

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, September 8, 1987

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

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

Approval of the minutes of the August 25, 1987, Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Swartz moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of August 25, 1987, as written. Mr. Hosfeld seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 with Mrs. Simmons abstaining.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Sheltenham - Planning Commission Special Approval

MOTION: Mr. Foland moved to remove Sheltenham from the table. Mr. Swartz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Mr. Denis Davin, Ryan Homes, stated that since the previous Planning Commission meeting, they had revised their plan addressing the concern of the park location. He stated that the original site of the park buffer area along Wilmington Pike had been greatly diminished and approximately 3 acres of land had been created for a park location in the area the Park District was interested in obtaining. Mr. Davin stated that they are not convinced that this new area is the best location, simply because they wanted to do something interesting and unique at the entrance to the subdivision.

Mr. Chappell arrived at this time.

Mr. Bob Feldmann, Centerville-Washington Park District, stated that the area shown as park on the revised plan is definitely in the right direction, however, they would have like some time to review the plan as to the frontage and detention basin issues prior to the meeting.

Mr. Davin stated that he was under the impression that the Park District would maintain the detention basin as a part of the park.

Mr. Feldmann stated that detention basins are normally not accepted by the Park District and, if they are, are done so because they benefit the park user if designed properly. He stated further, that if these detention areas are accepted, those areas are not calculated as usable acreage to satisfy the parkland requirement.

Mr. Tate asked if the detention areas are not permitted in the area of the parkland, how did the Park District suggest that the water runoff be handled.

Mr. Feldmann suggested that in some other subdivisions in the Township, underground piping is used successfully.

Mr. Davin stated that they are willing to give the Park District the appropriate acreage for a nature park which could include a stream for detention purposes; however, they would not be prepared and, under no circumstances, would provide piping as an alternative.

Mr. Foland asked staff if the revised plan addressed their concerns.

Mr. Schwab stated that he did not have an opportunity to review the plan prior to the meeting, and although it appears some of the issues have been addressed, he would like an opportunity to review it in detail. He did indicate, however, that the time period for review would expire prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Davin agreed to waive the time restrictions in order to give staff additional time to review the revised plan.

The majority of the Planning Commission preferred the revised plan locating the park site in the northwest portion of the development with stub streets provided to the north and west.

Mr. Davin stated that another issue is the improvements to Wilmington Pike. He stated that they are prepared to provide deceleration lanes to the project, however, not provide an additional paved lane of Wilmington Pike the entire length of the project.

Mr. Schwab stated that he informed Mr. Davin there was a possibility that improvements to Wilmington Pike could be a condition of approval at the record plan stage. He stated that numerous projects have been approved with these same kinds of conditions, and he simply wanted the applicant to be aware of this possibility.

MOTION: Mr. Chappell moved to table the Planning Commission Special Approval application for Sheltenham based on the agreement by Mr. Denis Davin, Ryan Homes for Sheltenham, until the next Planning Commission meeting in order to resolve the issues of concern. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

NEW BUSINESSVoss Chevrolet, Inc. - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application submitted by Voss Chevrolet, Inc., located at 100 Loop Road, requesting a building addition to the existing building. The zoning on the property is Business Planned Development, B-PD. The 5,850 square foot addition is to be constructed on the west elevation of the building for the purpose of expanding the service department area.

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

1. A sidewalk shall be constructed in front of the premises along Loop Road to standards acceptable to the City Engineer.
2. A plan detailing vehicular circulation and parking on the west side yard shall be submitted and subject to approval by the 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. Looper asked if the proper setbacks would be maintained if the construction were to take place as proposed.

Mr. Schwab indicated that the proper setbacks would be maintained.

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by Voss Chevrolet, Inc., subject to the following conditions:

1. A sidewalk shall be constructed in front of the premises along Loop Road to standards acceptable to the City Engineer.
2. A plan detailing vehicular circulation and parking on the west side yard shall be submitted and subject to approval by the 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. Chappell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

Anthony F. Staub - Planning Commission Special Approval

Mr. Schwab reviewed the application submitted by Anthony F. Staub requesting approval of a new retail/office building to be located at 121 and 133 North Main Street in the Architectural Preservation District (APD). He stated that this new building will be on the same site as 2 existing houses which have been approved for demolition by the City. The 2-story building, with the third floor being a walk out ground level from the rear, will provide some retail space on the lower levels and office space above. The building height is proposed to be 47 feet. The proposed 56 parking spaces meets the minimum parking requirement which is 55 spaces and would be located to the rear of the building. A single driveway will access the property, aligning with Iron Gate Park Drive.

Mr. Schwab reviewed some of the other building heights within the APD. The tallest buildings are located on West Franklin Street, those being the Southmont Building at 32 feet and the Michael Perkins Building approved to be 38 feet. The building setback would be towards the front of the property and approximate the adjacent Main Auto Parts building.

The Board of Architectural Review (BAR) reviewed this application at their last meeting and recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The overall height of the building not exceed thirty-eight (38) feet.
2. The design and alignment of the proposed curb cut across from Iron Gate Park Drive shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Department.
3. A brick sidewalk shall be constructed along North Main Street.
4. A screening plan shall be submitted for approval by the Planning Department to screen the residences along the west and north property line and the dumpster.
5. 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.
6. All exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
7. All building colors shall be subject to approval by the BAR.

8. Stormwater detention and/or retention and erosion control during construction shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Department.
9. The front elevation should be amended to include one or more offsets to break up the mass subject to approval by the BAR.
10. The window in the center of the second story should be raised to a height equal to those others on the second story.
11. The concrete island on the southeast corner of the driveway should be changed to landscaping to meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance.
12. All windows shall be subject to approval by the BAR.

Mr. Looper asked at what point the building height was measured.

Mr. Schwab stated that the building height would be measured from the front of the building up to the peak of the roof.

Mr. Paul Striebel, architect for the project, was present to review the application. He stated that they would have no objections to the recommended conditions for approval.

Mr. Chappell questioned Mr. Striebel's agreement to the suggested building height by the BAR. Mr. Chappell stated that if the building were approved with a maximum height of 38 feet, the elevations being reviewed by the Planning Commission would definitely not be the same with the change in building height.

Mr. Striebel stated that a change to a flat type roof would have to be made in order to satisfy the height requirements.

Mr. Chappell indicated that perhaps by using the arbitrary 38 foot figure, a compromise was being made to the intent and desire of the APD.

Mr. Schwab stated that the proposed building is very large and, in comparison to the smaller buildings typically seen in the APD, it will look massive.

Mr. Swartz agreed it will appear massive with the proposed building height, and the intent of the APD is to remain small in scale.

Mrs. Simmons stated that this particular building would not be located in the older sections of the APD and felt that it could fit in with the surrounding buildings very nicely.

Mr. Schwab stated that the maximum square footage of a building in the APD cannot exceed 5,000 square feet. He stated that staff started to review the plan and drew in the outlines of some of the other buildings that are considered to be large in the APD. The proposed building is particularly massive if you would view it from the rear property line which is developed as a single-family residential neighborhood. He stated that an extra 10 feet of roof is going to be a huge building facade.

MOTION: Mr. Chappell moved to approve the Planning Commission Special Approval application submitted by Anthony F. Staub for property located at 121 and 133 North Main Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. The design and alignment of the proposed curb cut across from Iron Gate Park Drive shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Department.
2. A brick sidewalk shall be constructed along North Main Street.
3. A screening plan shall be submitted for approval by the Planning Department to screen the residences along the west and north property line and the dumpster.
4. 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.
5. All exterior lighting shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
6. All building colors shall be subject to approval by the BAR.
7. Stormwater detention and/or retention and erosion control during construction shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Department.
8. The front elevation should be amended to include one or more offsets to break up the mass subject to approval by the BAR.
9. The window in the center of the second story should be raised to a height equal to those others on the second story.
10. The concrete island on the southeast corner of the driveway should be changed to landscaping to meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

September 8, 1987


PC

Page 7

11. All windows shall be subject to approval by the BAR.

Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-2, with Mr. Hosfeld and Mr. Swartz voting no.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Elmer Tate".

