

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
Tuesday, April 9, 1991

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

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

Approval of the minutes of March 19, 1991:

MOTION: Mr. Stone moved to approve the Planning Commission Work Session minutes of March 19, 1991, as written. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 with Mr. Samples abstaining.

MOTION: Mr. Stone moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting minutes of March 19, 1991, as written. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 with Mr. Samples abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ronald D. Goenner, DDS - Variance of Parking/Paving Setback Requirement

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application submitted by Ronald D. Goenner, DDS, requesting a Variance of the parking/paving setback requirement for the property located at 7244 Far Hills Avenue. The zoning on the property is Office-Service, O-S. The applicant has requested an 11.5 ft. parking/paving setback from the east property line rather than the required 25 ft. setback. The 25 ft. setback is required since the subject property abuts residential property on the east side. If the subject property abutted commercial property to the east, only a 10 ft. setback would be required.

A 60 ft. wide double-loaded parking bay is shown on the plan with a 3 ft. planter strip against the rear building wall. Included in that planter strip are window wells resulting from the basement of the building. Pyramidal or column-type arborvitae will be planted along the east property line at a height initially to provide an immediate screen to the neighboring residential properties. Some deciduous trees will also be planted in front of this hedging affect. Planting smaller trees is acceptable under the requirements of the Ordinance as long as the height at maturity meets the screening standards. In this particular case, the applicant is proposing to plant arborvitae at a height to provide an instant screen in exchange, therefore, for the requested variance.

The number of parking spaces will increase to 17 spaces which is 2 spaces more than originally approved as a part of the Planning Commission Special Approval process.

Mr. Schwab stated that the basic proposal of the variance is to increase the effectiveness of the screening in exchange for a reduction in the width of the setback area.

Mr. Schwab stated that it had been discussed by the Planning Commission previously for Council to consider changing the Ordinance to allow an exchange of setback width for a greater intensity of landscaping materials to increase the overall effectiveness of the screening. He stated that this could not be considered by staff at this time and, therefore, recommended that the Variance application be denied based on the lack of a unique situation to property.

Mr. Foland opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Koverman, representing the applicant, stated that the original plan showed 4 parking spaces in the front of the property and 11 spaces in the rear yard. The revised plan, with the approval of the requested variance, would increase the parking by 2 spaces for a total of 13 parking spaces in the rear yard. Of the 13 spaces proposed for rear yard, 2 of those spaces will accommodate handicapped parking which does require additional width. Mr. Koverman stated that the conceptual plan reviewed during the Work Session with the Planning Commission, suggested 4 spaces in the front yard and 16 spaces in the rear yard. When the spaces were actually measured off on the site, the widths originally proposed were too narrow to be practical and, therefore, were adjusted to work more comfortably. Mr. Koverman stated that the Ordinance does allow greater sign area to be used in exchange for an increased setback; and since the City in the past has stressed quality rather than quantity, requested that consideration be given to this same principle in screening.

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

Mr. McMahon stated that what has been proposed is what was basically agreed to in Work Session provided there was no objection from the neighboring property owners.

Mr. Durham stated that during the original review of the project, the applicant indicated that a second story to the building would not be feasible. He stated that this being the case, why was a basement constructed.

Dr. Goenner stated that the existing foundation was deteriorating and had to be replaced. A basement was constructed to give the building added stability as well as to provide additional storage space.

Mr. Durham stated that if the additional space had been added upstairs, the density question would have been eliminated. He stated that the unique circumstance should not have existed because it was created as a result of new construction.

Mr. Koverman stated that the parking layout as approved previously will work, however, a layout is now being proposed which would make the parking more practical and efficient for the utilization of the property.

Mr. Durham stated that the landscaping as proposed does not seem to be what was described in the Work Session. He asked if a 6 ft. arborvitae would be required should the variance be approved.

Mr. Schwab stated that landscaping height at planting would have to be made a condition of the approval and suggested that an additional condition be placed on the approval that would provide for maintenance of that planting height.

Mr. Swartz stated that he felt the applicant should be given ample parking for his project which is definitely an improvement in appearance to the community. He stated that he felt the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance should not be changed in reference to the setback and each case should be considered on its own merit. Mr. Swartz stated that his only concern is that the arborvitae is planted and maintained as a solid screen once it is in place.

Mr. Patrick Kelly, landscaping consultant for the applicant, stated that Techny Arborvitae will be used which is primarily as a hedging material. Its height at full maturity will be 12 to 15 ft, although it can be sheared to maintain a 6 ft. height if desired.

MOTION: Mr. McMahon moved to approve the Variance Application submitted by Ronald D. Goenner, DDS, for a parking/paving setback requirement for the property located at 7244 Far Hills Avenue subject to the following condition:

1. Techny Arborvitae shall be planted along the entire east property line so that at initial planting at least a six (6) foot high continuous screen is in place. As long as the variance is used, a continuous evergreen hedge at least six (6) feet high must be maintained on the property along the entire east property line.

Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1 with Mr. Durham voting no.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

*A. H. F. Sand* 5/14/91

