

**CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, May 26, 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. David Hall; Mr. Robert Chappell (where noted). Absent: Mrs. Marian Simmons; Mr. Robert Hosfeld. Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Steve Feverston, Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney.

Approval of the minutes of the May 12, 1987, Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 12, 1987, as written. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Tatone, Steve M. and Linda - Parking Setback Variance

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request by Steve M. and Linda Tatone for a variance of the parking or paving setback. The facility is located at 2 Loop Road and is zoned B-PD. The minimum setback of parking or paving in a B-PD zoning district is 20 feet from the right-of-way. The applicants are requesting a setback of 3 feet in order to provide additional parking area. The applicants are also requesting a site plan amendment in order to construct light poles to illuminate this new proposed parking area.

Staff recommended approval of the variance based on the following analysis:

1. The existing 35 foot front yard is the minimum that was required at the time the building was built. The current minimum front yard requirement is 50 feet.
2. At the time the building was built there was no requirement for a parking or paving setback from the right-of-way. The current ordinance required 20 feet of setback, which combined with the current 50 foot building setback would leave 30 feet of paved area permitted in front of a building. This is the amount of paved area that would be permitted by the granting of the variance.

Staff further recommended approval of the site plan amendment (special approval) subject to the following conditions:

1. The existing ground sign, if located within the proposed area to be paved, shall be required to have a landscaped area underneath the sign. The landscaped area shall be protected by a raised curb where adjacent to a paved area. The size, design, and curbing of the landscaped area shall be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Department in accordance with the standards contained in the sign section of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The detailed plans and specifications of the proposed exterior lighting fixtures shall be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Department.
3. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Tate asked if the sign location would remain as it presently exists.

A representative of the Tatones stated that the sign would remain in its present location and they would have no objection to providing any necessary landscaping at the base of the sign.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the variance as requested by Steve M. and Linda Tatone, property located at 2 Loop Road, and further approve the site plan amendment subject to the following conditions:

1. The existing ground sign, if located within the proposed area to be paved, shall be required to have a landscaped area underneath the sign. The landscaped area shall be protected by a raised curb where adjacent to a paved area. The size, design, and curbing of the landscaped area shall be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Department in accordance with the standards contained in the sign section of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The detailed plans and specifications of the proposed exterior lighting fixtures shall be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Department.
3. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer.

Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Chappell arrived at this time.

Ellis, Stephen - Parking and Building Setback Variance/Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application by Stephen Ellis requesting a variance of parking and building setback requirements. The parking or paving setback required on this B-2 zoned parcel, located on the rear lot of 6236 Far Hills Avenue (fronting Fireside Drive), is 10 feet along the front, side and rear yards- the applicant is requesting a 6 foot side and rear yard setback, and a 7 foot front yard setback. The building side and rear yard setback required is 20 feet and the applicant is proposing a 14 foot rear yard and a 13 foot side yard setback for the proposed office building.

Mr. Schwab stated that this lot was created under the old Zoning Ordinance and, therefore, is somewhat smaller in size. Staff felt that some relaxation should be made in the setback requirements since this lot was created under the old standards.

Staff recommended to approve the variance request except for the rear yard parking or paving setback which should maintain the 10 foot standard.

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by Stephen Ellis requesting approval to construct a 2-story 4,464 square foot office building on the rear lot of 6236 Far Hills Avenue to be accessed from Fireside Drive. The zoning on the parcel is B-2. The 16 parking spaces proposed do meet the required 15 space standard.

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

1. If the requested variances should not be granted, a revised set drawings shall be submitted, subject to approval by the City Planner, incorporating the required building and parking lot setbacks.
2. The median opening along Fireside Drive shall be widened to standards acceptable to the City Engineer to allow for full vehicular movement at the driveway intersection.
3. The dumpster shall be screened subject to approval by the City Planner.
4. All exterior lighting shall be screened subject to approval by the City Planner.
5. Stormwater detention and/or retention and erosion control during construction shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Swartz asked if the median opening along Fireside Drive would be done at the developer's expense.

Mr. Schwab indicated it would be done at the expense of the developer.

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the variance application submitted by Stephen Ellis for the property located at the rear of 6236 Far Hills Avenue (rear lot) with the exception of the rear yard parking or paving setback which must meet the 10 foot setback standard. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval submitted by Stephen Ellis for the property located at the rear of 6236 Far Hills Avenue (rear lot) subject to the following conditions:

1. If the requested variances should not be granted, a revised set drawings shall be submitted, subject to approval by the City Planner, incorporating the required building and parking lot setbacks.
2. The median opening along Fireside Drive shall be widened to standards acceptable to the City Engineer to allow for full vehicular movement at the driveway intersection, and shall be constructed at the expense of the developer.
3. The dumpster shall be screened subject to approval by the City Planner.
4. All exterior lighting shall be screened subject to approval by the City Planner.
5. Stormwater detention and/or retention and erosion control during construction shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Linclay Corporation - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application submitted by the Linclay Corporation proposing a 15,830 square foot retail building on a front outlot to Cross Pointe Centre, 101 East Alex-Bell Road. The zoning on this parcel of land is B-PD. The required parking spaces for this specific outlot is 65 spaces and the developers have proposed 121 parking spaces. No direct access will be May

provided from Alex-Bell Road. All access will be from within the center. The proposed architectural elevations will be very similar to the existing shopping center with a slightly taller roof line. All requirements, including landscaping, have been met in this particular proposal.

Mr. Schwab indicated that those persons residing in the area requesting notification of any application for this site were notified by mail.

Staff recommended approval of the application as requested.

Mr. Looper stated that the traffic flow situation in the shopping center does not work well, especially in the east end of the center. He stated that at the time the project was being reviewed, he thought the intent was to have a circulation pattern that would work much better than any of the existing shopping centers in the area.

Mr. Schwab stated that the Gold Circle parking area is the basic problem with the center. He stated that the Gold Circle people have indicated that they wish to do a major improvement to their parking area in the near future to extend the ring road.

Mr. Hall questioned the distance of the entrance to the proposed building from the entrance drive to the center.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff reviewed this plan at length and determined that to limit the access to the building along the west side in any way would not work very well. Should the access be eliminated and force traffic to the ring road where it would be forced to make an immediate turn into the site, it would create a more serious traffic problem.

Mr. Hall suggested having one point of access directly in the middle of the lot and looping the traffic around the entire building.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff felt that would be placing very tight restrictions on the property.

Mr. Swartz asked if additional lighting would be placed in the area of the new building.

Mr. Schwab stated that additional lighting would be placed on the site similar to what exists in the center.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by the Linclay Corporation for 15,830 square feet of retail space as requested. Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

Mr. Swartz asked if Planning Commission would consider adding a condition to the approval stating that any additional lighting placed on the property would be subject to staff approval.

FINAL MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by the Linclay Corporation for 15,830 square feet of retail space subject to the following condition:

1. If any changes are made to the approved lighting plan for Cross Pointe Centre, those changes are subject to the approval of staff.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

