

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
Tuesday, June 26, 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 (where noted). Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney.

Approval of the minutes of June 12, 1990:

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of June 12, 1990, Regular Meeting, as written. Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Centerville Lanes - Variance of Satellite Dish Antenna Size/  
Mounting

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application submitted by Robert Rentz, owner of Centerville Lanes located at 911 South Main Street, requesting the placement of a 12 foot satellite dish antenna with a pole mounted installation. The pole is proposed to be installed at the back of the building with an open-mesh style dish mounted above the roof line. The standards in the Ordinance are one (1) satellite dish per property; a ground-mounted dish is limited to 12 feet in diameter and no part of the dish can be above 15 feet of the ground; and, a roof-mounted dish is limited to 4 feet in diameter and the height cannot exceed 5 feet above the highest portion of the roof line. The ordinance specifically prohibits a pole-mounted dish which is the type being proposed by the applicant. The two specific variances being requested are, 1) to pole mount the dish; and, 2) to allow a height variance based on the diameter of the dish being above the roof line.

Mr. Stone arrived at this time.

Mr. Schwab stated that in reviewing the application, finding a location for a ground-mounted dish is basically impossible without eliminating parking spaces. The only option remaining would be a roof-mounted dish which does not permit a 12 foot diameter dish. In order to receive those signals desired by the applicant, a 12 foot is required. Staff's only reservation concerning the request is whether a pole-mount installation should be approved over a roof-mount which is permitted by the ordinance.

The staff recommendation was to approve the variance for a 12 foot dish with the installation location to be placed on the roof rather than pole-mounted.

Mr. Hosfeld opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dave Houser, contractor, stated that it was his feeling that the dish could be reduced to 10 feet in diameter and still receive the signals that would be necessary.

Mr. Robert Rentz, applicant, stated that their concern with a roof-mounted installation is damage to the roof. He stated that with leakage through the roof onto wood bowling lanes is very damaging to their business. The pole mount would give them the safety of security and not having the tension on the roof. The net result is that it would not be any greater in height than if it were a roof-mounted dish. Mr. Rentz stated that they have made several improvements to Centerville Lanes since purchasing the business and they do not want to do anything that would detract from their site or the surrounding community.

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

Mr. Samples stated that with the ordinance to regulate satellite dishes was drafted, there was probably no thought of a dish being pole mounted. He stated that he did not feel the proposed installation method violates the intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Durham stated that he would be voting no on the application based on the set of guidelines Council had given the Planning Commission to work with. He stated that this is not a unique situation and that any business in the City with a flat roof is going to want the same size dish mounted on a pole. If the application is denied, an appeal can be made to Council so that the Council has to confront its own ordinance and make the policy decision for the City of allowing the larger dish mounted on a pole. Mr. Durham stated that the Planning Commission is not a policy-making body and should, therefore, deny the request.

Mr. Farquhar stated that the standards for granting a variance under the guidelines of this particular ordinance are, 1) compliance with the intent of the ordinance, and 2) causes no material harm to adjacent property owners.

Mr. Durham agreed that the pole-mounted dish did fit the intent of the ordinance, however, did not feel that the 10 foot dish size had any justification for approval.

Mr. Hosfeld stated that he did not object to the request, stating that he felt the standards were more in place to protect the residential areas of the City.

Mr. Samples stated that he supported the application based on the staff recommendation to approve the request. He stated that staff had drafted the ordinance approved by Council to regulate these situations and felt that staff was aware of Council's intent of the ordinance.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the Variance application submitted by Robert Rentz for Centerville Lanes, 911 South Main Street, to allow the installation method of a satellite dish antenna to be pole mounted. Mr. Durham seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

MOTION: Mr. McMahon moved to approve the Variance application submitted by Robert Rentz for Centerville Lanes, 911 South Main Street, to allow the installation of a satellite dish antenna not to exceed 10 feet in diameter. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-2 with Mr. Durham and Mr. Foland voting no.

Mr. Durham requested that staff consider drafting an amendment to the ordinance addressing the installation of satellite dish antennas for commercial properties.

Mr. Rentz pointed out that cable television companies make their service available to residential properties, however, they do not make them available to commercial properties. He stated if these services were available, it would not be necessary to have the dish antenna.

#### NEW BUSINESS

#### Ronald D. Goenner, DDS - Amendment to a Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab stated that Dr. Ronald D. Goenner had requested an amendment to a Planning Commission Special Approval application previously reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission for his building located at 7244 Far Hills Avenue. The amendment specifically requests the use of aluminum siding on the eave areas of the building on the north and south elevations.

Dr. Goenner was present to discuss his request. He stated that his purpose for the request is to make the facility basically maintenance free, stating that surrounding buildings have used the same material.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the request. Mr. McMahon seconded the motion.

Mr. Durham stated that aluminum is not a permitted material and felt there was nothing unique about this situation.

Mr. Swartz stated that he agreed with Mr. Durham and that the surrounding buildings probably predated the new standards in the ordinance regulating the use of building materials. He stated that the amount of area involved in this request would seem to take minimal maintenance to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Foland withdrew his motion and Mr. McMahon withdrew his second.

June 26, 1990

PC

Page 4

MOTION: Mr. Swartz moved to deny the use of aluminum siding on the building located at 7244 Far Hills Avenue as requested by Dr. Ronald D. Goenner. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-2 with Mr. Stone and Mr. McMahon voting no.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.