

**CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, October 11, 1988**

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

Attendance: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr., Chairman; Mr. Robert Looper; Mrs. Marian Simmons; Mr. Arthur Foland; Mr. Robert Hosfeld; Mr. Robert Chappell (where noted). Absent: Mr. Stanley Swartz. 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 the September 27, 1988, Meeting:

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of September 27, 1988, with the following correction:

The word "not" shall be added to Page 3, last paragraph, first line and should read as follows:

"Mr. Farquhar stated that if the sign does not flash, move or scroll . . ."

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

COMMUNICATIONS

Thomas Harrigan Chrysler/Plymouth - Reconsideration of Variance

Mr. Schwab stated that no addition information was submitted by the applicant, however, Mr. Dave Hall, representing the applicant, was present to discuss the issue.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to remove the variance issue for Thomas Harrigan Chrysler/Plymouth from the table for active discussion. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Hall stated that his client is proposing the sign setback to be 55 feet from the sidewalk which is 65.5 feet from the curb. The sign company was contacted and they concluded that the sign could be setback another 8 feet, but if moved back any further would come in conflict with the light poles on the site. Mr. Hall stated that according to the information he had gathered, his client's sign is 14% smaller than the existing signs for Voss Chevrolet and Jeff Walther Dodge also located on Loop Road. Based on the business needs of Thomas Harrigan, Mr. Hall asked that the sign variance be approved.

Mr. Schwab reviewed a summary of variances filed by businesses along Loop Road from March, 1973, to the present time. He explained that the Sign Ordinance did not regulate the setback or height of signs prior to 1972. After that time, height and setback limitations were put in place with the current limitations being 6 feet in height with a 25 foot setback, and a sign area of 32 square feet per face for a total of 64 square feet.

Mr. Schwab stated that the variance request for the Tom Harrigan sign is 211 square feet per face for a total of 422 square feet of sign area at a 36 foot height. He stated that the sign placed at the 55 foot setback as proposed would generate a sign height of 12 feet.

A slide presentation of the existing sign along Loop Road was reviewed with Mr. Schwab pointing out that the variances which were approved for business in the area of Loop Road were minimal variances in comparison to the limitations that were in place at the time of application. He stated that the history of the Sign Ordinance reveals the City's trend in becoming more restrictive on sign area, height and setback over the past 25 years. The purpose of adopting new standards in the Ordinance that are more restrictive is that they make the large existing signs legally-nonconforming and will eventually be replaced by signs that are legally-conforming by the new standards that are desirable.

Mr. Hall stated that what may be best for the entire community in terms of zoning and sign restrictions, may not be best for a specific area. He suggested that the proposed sign be platted on a site plan and at that point determine what will be needed for proper visibility. He indicated he would have that new information for the next meeting of the Planning Commission.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to table the variance request by Thomas Harrigan, 95 Loop Road, until October 25, 1988. Mr. Hosfeld seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Centerville Builders Supply - Minor Amendment

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request by Centerville Builders Supply for an addition to an existing building on the southern portion of the site located on the southeast corner East Franklin Street and South Suburban Road. The zoning on the parcel is Light Industrial, I-1. Centerville Builders Supply was granted variances previously for building setbacks at the time they acquired additional property from the City property which abuts the site to the south. The applicant is now ready to move forward with their improvement.

The 3-sided cement block addition will be entered from the back. The front wall will be painted beige, and the remainder will be the natural color.

Staff recommended that the Minor Amendment be approved as requested.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Minor Amendment requested by Centerville Builders Supply, 948 East Franklin Street, for the purpose of constructing a lumber storage building addition to an existing building, specifically shown on the submitted drawings marked "Received October 5, 1988 City of Centerville Planning Department". Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Thomas G. Pavey, DDS - Variance/Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Variance and Planning Commission Special Approval applications submitted by Thomas G. Pavey, DDS, for the property located at 50 North Main Street situated in the Architectural Preservation District (APD).

The first variance requested is to reduce the number of parking spaces from 16 to 10 spaces. The applicant has indicated that 4 off-site spaces can be acquired on the adjacent property to the north. The second variance is a request to allow the 10 foot paving setback requirement to be 2 feet on the south and east property line, and 5 feet on the north property line. The Special Approval application proposes to construct an addition to the rear of the main building on the property, as well as a request to demolish an existing barn to the rear of the property. The intent is to match the existing siding and roofing materials used on the existing building.

In reviewing the Variance application, staff made the following analysis:

1. The subject property is narrow (49) feet width. The standard 42 foot width of a parking lot plus a 10 foot parking lot setback on either side cannot fit within the dimensions of the rear yard. The applicant suffers a hardship that is unique to this property and precludes the reasonable use of this property.
2. The AP section of the Zoning Ordinance requires parking lots to be located in the rear yard of a premises.

3. The existing parking lot has a 5 foot setback on the north side and a 2 foot setback on the south side.
4. A setback of 2 feet on the east property line is not necessary for the construction of a vehicle backing area. A setback of 6 feet would be the minimum setback required for this purpose.
5. The applicant is pursuing a joint parking and access agreement with the property owner to the north to share the 4 parking spaces adjacent to and slightly encroaching on the subject parcel. Access to this parcel is limited to those driveways located on the parcel to the north.
6. If a joint parking agreement is secured, 14 parking spaces would be acceptable as a minimum parking requirement.

Based on that analysis, staff recommended that the Variance application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The parking and paving setback along the east property line shall be a minimum of 6 feet.
2. The minimum number of parking spaces shall be 14 spaces.
3. An access and parking easement between this property and the property to the north shall be submitted to the City and subject to approval by the Law Director granting vehicular access from the property to the north and the use of the 4 parking spaces located along the north property line.

Staff recommended that the Special Approval application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The Planning Commission approve the requested variance to reduce the number of required parking spaces.
2. The wood siding used on the building addition shall match the siding on the existing building.
3. New roofing material shall match the existing roofing material.
4. Building and roof colors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. Approve the request to demolish the barn located in the rear yard of 50 North Main Street.
6. Screening shall be installed along the north property line adjacent to the residential property subject to approval by the Board of Architectural Review.

7. All replacement windows shall be subject to approval by the Board of Architectural Review.
8. The parking lot and spaces shall be square to the north property line.

Mr. Feverston stated that the Special Approval application had been reviewed by the BAR, and they recommended that it be approved subject to the above-stated conditions.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mr. Patrick Hansford, Atelier Design representing the applicant, stated that there was an attempt to utilize the existing barn located at the rear of the property, however, they could not find an appropriate use for the barn.

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

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Variance application submitted by Thomas G. Pavey, DDS, for the property located at 50 North Main Street subject to the following conditions:

1. The parking and paving setback along the east property line shall be a minimum of 6 feet.
2. The minimum number of parking spaces shall be 14 spaces.
3. An access and parking easement between this property and the property to the north shall be submitted to the City and subject to approval by the Law Director granting vehicular access from the property to the north and the use of the 4 parking spaces located along the north property line.

Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by Thomas G. Pavey, DDS, for the property located at 50 North Main Street subject to the following conditions:

1. The wood siding used on the building addition shall match the siding on the existing building.
2. New roofing material shall match the existing roofing material.
3. Building and roof colors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.

4. Screening shall be installed along the north property line adjacent to the residential property subject to approval by the Board of Architectural Review.
5. All replacement windows shall be subject to approval by the Board of Architectural Review.
6. The parking lot and spaces shall be square to the north property line.

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

Mr. Chappell arrived at this time.

Centerville Design Associates - Variance/Planning Commission
Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the applications submitted by Centerville Design Associates to be located in the Architectural Preservation District at 28 South Main Street.

The Variance application is requesting the use of a stucco-like material for siding and a reduction in parking spaces from 13 to 9 spaces.

The Special Approval application is proposing the remodeling of the existing building for an office use.

The stucco-like material, dryvit, is proposed to be used on the west and south walls of the building which faces South Main Street and Weller Avenue, respectively. The north and east walls will remain unchanged other than being painted. The applicant intends to seal off the windows, vent and door on the west building elevation and remove a door and porch on the south elevation with the dryvit material. A garage door on the west elevation that has been sealed off will be utilized as the main entrance and will have a canopy above it. The carriage lanterns from the applicant's existing business, currently located at 65 West Franklin Street, will be used at the main entrance.

Mr. Feverston explained that dryvit is constructed of a styrofoam base that is anchored to the wall surface itself and it is bonded together with a fiber mesh that is embedded into the styrofoam. The horizontal and vertical features that imitate stone are grooved into the styrofoam mesh. The final coat is an acrylic troweled material that has a texture of sandstone.

Staff recommended that the Variance application be denied the use of the stucco-like material and approve the reduction in the number of parking spaces based on the following analysis:

1. The building materials used for the wall surface is a structural clay tile having a wire mesh texture to the tile face on the Main Street elevation and a smooth texture on the other three (3) elevations. Each tile measures larger than standard brick, but less than cement block (about 5 inches by 10 inches). This type of building material was used during the 1920's through the 1940's, approximately, and is no longer available today. Door and window openings have been patched or closed off by using cement block, wood, brick or stucco.
2. Dryvit is a stucco-like material that is prohibited by the Zoning Ordinance. The use of stucco or a stucco-like material is prohibited because it was not a building material used in the APD nor is it compatible with the wall materials used on surrounding buildings.
3. The color and texture of dryvit is very uniform which is uncharacteristic of the APD. The texture of dryvit approximates the texture of sandstone.
4. A dryvit wall surface may be sculpted to imitate mortar lines of a brick or stone surface. The "mortar" lines shown on the plans submitted are spaced too far apart (4 feet by 2 feet) to imitate the limestone walls commonly used in Centerville.
5. The former use of the building was wholesale sale of clothing items with a portion of the building used as retail. The number of parking spaces required for this use was legal-nonconforming.
6. The rear gravel parking lot was inefficiently used. The proposed parking arrangement maximizes the total number of parking spaces that may be placed on this lot.
7. There currently is on-street parking available along both sides of Weller Avenue.

Staff recommended that the Special Approval application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. A revised plan for the loading dock shall be submitted by the developer and subject to approval by the City Engineer.
2. A walkway shall be constructed along Weller Avenue from the parking lot to the front entrance subject to approval by the Planning Department.

3. The curb-cut onto Weller Avenue shall be widened to accommodate one (1) entrance lane and one (1) exit lane.

The Board of Architectural Review (BAR) reviewed this application and recommended that the dryvit material not be used since that particular material is not compatible with the APD even though the existing building is unique by virtue of the different building materials used in its original construction and additional building alterations. In addition, the following conditions were recommended:

1. Should the variance request to use a stucco-like siding material be denied, any new siding material used on this building, whether to face the entire building or to fill existing wall openings, shall be subject to approval by the BAR.
2. Revised building elevations shall be submitted by the developer and subject to approval by the BAR that incorporates the following:
 - a. A window shall be installed on each side of the main entrance on the west elevation. Approximately 33% of the front building wall shall be devoted to wall openings (doors and windows).
 - b. The italianate are over the door shall be removed.
3. Building and roof colors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
4. All exterior lighting and lighting fixtures shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. Plans and drawings for all signs shall be subject to approval by the BAR.
6. All doors and windows shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
7. The east property line shall be screened subject to approval by the Planning Department.

Mr. Feverston pointed out that staff would encourage the applicant to retain as many of the trees along the east property line as possible which would satisfy part of the screening requirement.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mr. Alexander Luque, applicant, stated that their decision to use dryvit as a siding material was made based on the architectural design of the exterior as well as the physical limitations of the building. He stated that they are trying to work with a set of circumstances existing which were not created by them. The building is constructed of many different types of building materials with an unattractive end result. He stated that they are trying to upgrade the quality and look of the building which is the nature of the business that will occupy this location. Mr. Luque stated that in the review of the project by the BAR, staff indicated that because of the shape and proportions of the building, any type of wood lap siding would not be a very suitable or attractive material in this installation to cover the building. He stated that at this point, they are at a loss as to what type of siding to use on the building and would be more than willing to get direction from the Planning Commission.

Ms. Joanne Ropp, 51 Weller Avenue, stated that she would welcome the proposed changes and improvements to the building. She stated that what she sees as uncharacteristic of the District is that this building has been permitted to look like it has for so many years.

Mr. Paul Striebel, 175 West Franklin Street, stated that the applicant had done an excellent job in trying to solve a design problem. If the material itself is not look at as dryvit, but rather what its potential abilities are to conform with the shapes and proportions that are required by the building, the materials are very appropriate for the project.

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

Mrs. Simmons stated that she sees no alternatives suggested for the siding material.

Mr. Schwab stated that a facing brick could be used, however, that becomes a matter of economics. He stated that look is not perhaps the appearance they want for their building. Mr. Schwab stated that staff, as well as the BAR, are very sympathetic to the problems the applicant is experiencing with the siding material possibilities. He stated, however, that the Design Review Criteria states that the building should be compatible to the surrounding buildings. The use of dryvit on this building would not be compatible with the area.

The members of Planning Commission felt that the use of the siding material should be the decision of the BAR, and therefore, agreed the variance should be denied.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to deny the variance request by Centerville Design Associates for the use of a stucco-like siding material, and a reduction in parking spaces. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-1 with Mr. Hosfeld voting no.

Mr. Tate explained the appeal process to the applicant.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted by Centerville Design Associates, 28 South Main Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. Any new siding material used on this building, whether to face the entire building or to fill existing wall openings, shall be subject to approval by the Board of Architectural Review.
2. Revised building elevations shall be submitted by the developer and subject to approval by the Board of Architectural Review that incorporates the following:
 - a. A window shall be installed on each side of the main entrance on the west elevation. Approximately 33% of the front building wall shall be devoted to wall openings (doors and windows).
 - b. The italianate arch over the door shall be removed.
3. Building and roof colors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
4. All exterior lighting and lighting fixtures shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. Plans and drawings for all signs shall be subject to approval by the BAR.
6. All doors and windows shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
7. The east property line shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
8. A revised plan for the loading dock shall be submitted by the developer and subject to approval by the City Engineer.
9. A walkway shall be constructed along Weller Avenue from the parking lot to the front entrance subject to approval by the Planning Department.

10. The curb cut onto Weller Avenue shall be widened to accommodate one (1) entrance lane and one (1) exit lane.

Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Joseph J. Mott - Variance of Number of Garage Spaces

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Variance application submitted by Joseph J. Mott for the property located at 1610 East Alexandersville-Bellbrook Road. The zoning on the property is R-1a, Single Family Residential which requires a minimum 40,000 square foot lot. The request is to place 6 garage spaces on the property, which exceeds the 4 spaces permitted under the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Although there is not a request for a specific type, size or location, the applicant is proposing 4 additional garage spaces on the south side of the existing 2-car garage. The Variance application is only asking for permission to place the additional 4 spaces on the property.

Staff recommended that the Variance application be approved based on the size of the property. This property is significantly larger than the minimum lot size the R-1a zoning district requires. Mr. Schwab stated further that a property zoned R-1d, minimum lot size 15,000 square feet, would allow the same number of garage spaces as the property in question. Staff felt that the size of the applicant's property would allow the additional garage spaces and stay within the normal setback requirements, which is not an unreasonable request.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mrs. Helen Rasor, 7121 Bigger Lane, stated that the residents in the area have the right to know what type of building is going to be constructed and the locations of that building on the property, as well as how the building is going to be used.

Mr. Jim Moore, 7111 Bigger Lane, stated that 11 residents have to drive by the proposed building to get to their homes and would ask the Planning Commission to consider the size and purpose of the building. He indicated that the use is important to the residents since they do not want to see an eyesore created.

Mr. Joseph J. Mott, applicant, stated that the building will be of custom quality construction with siding and windows to match the existing home. He indicated that he has been told that roof shingles can also be obtained that match the home. Mr. Mott stated that addition will not be connected to the existing garage in an effort to save all the trees, with the exception of one. The purpose of the new building is to park his boat and van because the existing garage is not of an adequate size to do so.

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

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Variance application submitted by Joseph J. Mott, for the property located at 1610 East Alexandersville-Bellbrook Road, to allow a total of 6 garage spaces on the property. Mr. Hosfeld seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Lyle A. Williams - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Special Approval application submitted by Lyle A. Williams requesting approval to convert an existing garage and portion of the existing residence to a retail use at his property located at 37-39 East Ridgeway Road in the Architectural Preservation District (APD). Construction of a new garage to the rear of the property is also being proposed as a part of this application.

This property was the subject of a Variance request some years ago to convert the existing single-family home to a double. The Planning Commission approved that application and the alterations were made. The lower level of the unit facing Maple Avenue is proposed to be utilized as a craft store. The existing garage, in part, will also be used as a craft store. Additional parking and 4 garage spaces will be added to the rear of the property.

Staff recommended that the Special Approval application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. A striping plan for the parking lot shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
2. All new doors and windows shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
3. All new siding added to the existing garage shall match the existing siding.
4. Building and roof colors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. The curb-cut onto Maple Avenue shall be widened to accommodate one (1) entrance lane and one (1) exit lane.
6. The north and west property lines shall be screened subject to approval by the Planning Department.

Mr. Feverston stated that the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) had reviewed this application and recommended that it be approved subject to the above conditions. Further, a recommendation was made to permit a gate in the screened area to the west because the applicant owns both properties. This will allow maintenance equipment to be used between both properties.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by Lyle A. Williams, for the property located at 37-39 East Ridgeway Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. A striping plan for the parking lot shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
2. All new doors and windows shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
3. All new siding added to the existing garage shall match the existing siding.
4. Building and roof colors shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
5. The curb-cut onto Maple Avenue shall be widened to accommodate one (1) entrance lane and one (1) exit lane.
6. The north and west property lines shall be screened subject to approval by the Planning Department.

Mr. Chappell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Bob Ross Mercedes-Benz - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by Bob Ross Mercedes-Benz, requesting approval of an additional 14,700 square foot office and service building to the dealership located at 85 Loop Road. The zoning on the parcel is B-PD, Business Planned Development.

The west elevation is to be constructed with a combination of building materials including split-faced concrete brick, beige brick, and a yellow brick that will create a striping pattern. The service bay doors will face to the south.

Staff recommended to approve the Special Approval application subject to the following conditions:

1. A five (5) foot wide sidewalk shall be required to be constructed along SR 48 in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineering Department.

2. The southeast portion of the property shall be enlarged by the addition of land from the adjacent parcel so that there is a twenty (20) foot side yard from the new building to the east property line.
3. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineering Department.
4. A twenty (20) foot fire lane shall be required around the entire building subject to approval by the Washington Township Fire Department.

Mr. Schwab stated that perhaps Planning Commission should seek additional information to determine exactly how the west elevation will appear. With the mixture of building materials proposed for use, as well as viewing the colored rendering submitted with the application, staff was unsure as to how the building will look in appearance.

Mr. Dan Wycoff, project designer, stated that the building on both the east and west facades are composed of 3 courses of standard base concrete block with a panel (8" x 8") brick for the fourth course. That pattern repeats up the side of the building.

Mr. Dave Hall, attorney representing Bob Ross, stated that they would like to have approval of their project with the staff recommendations with the exception of the requirement of the 5 foot sidewalk to be constructed along SR 48. He stated that they can see no purpose in constructing a sidewalk extending from Loop Road south to the exit ramp of I-675. He stated further that the zoning amendments forwarded from the Zoning Task Force, recommends that sidewalks not be required as a condition of building additions.

Mr. Looper stated that the intent of the Zoning Task Force is to provide sidewalks throughout the City; however, in certain instances where sidewalks are not present in the area, that condition does not seem appropriate.

Mr. Foland indicated that many people employed at businesses north of Loop Road walk south each day to get home and, therefore, would use this missing link in the sidewalk system.

Mr. Schwab stated that the Zoning Ordinance amendments as currently drafted would not require sidewalks on this property, however, this amendment is still open for great debate by the Planning Commission as well as Council. He stated, further, that a sidewalk in the public right-of-way in this area would be in

the limited access are for I-675. A technicality is that the State of Ohio would have to agree for the necessity of the sidewalk, as well as the design and construction which is likely to take some time.

Mr. Hall indicated that with the sidewalk at the cost of \$30,000, the project by Bob Ross would have to be reconsidered at this time.

Mr. Looper stated that the Ordinance is in place to give the City a tool to acquire sidewalks that are so badly needed to complete the sidewalk system.

Mr. Paul Striebel, Paul Striebel and Associates, stated that this particular requirement creates a hardship on the businessman. He stated that sidewalk installation is a costly item and if the City wants sidewalks, they should pay for them.

Mr. Tate suggested that the application be approved with the sidewalk requirement and should the applicant desire to do so, the application can be appealed to Council.

Mr. Farquhar stated that this could result in a unique situation depending upon the State restrictions. He recommended that if the Planning Commission like the project, it should be approved with the sidewalk requirement, the applicant could then exercise their right to appeal, and a legal examination of the situation could be done. Mr. Farquhar stated that the project would have to be approved with the sidewalks since no variance application was filed.

MOTION: Mr. Chappell moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by Bob Ross Buick, Inc. for Bob Ross Mercedes-Benz, 85 Loop Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. A five (5) foot wide sidewalk shall be required to be constructed along SR 48 in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineering Department.
2. The southeast portion of the property shall be enlarged by the addition of land from the adjacent parcel so that there is a twenty (20) foot side yard from the new building to the east property line.

3. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineering Department.
4. A twenty (20) foot fire lane shall be required around the entire building subject to approval by the Washington Township Fire Department.

Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Elmer [unclear]", located at the bottom right of the page.