

**CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, September 27, 1988**

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

Attendance: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr., Chairman; Mr. Robert Looper; Mr. Robert Chappell; Mrs. Marian Simmons; Mr. Arthur Foland; Mr. Stanley Swartz; Mr. Robert Hosfeld. 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 13, 1988, Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of September 13, 1988, as written. Mr. Hosfeld seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

COMMUNICATIONS

Thomas Harrigan Chrysler/Plymouth - Reconsideration of Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab stated that a letter was received from Mr. Dave Hall, the attorney representing Thomas Harrigan, requesting reconsideration of the variance application denied by the Planning Commission on August 30, 1988. An appeal of that decision was filed with the City Council, however, it was one (1) day too late. The appeal was, therefore, not accepted by Council.

Mr. Dave Hall was present to discuss his request. He stated that they would appreciate the Planning Commission reconsidering their sign variance application in terms of allowing his client the same sign privileges that have been granted to other car dealerships, for freestanding signage, in the surrounding area. He stated that if the Planning Commission were willing to review a variance that would be consistent with sign area and sign setback as others in the area, he would request that the application be tabled until specific information can be submitted for formal review. Mr. Hall indicated that there intent is to amend the application for consideration by the Planning Commission and not to simply allow the applicant a second opportunity to appeal the decision to Council.

MOTION: Mr. Chappell moved to reconsider the variance application submitted by Thomas Harrigan Chrysler/Plymouth, 95 Loop Road, originally denied by the Planning Commission on August 30, 1988. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to table the variance application submitted by Thomas Harrigan Chrysler/Plymouth, 95 Loop Road, pending additional information to be submitted by the applicant for review on October 11, 1988. Mr. Chappell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Bank One - Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request submitted by Bank One, 6000 Far Hills Avenue, for a wall sign that conveys a moving message that is changed by a computer control. The zoning on the property is B-2, General Business. The subject of the variance is the 2 foot 6 inch high, by 21 foot 10 inch long portion of the sign with the computerized message board that is able to scroll and flash messages on the wall of the building.

Mr. Schwab reviewed the following points in the staff analysis:

1. Subsection E. Prohibited Signs and Sign Characteristics of the Sign Section of the Zoning Ordinance states that "Any sign which conveys at any time the visual sensation or appearance of motion, or presents a non-constant visual image to the eye of an observer shall be prohibited".
2. The proposed "Message Center" sign would create a distraction to motorists along SR 48.
3. This business property is a corner property. The applicant has 69 feet of building frontage on SR 48 and 93 feet on Whipp Road. The applicant has the option of locating wall sign(s) equaling 103 square feet facing SR 48 or 140 square feet facing Whipp Road. There is ample sign area available for the applicant to display commercial or non-commercial information.
4. There is currently a wall sign facing Whipp Road. This sign must be removed before any sign is installed on the SR 48 frontage.

Staff recommended that the variance application be denied based on no unique circumstances that would warrant such a sign.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mr. Charles Held, Sr. Vice-President of Bank One, stated that the site is currently undergoing an extensive exterior improvement involving Bank One as well as Siebenthaler Garden Center. He stated that there is currently a message board in place and they desire to modernize that concept. Mr. Held stated that it is not their intention to provide moving signage, pulsating signage, or any rotation of the signage, but to have the ability to change

the signage daily representing both messages that Bank One and Siebenthaler would want to convey relative to business issues as well as to promote any community activities that would seem to be appropriate.

Mr. Foland expressed concern as to the possibility of placing an effective message on the proposed sign without movement, based on the size of the sign shown.

Mr. Held indicated it could be done through the use of abbreviations.

Mr. Chappell asked if the message board would be limited to one (1) line.

Mr. Dick Blommel, Blommel Sign Company, stated that it would be limited to one (1) line.

Mr. Schwab stated that his concern is that this sign will most likely need the flexibility as other message board signs to be three (3) or four (4) lines in order to convey the desired message. The other concern is that of a policing problem to determine how often the message is being changed.

Mr. Hosfeld asked how the variance request was required--if it was staff's impression that the sign would move.

Mr. Schwab stated that in all the discussions that staff had with the applicant or their representative, it was with the idea that the sign would be scrolling or moving. The impression was never that the sign would simply be a changeable sign with the convenience of a computer to change those messages.

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

Mr. Looper stated that he did not have any objections to the sign, however, some stipulation should be placed on it to regulate the number of times it could be changed. Mr. Looper felt that changes should not be made more than once per day.

Mr. Tate stated that if the sign is installed in the way the applicant is describing in the public hearing, a variance would not be required.

Mr. Farquhar stated that if the sign does ^{NOT} flash, move or scroll, it would not require a variance. If it would start to flash, move or scroll in the future, it would be a basis for prosecution.

September 27, 1988

PC

Page 4

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to deny the Variance application requested by Bank One, 6000 Far Hills Avenue, for a message center based on the grounds that a Variance is not needed because it has been represented that the sign will not scroll, flash or move, and that it will be the nature of a sign that would be a hand-changed sign which is permitted under the Ordinance. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

