CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING Tuesday, November 10, 1987

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

Attendance: Mr. Elmer Tate Jr., Chairman; Mr. Robert Looper; Mr. Stanley Swartz; Mr. Arthur Foland; Mr. Robert Hosfeld; Mr. Robert Chappell (where noted). Absent: Mrs. Marian Simmons. Also present: Mr. Alan Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney.

Approval of the minutes of the October 27, 1987, Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of October 27, 1987, as written. Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mr. Hosfeld abstaining.

COMMUNICATIONS

ALL STATES

Mr. Schwab stated that a request from Mr. Dave Hall, an attorney representing Centerville Mill, is asking that a variance application and a Planning Commission Special Approval Application withdrawn at the June 9, 1987, Planning Commission be placed on the agenda for the next Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Schwab explained that at the June 9, 1987, meeting, Mr. Hall stated that the applications were to be withdrawn. On July 14, 1987, the City received a letter from Mr. Will Wilson, applicant, stating that the applications were intended to be withdrawn for the June 9, 1987, meeting only. Mr. Schwab stated that the Planning Commission minutes reflected that the applications were withdrawn from consideration. The letter received from Mr. Hall is asking that "withdrawn" mean only withdrawn from the June 9, 1987, meeting.

Mr. Schwab stated that if the Planning Commission honors the request, new prints and materials will have to be submitted since all copies, with the exception of a file copy, were not retained and legal advertising will be required to set a new public hearing for the variance.

Mr. Chappell arrived at this time.

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to deny the request for Centerville Mill asking that Applications V-87-53 and PC-87-54 be reconsidered as active applications. New applications must be filed by the applicant should he desire project review. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 with Mr. Chappell abstaining.

F. J. L.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Linclay Corporation - Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab reviewed the variance application submitted by the Linclay Corporation for the Cross Pointe Centre Shopping Center located on the northeast corner of Alex-Bell Road and SR 48. The zoning on the parcel is Business Planned Development, B-PD. The two (2) variances requested involve the total wall sign area permitted and the location of wall signs.

Wall signage permitted is 1.5 square feet per linear foot of the building frontage and the applicant is requesting 2 additional wall signs facing I-675 with the size unspecified. The location of wall signage is permitted on one (1) wall only and the request is to have wall signage placed on 2 walls. Wall signage is currently in place on the building wall facing Alex-Bell Road. The 2 additional wall signs are to be placed facing I-675 at the vacant anchor store and the existing Marshall's store.

Architectural changes are being made in terms of painting and placing canopies to the back of the building to improve the appearance. Some landscaping changes will also occur to enhance the appearance of the shopping center from I-675.

Staff felt that the site had no unique circumstances and, therefore, recommended that the variance application be denied. Mr. Schwab stated that Council had reviewed the architectural changes to the building and had no objection to them, however, they directed the applicant to review the signs with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bill Shelby, Mr. Peter Rayfuse and Ms. Barbara O'Brien, of the Linclay Corporation, were present to review the variance request.

Mr. Shelby stated that in opinions taken from clients coming into the center, the majority cited the need for signage on the back of the building to identify it as a shopping center and not an unattractive warehouse. He stated that they fell that the center can be improved and the proposed alternatives will accomplish that goal.

Mr. Peter Rayfuse stated that it was his task to treat the back side of the center as if it were the front. He stated that a paint color was chosen to match the existing brick used throughout the center. The colors of the arches and columns are still being studied so that it will be something that will not only wear well, but will not be out of date in a few years. Even though these changes will define the building as one, it still requires some signage to identify it as a shopping center. Mr.

Rayfuse stated that they have no further plans of extending the use of signs on the back wall beyond what is now being proposed. These 2 additional signs will be approximately 70 square feet which is one third (1/3) the size of the signs permitted on the front of the building. The canopies on the anchor spaces will be very gently up-lit to add value to the building at night from the back side. The landscaping is to reenforce the theme of unification on the back side of the center. Mr. Rayfuse stated that it is their feeling that the brick color, the painted arches, minimal signage and the landscaping will add to the appearance of the center.

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

- Mr. Foland asked if the drainage wall on the western portion of the site would have any improvement as a part of this proposal.
- Ms. O'Brien stated that their 1988 budget has allowed funds to repaint that area.
- Mr. Looper stated that he did not feel that the variance was necessary based on the lack of criteria for granting a variance. He stated that the provisions of limiting the use of wall signage on one (1) wall was included in the Zoning Ordinance to restrict sign proliferation along I-675.
- Mr. Chappell stated that he felt that the center did have some uniqueness since the center lacks identity from I-675.
- Mr. Hosfeld stated that with the other improvements being made to the building, the signs are more justifiable to help enhance the building.
- Mr. Chappell was concerned with the design of the signs to be placed on the back of the building.
- Mr. Farquhar indicated that a condition could be placed on the approval that the specific design of the signs be resubmitted to the Planning Commission for approval.
- Mr. Shelby stated that a condition could be placed on the approval that would state that the design would be miniature reproductions of the identification signs on the front of the building.

MOTION: Mr. Chappell moved to approve the Variance Application submitted by the Linclay Corporation for Cross Pointe Centre located on the northeast corner of Alex-Bell Road and SR 48 subject to the following conditions:

1. The two (2) wall signs not exceed 70 square feet each.

4 - 4 - 5

- 2. Approval of the specific drawings for design and color scheme be approved by the Planning Commission.
- 3. The drainage wall be repainted and approved by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Foland seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-2 with Mr. Looper and Mr. Swartz voting no.

NEW BUSINESS

The Castillo Company, Inc./State Farm Insurance - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application submitted by the Castillo Company, Inc. for State Farm Insurance requesting to construct a new service center on the northeast corner of Clyo Road and Centerville Business Parkway. The zoning on the property is Industrial Planned Development, I-PD. The new building will be 10,602 square feet in total office space and will provide 85 parking spaces which more than meets the requirement of 35 spaces. This parcel will have no direct access to Clyo Road, but will have 2 curb cuts to service the property from Centerville Business Parkway.

The building will be constructed of some type of red brick with brown trim. The pitched roof will be covered with a shingle color of medium to dark brown.

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

- 1. Only one (1) building frontage shall be used to display a wall sign; either the wall sign facing Clyo Road or the wall sign facing Centerville Business Parkway shall be eliminated.
- 2. A lighting plan detailing all exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
- 3. The dumpster shall have a concrete pad and shall be of a dimension to permit the front wheels of a trash disposal truck to rest on the pad while emptying the dumpster.

Mr. Dave Parker, representing the applicant, stated that they had no objection to the conditions recommended by staff.

8 . . (

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval Application submitted by The Castillo Company, INc., for State Farm Insurance, location to be the northeast corner of Clyo Road and Centerville Business Parkway, subject to the following conditions:

- Only one (1) building frontage shall be used to display a wall sign; either the wall sign facing Clyo Road or the wall sign facing Centerville Business Parkway shall be eliminated.
- 2. A lighting plan detailing all exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
- 3. The dumpster shall have a concrete pad and shall be of a dimension to permit the front wheels of a trash disposal truck to rest on the pad while emptying the dumpster.

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

<u>Centerville Storage Inns - Amendment to a Planning Commission</u> Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request by Centerville Storage Inns to amend their Planning Commission Special Approval application. He stated that the original application was amended in August of this year to allow the use of a glass type material on the front building and to repaint the unit doors a brown color. The Planning Commission approved that amendment to allow the use of the glass materials subject to the doors being repainted a brown color. Mr. Schwab explained that the applicant is now requesting that the condition to repaint the doors brown be deleted due to a void of the warranty by the manufacturer should the doors be repainted. In exchange for this consideration, the applicant would be willing to use the funds set aside for the repainting the doors, and instead apply them to additional landscaping on the south and east sides of the property.

Mr. Harry Misel, representing Centerville Storage Inns, stated that the request is being made in order to allow the extended warranty on the doors to remain in place. He stated that in contacting the manufacturer of the doors, his client was informed that if the paint were altered in any way, the warranty would be void. Mr. Misel stated that it was their feeling that perhaps additional landscaping would create a more attractive site and would downplay the objectionable color of the doors.

Mr. Foland stated that the use of the additional landscaping on the south and east sides of the buildings would not enhance the view from Bigger Road which is what most people see.

Mr. Hosfeld indicated that regardless of the warranty issue, he felt the doors should be painted as approved by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Chappell was concerned that significant changes to the plan were being considered without reopening the public hearing.

Mr. Farquhar stated that the Public Hearing was for the Variance Application only, not the Planning Commission Special Approval Application of which these amendments are being made.

The members of the Planning Commission indicated that would be interested in seeing information from the manufacturer stating why the warranty would be void as well as viewing a copy of the exact warranty.

Mr. George Oaks, representing Steeplechase Apartments, stated that their residents were anxiously awaiting the opening of the facility.

Mr. Schwab stated that the facility is renting space for storage use at this time. The only thing not being permitted is occupancy of the residential and office space.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to table the request by Centerville Storage Inns pending the submission of additional warranty information. Mr. Hosfeld seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Amer att