

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, June 12, 1990

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

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

Approval of the minutes of May 8, 1990:

MOTION: Mr. Stone moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 8, 1990, Work Session Meeting, as written. Mr. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-2 with Mr. Foland and Mr. Swartz abstaining.

Approval of the minutes of May 29, 1990:

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 29, 1990, Regular Meeting, as written. Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0-1 with Mr. Stone abstaining.

OLD BUSINESS

South Metro Park - Major Use Special Approval

MOTION: Mr. Swartz moved to remove the Major Use application submitted by Moody-Woodley Development from the table. Mr. Stone seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

Mr. Schwab stated that the application had been tabled at the previous in order to research some of the concerns raised during the public hearing. Those issues included the following:

1. The location of South Metro Parkway between Centerville Storage Inns and the property located directly to the east.
2. Traffic safety of having the intersection of proposed South Metro Parkway and Thomas Paine Parkway too close to Bigger Road.
3. The affect of having the traffic and possible signal at the Thomas Paine Parkway and Bigger Road intersection.
4. The possibility of utilizing the existing curb cut along Bigger Road as access to the proposed project or to vacate that curb cut due to the traffic hazards created as a result of the grade along Bigger Road.
5. How stormwater drainage will be handled.

6. The variance requesting a reduction of the required 100 foot buffer strip to 40 feet was withdrawn at the previous meeting.
7. A concern of the radius of the curvature of the proposed roadway as it bends around and turns to the east.

Mr. Schwab stated that revised drawings were submitted showing the 100 foot buffer strip being maintained rather than the originally proposed 40 foot strip which was the subject of a variance. The revised plan, however, indicates detention basins located within the required 100 foot strip. The location of these detention basins within the 100 foot buffer strip would require specific approval by the City. The plan also indicates a revision of the street radius to 225 feet which is the minimum radius that would be acceptable to the City Engineer; however, he did indicate he would like to have that radius increased to 300 feet.

Mr. Schwab reviewed the report submitted to the Planning Commission by the City Engineer, Norbert Hoffman, addressing the issues of traffic. Mr. Hoffman reviewed the distance between the proposed intersection of South Metro Parkway/Thomas Paine Parkway to Bigger Road and felt that the 270 feet of roadway is great enough that he did not view it as a safety issue, in this case. Signalization is possible at Thomas Paine Parkway and Bigger Road once development in the industrial area is complete as traffic volumes may warrant a signal. This signal, however, would be the benefit of traffic from Thomas Paine and the Woods Apartments to the west only, and would slow traffic flow along Bigger Road especially during non-peak hours and on weekends. Mr. Hoffman further recommended that the curb cut along Bigger Road not be used as a right-in, right-out only access due to the severe grade of the roadway. He reported further that to preserve the residential character of the Thomas Paine Settlement east of the industrial development, the design and construction of Cloyo Road and the access road serving the remaining land to develop north of Cloyo Road must discourage or perhaps prevent through traffic flow on Thomas Paine Parkway while maintaining emergency vehicular access.

Mr. Farquhar stated that he reviewed the situation of the property owner, Mr. Rider, to the east of the proposed intersection of South Metro Parkway and Thomas Paine Parkway and how the property would be affected concerning reestablished building setbacks as a result of the property becoming a corner lot. Mr. Farquhar stated in his review, the Supreme Court indicated in 1984 that when an area variance is involved, unnecessary hardship does not have to be shown by the applicant, but it is sufficient for the applicant to show practical difficulties. He stated that in speaking to the property owner about the purchase of his property, Mr. Rider indicated there was no plan for a roadway at that time. He also had an opportunity to purchase additional land, however, it was not needed to extend the use of his property. Mr. Farquhar stated that his situation is a classic case for a variance and that would be

the best remedy to give to the property owner. Once a variance is granted, there is no longer a nonconforming situation, therefore, should the building be destroyed, it could be rebuilt under the same conditions as the variance permitted. Mr. Farquhar pointed out that a variance application procedure would have to be followed.

Mr. Bob Archdeacon, Woolpert Consultants, and Mr. Gary Woodley, applicant, were present to review the revised plan.

Mr. Charles Hoefer, Thomas Paine Settlement, was concerned about the current water problems in Thomas Paine which might be compounded by seepage from the detention basins should they be permitted to be located in the 100 foot buffer area.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that if the detention area are going to be effective, they have to be placed at the lowest possible area on the site which is not the buffer area. These dry basins will be dry 95% of the time.

Mr. Woodley stated that undeveloped land allows stormwater runoff to channel itself to the topography of the land. With the development of the land and providing the dry basins, water could not be directed to run to those areas.

Mr. Hoefer stated that there are currently 4 access points to the storm sewer system in this area and asked if all 4 would be utilized.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that all 4 points would be used, however, 1 would be used solely for Thomas Paine Settlement.

Ms. Betty Mickie, 6368 Joseph Place, stated she has a stormwater drainage problem at the current time and asked if the proposed dry basins on the west property help her situation.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that the proposed basins would not help her situation, although the development would not add to the problem. He stated that the problem she is experiencing is a local problem from downspout drainage and runoff from the Thomas Paine Settlement project.

Mr. Mike Owsley, 6386 Adams Circle, stated it was his understanding that a buffer strip was to be left in its natural condition and not disturbed. His concern was losing trees in the area to provide for the drainage basins.

Mr. Schwab stated that the strip is left in its natural stated unless Council approves changes for that area. The concept being presented with the plan submitted for the South Metro Park development is proposing those changes in the buffer strip to include detention basins.

Mr. Durham asked if the detention areas could be placed north of the buffer strip.

Mr. Woodley stated that it would be more difficult and would not be acceptable to them. The proposed detention basins with the screening requirements can easily be maintained within the 100 feet. No areas are going to be created that will be permanently wet, so the buffer that was going to be grass would only be altered in slight elevation rather than what exists at the present time. Mr. Woodley stated that there are 2 things that are diametrically opposed--one, being the location of the residential area, and the fact that it is the lowest part of the property. He stated that what they are trying to do is come up with a method that will handle the water and make sure no additional water runoff is crated to compound an existing problem for Thomas Paine Settlement.

Mr. Byron Hall, 6425 Little John Circle, asked how close to the property line would the basins be located.

Mr. Woodley stated that the basins would be located between 15 and 29 feet from the property line.

Mr. Hall stated that if through traffic was cut off from Thomas Paine Parkway, emergency equipment would have a longer route to service the residences at the other end of Thomas Paine Parkway.

Mr. Schwab stated that there is no easy solution to the situation.

Mr. Doug Barker, Paine Woods Association, stated that his concern is not with the industrial development in the area, but rather the proposed road that would provide access to the site in question. He stated that there seems to be many major concerns for the development of the entire area without any solutions that are being overlooked for the convenience of one (1) developer.

Mr. Durham stated that his focus on this project has been its affect on the streets. He stated that he has tried to look at several solutions to a bad situation, one of them being creating a cul-de-sac for Thomas Paine Parkway. The feeling now seems to be that the residents of the Thomas Paine Settlement area do not want the street constructed as a cul-de-sac mainly based on the response time of emergency vehicles. Mr. Durham stated that the response times are virtually the same as other areas which would be serviced by the same station. Mr. Durham stated, further, that the developer purchased the property when the access to Bigger Road was the main access to the property. Based on the grade of the bridge constructed by the State, the developer is not permitted to use that access because of the traffic hazard along Bigger Road. Mr. Durham stated that this area of the City is a bad piece of planning that should not have allowed the development of Thomas Paine Settlement north of Clyo Road to occur. He stated that since Thomas Paine Settlement is constructed and that cannot be changed, the Planning Commission and staff are trying to keep the best

interests of the citizens in mind by trying to protect the property values and living situation so that they are not injured. He stated that this is a very difficult, if not impossible, situation since there are not any good choices at this point in time. Mr. Durham stated that in teaching land use planning, he has reviewed numerous issues of land theory and could not determine a good way out of this situation.

Mr. Barker stated that the only option for the developer should be to cul-de-sac South Metro Parkway at its western terminus and wait until the remainder of the roadway is built for the land to develop. He stated that he realized that the developer wants to develop the land now, however, his impatience is going to create an incredible number of headaches for many people. When the State took the developers access away along Bigger Road, the developer was put in a situation where he is simply going to have to wait until the land owners to the south develop their land. The other option is to utilize the right-in, right-out access along Bigger Road as a temporary access until the full completion of South Metro Parkway.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that the cul-de-sac solution described by Mr. Barker would be in excess of the length standards determined in the Subdivision Regulations and would, therefore, require a variance.

Mr. Hosfeld stated that long-range planning has been a part of the City for many years and watching the City come together in development according to the Master Plan has proved to very interesting. Although the area is consistent with the development outlined in the Master Plan, there are problems such as traffic and drainage that need specific attention.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to recommend approval to Council of the Major Use Special Approval application for South Metro Park submitted by Moody-Woodley Development subject to the following conditions:

1. The radius of the westernmost curve on South Metro Parkway shall be increased to a radius acceptable to the City Engineer.
2. No variance shall be granted reducing the minimum building setbacks along Bigger Road (50 ft. min.), I-675 (50 ft. min.) or Thomas Paine Development (100 ft. min.).
3. No variance shall be granted reducing the buffer strip abutting the Thomas Paine Development from the required 100 foot width to 40 feet.
4. Detailed landscape plans for screening the buffer strip shall be subject to approval by the Planning Development.

5. A revised 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.
 - a. The stormwater drainage system, particularly as it ties into the Thomas Paine system, needs to be reviewed in greater detail.
 - b. A larger basin(s) providing stormwater retention and/or detention for the entire development shall be required.
 - c. The use of small permanent or temporary detention basins on each lot is not acceptable to the City Engineer.
6. Adequate covenants approved by the City Attorney shall be recorded to provide for the future private maintenance of the proposed stormwater retention/detention basin(s).
7. All interior lot lines shall be deleted from the plan.
8. Sidewalks, 5 feet in width, shall be constructed along both sides of South Metro Parkway.
9. A temporary turnaround shall be constructed at the terminus of South Metro Parkway. The design shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Department. The turnaround shall be removed when South Metro Parkway is extended.
10. No driveway access shall be permitted to Bigger Road. The existing driveway and curb-cut shall be removed and the curbing on Bigger Road restored by the applicant.
11. The plans for water lines and fire hydrants shall be subject to the approval of the Washington Township Fire Department.

Mr. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-1 with Mr. Durham voting no.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved 6/26/90
Robert Hoffeld