, 1991, as written. Mr. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 With Mr. Stone abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Centerville Storage Inns - Variance/Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application submitted by the Storage Inns of America for Centerville Storage Inns located on the northeast corner of Bigger Road and Thomas Paine Parkway. The zoning on the existing facility is Light Industrial, I-1; and, the zoning on the expansion 4.0 acre site is Industrial Planned Development, I-PD. The expansion site is the first lot to develop as a part of South Metro Industrial Park approved previously by the City Council.

There are three (3) variances requested as a part of this project. The first is to reduce the number of parking spaces from the required 36 spaces to 18 spaces; the second, is to increase the fence height in the front yards along Bigger Road, I-675 and South Metro Parkway from the required 4 ft. to 6 ft.; and, the third variance is to allow the use of chain-link fencing material which is prohibited in front yards, along Bigger Road and South Metro Parkway. A wrought iron fencing material is proposed to be used along the I-675 frontage.

Mr. Schwab stated that the 18 proposed parking spaces does include the spaces designated for the storage of recreational vehicles (RV's) on the site.

The Special Approval application is seeking approval to construct mini-warehouses and an office warehouse on the 4-acre tract. There is currently an access drive to the property from Bigger Road, however, this particular plan would block off that roadway and remove it reducing access strictly from South Metro Parkway as well as through the existing phase on Thomas Paine Parkway.

Mr. Schwab stated that the construction materials proposed are those used on the existing Storage Inn project composed of pre-painted steel doors using a red color and a metal siding with a stucco-like coating. The roofs are galvanized metal roofs which have a slight slope for drainage.

The following analysis was used to determine the recommendation of the staff:

1. The existing lot is bordered on three (3) sides by a public street and is restricted to vehicular access only onto South Metro Parkway
2. The lot is situated substantially below the grade of Bigger Road and above the grade of I-675.
3. There is currently an existing chain-link fence situated in the I-675 right-of-way along the entire frontage of this parcel.
4. The argument presented to reduce the number of parking spaces for the mini-warehouse buildings is an argument to change the parking standards of the Zoning Ordinance as they apply to a mini-warehouse use and not an argument for a variance.

Staff, therefore, recommended the following actions be taken on the Variance application:

1. Deny the requested variance reducing the total number parking spaces required.
2. Deny the requested variances to construct a chain-link fence at a height of six (6) feet in the front yard of South Metro Parkway.
3. Approve the requested variance to permit a maximum fence height of six (6) feet in the front yard along Bigger Road and I-675.
4. Approve the variance request to construct a chain-link fence in the front yard along Bigger Road.

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

1. The requested parking and fence variances must be approved by the Planning Commission. If the variances are not approved then a modified plan must be approved by the Planning Department eliminating the variances.

2. The Planning Commission must specifically approve the split-face concrete block, stucco-like steel siding, and the flat metal roofing shown on the plan. Building colors must, also, be approved by the Planning Commission.
3. The Planning Commission must approve exterior building elevations of the proposed office-warehouse building.
4. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer.
5. Detailed plans for the exterior lighting shall be subject to the approval of the City Planner.

Mr. Hosfeld opened the public hearing.

Mr. Thomas Smith, applicant, stated that their request for a variance concerning the number of parking spaces on the site is based on their desire to discourage vehicles from being left on the property. He stated that this would make it difficult to police the site since each renter has a code access to the facility. The potential of vehicles being left on the site would also increase the possibility of undesirable vehicles to appear. Mr. Smith stated that Phase 1, as it currently exists, has no parking and it has not been a problem to the operation of the facility. The fence height variance was requested as a matter of securing and safety, as well as to continue the brown vinyl chain link fence throughout the entire project.

Mr. Joe Lang, 6363 Jason Lane, stated that the requirement to provide parking for the facility would detract from the appearance of the building as well as interfere with the business. He inquired as to what through process was put into requiring parking spaces for this type of facility.

Mr. Schwab stated that the necessity for parking was determined to be used for persons visiting the office for rental information. He stated that in speaking with the applicant as well as reviewing information made available to the City, it appears that our requirements are excessive in terms of what is actually necessary. Even with this the case, the requirement is in place and very clearly applies in this situation. It is suggested that this requirement be reviewed by Council to determine if a change in the Zoning Ordinance is appropriate.

Ms. Linda Clemens, 6351 Adams Circle, requested that green space be added along the east property line as is used through the

remainder of the site. She asked that this consideration be given in respect to the neighboring properties. Ms. Clemens stated that the variances for chain-line fencing material as well as fence height should not be granted to increase a situation that is not visually appealing. She asked the members of the Planning Commission to consider if extending this project would be in the best interests of the neighborhood.

Ms. Becky Alejandrino, 5903 Gloucester Court, stated that allowing RV parking to be visible from Bigger Road would be a mistake. She stated that in other facilities of this type through the area, it is typical to install barbed wire along the top of chain-line fence.

Mr. Schwab stated that barbed wire is not permitted in the City, and would require a separate variance application for its consideration.

Mr. Doug Barker, 6351 Adams Circle, agreed that the parking spaces required for the site would be a waste of space and money. Given that Bigger Road is the far more visible view of the facility, to park RV's along Bigger Road is probably the worst possible location for RV storage. Since the Planning Commission concerns themselves with the type of building materials to be used in the project, RV storage in that location on the site should not be permitted since RV's are an incredible eyesore. Mr. Barker requested that the variances requested by the applicant be denied, stating that the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance should be maintained.

Mr. Smith stated that they placed the RV parking spaces on the site where they felt it would be the least offensive. With the grade of Bigger Road, cars traveling in either direction will not be able to see this location on the site. He stated that the one building was placed on the site to screen that parking area from I-675 as well.

Ms. Cindy Obringer, 6362 Jason Lane, asked if RV parking was permitted on this site.

Mr. Schwab stated the RV storage is a permitted use in an industrial zoning district.

Ms. Obringer stated that she felt Centerville would have land without three (3) frontages better suited for RV storage.

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

Mr. Foland asked if the buildings materials would match exactly, specifically door colors.

Mr. Smith stated that is correct, materials will duplicate the existing facility.

Mr. Durham asked if the chain-link fence material used on the east property line was the result of a variance.

Mr. Schwab did not recall if it was permitted because that property line was a side yard at that time, or if it was permitted by variance due to the anticipation of the future roadway.

Mr. Durham stated that he did not feel that he had enough information to act on the Special Approval application based on the lack of elevations supplied by the applicant, particularly Building "P". He asked Mr. Smith why the decorative emphasis was being made towards I-675 rather than Bigger Road and South Metro Parkway, and what would be the difference in material cost.

Mr. Smith stated that was basically just what they decided to do at a cost of approximately 10 times greater than that of a chain-link material.

Mr. Durham stated that in reviewing the overall site plan for this property, he felt that the use of chain-link along I-675 would be appropriate since it is an extension of the material used by the State in conjunction with the construction of the interstate. He felt that the materials, as proposed, were reversed. In establishing industrial park areas in the City, there is a real emphasis to try to have some aesthetic quality to the development. He did not think a brown-coated fence with pavement behind it would address that quality.

Mr. Hosfeld stated that he would have a hard time approving the fence along South Metro Parkway as proposed, and felt that the continuation of the fence along Bigger Road would be acceptable.

Mr. Stone stated that he agreed with Mr. Hosfeld on the fence material issue. The parking spaces, since they are based on the updated Zoning Ordinance requirements specifically for parking, should be maintained.

The following motions were taken on the Variance application:

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved to deny the Variance requesting a reduction of the total number of parking spaces from 36 to 18 spaces. Mr. Stone seconded the motion. The vote ended in a 3-3 tie with Mr. Samples, Mr. McMahon and Mr. Foland voting no.

MOTION: Mr. Stone moved to deny the 6 ft. chain-link fence to be located along South Metro Parkway. Mr. Samples seconded the motion.

Mr. Samples felt that the height should be maintained at 6 ft. for safety and security reasons.

Mr. Durham stated that he was not convinced by the applicant that the 6 ft. fence height was necessary.

Mr. Smith stated that 6 ft. will not keep someone from entering the property who is determined to get in, however, it is a deterrent to kids simply being able to hop a 4 ft. fence at will.

ACTION: The vote ended in a 3-3 tie with Mr. Foland, Mr. Samples and Mr. McMahon voting no.

Mr. Samples stated that being a member of City Council when the original phase of the project was considered by the City, there was a certain program bought into by Council. He stated that he wished there could have been something the City could have done to prevent the project from locating on that site, however, there was nothing legally the City could do. At that time, the City knew that expansion would no doubt occur based on the success of the business. He stated that unless he was convinced otherwise, it would be unfair and inconsistent to change the rules midstream and not let the development continue along the same lines as Phase 1.

The following motions were taken in a positive nature, in order to make the decisions of Planning Commission conclude their final action.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Variance to allow a 6 ft. fence along Bigger Road. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1 with Mr. Durham voting no.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to deny the variance to allow a 6 ft. fence along I-675. Mr. Durham seconded the motion. The motion was denied 4-2 with Mr. Samples, Mr. Stone, Mr. McMahon and Mr. Hosfeld voting no.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Variance to allow a 6 ft. fence along I-675. Mr. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1 with Mr. Durham voting no.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Variance for chain-link fencing material along Bigger Road. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1 with Mr. Durham voting no.

Mr. McMahon and Mr. Durham agreed that a Work Session should be scheduled to review the fencing standards for industrial districts. Mr. Durham stated further that he felt the parking requirements are inappropriate, however, it should be appealed to Council for them to see the affect of their own Ordinance.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Variance requesting a reduction in the parking requirements from 36 to 18 spaces. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was denied 2-4 with Mr. Hosfeld, Mr. Durham, Mr. McMahon and Mr. Stone voting no.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the 6 ft. chain-link fence in the front yard along South Metro Parkway. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was a 3-3 tie with Mr. Hosfeld, Mr. Durham and

Mr. Stone voting no, therefore, the motion was denied.

Mr. Smith asked if he would incorporate the Planning Commission actions into the site plan, if it would be approved. He stated that to accomplish this he would reduce Building "L" on the south end by 30 ft. and eliminate the RV storage spaces. He stated he had no desire to appeal to Council and agreed to table the Special Approval application for a work session with Planning Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to table the Planning Commission Special Approval application for Centerville Storage Inns until the March 19, 1991, Planning Commission Work Session. Mr. Stone seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Mr. Samples left the meeting at this time.

A 5-minute recess was taken at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

Centerville Mill - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Special Approval application submitted by Centerville Mill located at 7991 Clyo Road requesting the construction of a new 8,000 sq. ft. warehouse building. The zoning on the property is Light Industrial, I-1. Parking required for the project is 8 spaces. The applicant is proposing 4 spaces, however, there is ample space to satisfy the requirement.

Mr. Schwab pointed out that a variance was approved in 1988 for a zero (0) foot parking and paving setback and a three (3) foot building setback to the west property line.

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

1. Four (4) additional parking spaces must be added to the site plan subject to the approval of the Planning Department.
2. A revised plan showing the paving of the site plan area is the area of the new building and parking areas must be approved by the Planning Department. The paved areas are to be asphaltic concrete or portland concrete.
3. The Planning Commission specifically approves the concrete block wall materials proposed for this building.
4. The Planning Commission specifically approve the exterior building colors (i.e., roof shingles, metal doors, and wall color).
5. Any exterior lighting added with this addition shall require the approval of the Planning Department.

6. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineering Department.

Mr. Will Wilson, applicant, was present for the review of the project and had no objection to the staff recommendations.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted for Centerville Mill, 7991 Clyo Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. Four (4) additional parking spaces must be added to the site plan subject to the approval of the Planning Department.
2. A revised plan showing the paving of the site plan area is the area of the new building and parking areas must be approved by the Planning Department. The paved areas are to be asphaltic concrete or portland concrete.
3. The Planning Commission specifically approves the concrete block wall materials proposed for this building.
4. The Planning Commission specifically approve the exterior building colors (i.e., roof shingles, metal doors, and wall color).
5. Any exterior lighting added with this addition shall require the approval of the Planning Department.
6. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineering Department.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

*Arthur H. Foland*  
3/10/91