

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
Tuesday, May 8, 1990

Mr. Hosfeld called the meeting to order at 8:40 P.M.

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

Marathon Petroleum Company

Mr. Harold Foreshaw and Mr. Paul Cottel, Marathon Petroleum Company; Mr. Mike Middlen, Emerald Marketing Company; and Mr. Paul Finke and Mr. Jim Finke, Sr., property owners, were present to review possible revisions to their Major Use application concerning the development of a 22-acre site on the southwest corner of Wilmington Pike and Whipp Road.

Mr. Foreshaw stated that their original plan was denied by the Planning Commission and Council, and the purpose of this work session was to discuss what the City feels is appropriate for their development of this particular site.

During the hearing process, the 3 major concerns were:

1. The number and location of the curb cuts;
2. The architectural look of the Starvin' Marvin/Speedway station;
3. Question of the canopy setback and whether a variance would be granted.

Mr. Durham stated that he would not be in favor of granting a variance for the canopy setback.

Mr. Foland stated his concern at the time of Planning Commission review was the curb cuts on Whipp Road being situated too close to the left turn stacking lane for northbound Wilmington Pike traffic. His second concern was the angled curb cut along Wilmington Pike immediately south of Whipp Road.

Mr. Hosfeld stated that the overall plan appears to be thrown together. This particular corner requires some creativity.

Mr. Durham stated that although the Planning Commission is sympathetic towards the neighboring properties, the land in question has been zoned commercial for many years. The issue is the design for the entire 22 acre site which is the purpose of this type of zoning classification. The City is interested in looking at the entire area rather than section-by-section.

Mr. McMahon stated his concerns include storm water drainage, sewage, water, power, and how the whole project is going to fit together. He requested a more detailed plan which shows the exact location of the temporary detention pond.

Mr. Jim Finke stated that they were trying to find the best use for the property for the dollars involved. He stated that they have and will continue to work with the City to make the appearance of this area suitable and in the best interest of the City.

Mr. Hosfeld stated that the Planning Commission felt uncomfortable in approving a plan for the entire acreage that may never be completed as proposed.

Mr. Foreshaw stated that their attempt is to satisfy the Major Use application that is required by the City and in that attempt show what may occur on the entire parcel which includes the gas station. He stated that as long as the curb cuts were appropriate for the entire site, he thought modifications could be made at the time of development.

Mr. Foland stated that is true, however, development could also occur as soon as the plan received approval.

Mr. Durham stated that the City has an obligation to work with the owners to come up with a good overall plan for the site. He stated that he did not feel that constructing a gas station at the corner would be a good plan. These types of intense uses on the outlots at this corner will only generate more traffic problems in the future.

Mr. Hosfeld stated he felt the outlot for the gas station was too small in order to fit the appropriate curb cuts on the site to serve the proposed use.

Mr. Foland left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Foreshaw asked if the plan were resubmitted with the curb cut locations being revised to address the traffic situation, would the Planning Commission be satisfied with the plan to support its approval.

Mr. Stone and Mr. Samples indicated their concerns would be satisfied.

Mr. McMahon stated he would agree as long as the other details of the project were submitted as well.

Mr. Samples stated that he did not object to the gas station use locating on the corner, as it was his opinion that the City could not reject the use of the property since the proper zoning classification was in place.

Mr. Durham disagreed, stating that the City would have a legal right to tell them the use is not appropriate for the corner based on the plan being a bad plan for the entire 22 acre site.

Mr. Schwab stated that one point that came up more in front of Council was Marathon Oil's willingness to modify the building architecture by utilizing a more residential look.

Mr. Foreshaw stated that they would at the time of refiling the application, submit architectural elevations to be approved.

Mr. Durham objected, stating that the applicants can produce elevations during the review process, but those are not necessarily what is constructed when the project develops. At that point, approval is granted based on the presentation, but that is not legally locked in.

Mr. Hosfeld stated that he did not recall any of those situations.

Mr. Samples left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Schwab stated that one of the requirements of the Major Use application is to submit the architectural elevations for the project to be reviewed by the City for approval.

Mr. Cattel stated that in approximately 15% of their development projects, those are constructed of brick simple to be granted approval for their project.

Mr. Durham stated that the overall plan is still his concern with the 3 outlots with the proposed curb cuts as shown on the original application.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Robert Hosfeld
6/12/90

