

**CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, June 9, 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; Mr. Robert Hosfeld; Mrs. Marian Simmons (where noted). Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney; Mr. Steve King, Administrative Assistant.

Approval of the minutes of the May 26, 1987, Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 26, 1987, as written. Mr. Chappell seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 with Mr. Hosfeld abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Centerville Mill, Inc. - Variance/Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Feverston stated that Centerville Mill has requested that their application for a variance and Planning Commission Special Approval be withdrawn.

Mr. Tate stated that the public hearing would not be held since the applicant had requested that the applications be withdrawn.

Mr. Hall excused himself from the meeting at this time.

J. S. Davis Company - Variance/Major Use Special Approval

Mr. Feverston reviewed the variance application submitted by the J. S. Davis Company, property located on the south side of Loop Road east of the Voss Auto Dealership. The zoning on this property is B-PD. The applicant is requesting the following variances:

1. Building setback along I-675;
2. Parking and paving setbacks throughout the development;
3. Parking stall configuration;
4. Parking lot landscaping; and,
5. Sign setback.

Mr. Feverston stated that the applicants are also asking for a Major Use Special Approval since the zoning on the property is B-PD and, therefore, required an overall development plan to approve specific sites on that property. The request is construct three (3) auto dealerships on this 6.5 acre parcel.

The total development requires 96 parking spaces and the proposed number of parking spaces is 381. Three (3) curb cuts are proposed to service this entire site of which staff feels two will have considerable site distance problems. Four (4) lots will be created in this particular development--three(3) lots to be the independent auto dealerships and the fourth (4th), with no access to Loop Road, to be a common storage area for the three (3) facilities. This is the subject of the variance for the parking lot configuration. No aisles would be provided in this common storage area which would stack vehicles four (4) to five (5) deep. The building setback along I-675 is requested to be zero (0) feet. The variance for parking or paving is requesting a four (4) foot setback along Loop Road, a five (5) foot setback along I-675 and the west property line. The Zoning Ordinance requires a 20 foot setback along the perimeter of a lot. An additional variance is requested to allow a 0 to 2.5 foot along all other lot lines and the requirement of interior setback is 10 feet.

Mr. Feverston stated that the three (3) lots exceed the amount of landscaping area required in the Zoning Ordinance; however, a variance is being requested to waive the five (5) percent landscaping required in the fourth (4th) lot which is to be the common parking area. A variance for a six (6) foot sign setback, rather than required 25 foot setback, is being requested for three (3) signs to be located along the same side of each of the driveways.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the following staff analysis:

1. All buildings shown on the development plan meet the minimum building setback along I-675. No variances are shown.
2. The requested parking lot setback variances allows for total development of this portion of the site with minimal allowances for buffers or the creation of landscaped areas between interior parking areas, Loop Road, I-675 or the adjoining property to the west.
3. The required parking lot setback of twenty (20) feet along Loop Road, I-675, and the west property line would create a hardship to the property owner.
4. A parking lot setback on either side of the north and east lot lines of the common area for vehicle storage would be impractical for maneuvering vehicles to and from this lot.

5. The granting variance for the parking lot layout in the common area and along the west lot line of Parcel "A" would allow for efficient storage of vehicles. This area would not be used for customer or employee parking for which these requirements were intended for.
6. Landscaping within all parking areas of this proposed development exceeds the minimum requirement of five (5) percent.
7. There exists no unique situation or hardship concerning the proposed parcels in regards to granting a sign setback variance.

Staff recommended that the action on the various variances be as follows:

The recommendation of staff is to:

1. Deny the requested building setback variance
2. Approve a variance to allow a ten (10) foot parking lot setback along Loop Road and the west property line.
3. Approve a variance to allow a five (5) foot parking lot setback along I-675.
4. Deny the variance request for a 0 - 2.5 foot parking lot setback for the lot lines between parcels "A" and "B" and "B" and "C". A setback of ten (10) feet shall be required.
5. Approve the variance request to allow a zero (0) foot parking lot setback on both sides of the lot lines between the common vehicle storage area and parcels "A", "B", and "C".
6. Approve the requested variance for the parking stall configuration in the common area and along the west lot line of Parcel "A".
7. Approve the requested variance for parking lot landscaping.
8. Deny the requested sign setback variance.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dave Wheeler and Mr. Morgan Davis were present to review the application. Mr. Wheeler stated that he felt that their project was unique based on the fact that the auto dealership business needs to display their projects and in screen them. Further, this particular property is the last of the properties along the south side of Loop Road to develop and the intent is to develop it close to the same fashion as the current auto dealerships.

Mr. Wheeler stated they feel that the request for a setback variance along I-675 is justified based on the fact that the State owned right-of-way will be very unlikely to move and become a developable property in the future. The variance to allow a 10 foot setback along Loop Road and the west property line would be consistent with the other developed properties in the area.

Mr. Wheeler stated that in order to provide as much parking on the property as possible, they were requesting the parking variances for the lot lines between the three (3) parcels. He stated that although they would like to have the sign setback variance for better exposure to vehicular traffic, they would not object to the staff recommendation.

Mr. Wheeler stated that in review of the Major Use application, they did not object to any of the staff recommendations with the exception of the access onto this property. He stated that it is their feeling that the property can be regraded and the vegetation cleared from the areas that pose a sight distance problem. He indicated that it would be very difficult to provide one (1) access to be used by three (3) auto dealerships. Mr. Wheeler stated that if improvements could be made to provide a better sign distance, they would still request the three (3) access points. He stated that they would like to work with staff to achieve this improvement.

Mrs. Simmons arrived at this time.

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

Mr. Looper stated that he was not comfortable in approving the numerous variances being requested and felt that the proposed development plan was an overdevelopment of that particular property. He expressed concern as to whether the Planning Commission would be acting properly by considering plans for buildings that are not going to be constructed for quite sometime. Mr. Looper suggested that the applications be tabled until a solid proposal can be reviewed other than just a concept plan.

Mr. Wheeler stated that this plan was submitted principally for the development of parcel "A", however, a concept plan had to be submitted also for the concept of parcels "B" and "C" to comply with the Major Use Special Approval process. He stated that even though the entire site will be tight, they had to prepare the site plan in this manner in order to get three (3) dealerships on the property.

Mr. Tate stated that the concept was not objectionable, however, it would require a lot of work especially with the curb cut situation. He indicated he would not be willing to approve the Major Use Special Approval application without seeing more definite information. Mr. Tate stated that the variance along Loop Road, even though the other dealerships are closer to Loop Road, would create a problem simply because of the lot frontage being on the curve of the road.

Mr. Looper suggested that the applicants submit further information for the Planning Commission to consider at their next meeting. This information should include a plan for lot "A" that provides more concrete detail; a redesign of the curb cuts that provides detail and addresses the concern with the sight distance problems; detailed information on the parking structure which would be a possibility on lot "D" sometime in the future.

Mr. Wheeler stated that should the Major Use application be approved, they would submit detailed plans of lot "B" and "C" for review at the time of development.

Mr. Looper stated that variances should not be granted until the sight distance problems are solved. He stated that variances could essentially be approved for something that will just not work. It may be necessary to have one (1) common curb cut for the entire site in order to address the problem.

Mr. Hosfeld indicated that he felt that the concept was workable, however, more detail should be submitted prior to approved of the plan.

Mr. Wheeler asked for clarification as to what concerns should be addressed for review at the next meeting.

Mr. Tate stated that the sight distance problems, curb cuts, and building locations are the major issues which with more work and detail may make some of the variance unnecessary.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to table the Variance and Major Use Special Approval applications until June 30, 1987. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Mr. Hosfeld excused himself from the meeting at this time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESSCenterville Mill, Inc. - Lot Split

Mr. Feverston reviewed the request for a lot split by Centerville Mill, Inc., that was tabled by the Planning Commission in August, 1986. He stated that Centerville Mill has purchased property from Penn Central which extends from East Franklin Street north approximately one half (1/2) mile. The standards for lot area have increased from 10,000 to 20,000 square feet in the new Zoning Ordinance and lot width is not 150 feet instead of 100 feet.

Staff recommended approval of the lot split subject to the following conditions:

1. The ownership of the new lot shall be legally tied to the owner of the Centerville Mill parcel(s) of land and shall not be permitted to be a separate lot for sale or improvement without the approval of the City;
2. The deed restriction shall specifically prohibit the creation of a new access driveway from the new lot to East Franklin Street unless approved by the City of Centerville;
3. The City of Centerville shall be included as a party to all the deed restrictions with the approval of the City required before any restriction may be waived or modified.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to removed the Lot Split request by Centerville Mill, Inc., from the table. Mr. Chappell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Tate stated that he did not feel that we could eliminate the access the applicant had to his property from East Franklin Street.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Lot Split request by Centerville Mill, Inc., subject to the following conditions:

1. The ownership of the new lot shall be legally tied to the owner of the Centerville Mill parcel(s) of land and shall not be permitted to be a separate lot for sale or improvement without the approval of the City;
2. The City of Centerville shall be included as a party to all the deed restrictions with the approval of the City required before any restriction may be waived or modified.

Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-1 with Mr. Swartz voting no.

Mr. Hall returned to the meeting at this time.

Mr. Feverston reviewed the Record Plan for Plymouth Colony located as a north extension of Pine Frost Drive. The zoning on the 8.5 acre parcel is R-lc. The new subdivision provides 13 lots--12 new lots and the one that (1) currently exists. The Park District has requested that a fee be paid for the parkland requirement other than land dedication.

Mr. Feverston stated that during the Planning Commission Special Approval review of this project, the Planning Commission did not feel that park access easements between Pine Park Drive to Pelbrook Park were necessary.

Staff recommended approval of the Record Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans for water lines and fire hydrants shall be subject to the approval of the Washington Township Fire Dept.
2. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer.
3. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to the recording of the plat, a performance bond in an amount acceptable to the City Engineer shall be posted by the developer with the City of Centerville.
4. Prior to the signing of the record plan by the City, the developer shall pay the fee-in-lieu of parkland dedication. The amount of the fee shall be determined by an appraisal by a qualified independent appraiser approved by the Planning Commission in accordance with the provisions of City Ordinance 15,86, The City Parkland Dedication Ordinance.
5. The street name, Pine Park Place, be changed and the new name be subject to approval by the Planning Department.

Mr. Bob Feldmann, Centerville-Washington Park District, stated that the park access is important to move people from the Langdon Drive area to the park. It is, therefore, the Park District's recommendation to require a two (2) foot concrete walkway within a ten (10) foot easement between lots 10 and 11.

Mr. Chappell asked who would maintain the walkway.

Mr. Feldmann stated that the Park District would own the two (2) foot walkway and maintain it through the ten (10) foot easement.

Mr. Victor Griemann, developer, stated that he still objected to the park access from the cul-de-sac development. The parking along the street does not allow room for visitors to the homes as well as the park. He stated that should the walk be required, the Park District should be responsible for its construction with the money that is being paid to them.

Mr. Looper stated that since the original Planning Commission Special Approval waived the walkway, he felt the approval should remain the same with the Record Plan.

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to recommend approval of the Record Plan for Plymouth Colony to Council subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans for water lines and fire hydrants shall be subject to the approval of the Washington Township Fire Dept.
2. Detailed stormwater drainage calculations and plans incorporating retention and/or detention and erosion control during construction shall be approved by the City Engineer.
3. In lieu of completion of the required improvements prior to the recording of the plat, a performance bond in an amount acceptable to the City Engineer shall be posted by the developer with the City of Centerville.
4. Prior to the signing of the record plan by the City, the developer shall pay the fee-in-lieu of parkland dedication. The amount of the fee shall be determined by an appraisal by a qualified independent appraiser approved by the Planning Commission in accordance with the provisions of City Ordinance 15,86, The City Parkland Dedication Ordinance.
5. The street name, Pine Park Place, be changed and the new name be subject to approval by the Planning Department.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

