

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

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

Attendance: Mr. Elmer Tate Jr., Chairman; Mr. Dave Hall; Mr. Robert Looper; Mr. Robert Hosfeld; Mr. Stanley Swartz; Mr. Robert Chappell; Mrs. Marian Simmons. Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney; Mr. Steve Feverston, Assistant City Planner; Mr. Steven King, Administrative Assistant; Mr. Mike Haverland, Administrative Intern.

Items for Discussion

E-C Zoning on South Main Street to R-PD

Mr. Jeffrey L. Brown, representing Zeig and Castro, stated that the land his clients own is currently zoned E-C. The E-C zoning classification allows some commercial or multi-family use subject to the approval of Council. He stated what they are faced with at this time, is to have a R-PD classification placed on this property which they have determined is not the highest and best use for the 15 to 16 acre tract. A commercial classification is what the property should be classified. Mr. Brown stated that the only permitted use in the R-PD would be agricultural use--any other use requires an approval procedure by the Planning Commission and Council as well as the submittal of detailed drawings.

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Brown what he would propose for development of the site should a business classification be granted to their parcel of land.

Mr. Brown indicated that they would probably develop as a small shopping center.

Mr. Tate stated that he did not feel that a shopping center development on that parcel was appropriate.

Mr. Brown stated that should the property be zoned residential, the property would not be developable.

Mr. Hall disagreed, stating that what the Planning Commission is doing is looking at consistent planning. If developed as commercial, the parcel in question would be surrounded by residential zoning on the north, east and west. To the south is business zoning, however, it is up a steep grade which serves as a natural buffer strip.

Mr. Brown stated further that they feel that the proposed Zoning Ordinance has some definite procedural problems also.

Mr. Kevin O'Brien, representing the Zimmermans who own the property north of Revere Village Apartments, stated that he would like to reemphasize the need for O-S zoning in this area of the City. He stated that there is very little office development in this area, and by zoning this 11 acre parcel to O-S, it would provide a buffer from the multi-family units to the single-family units. If developed as office use, the land would provide tax dollars which would not be available should it develop as residential. Mr. O'Brien closed by stating that if the City as well as the Zimmermans want to gain some of their costs, it would be appropriate to rezone the parcel O-S.

Mr. Looper felt that it made good sense to rezone the front portion of the parcel (11 acres) to O-S, stating that there is a definite need for this type of development.

Mr. Hall stated that he was disturbed that the Planning is being asked to zone land that is not consistent with the Policy Plan and character of the area. He stated that it is difficult to evaluate the intentions of the owners and developers without having a specific plan to review. At this point, the zoning should remain R-PD and when a specific plan is submitted, the Planning Commission can evaluate the proposal.

Mr. Tate stated that he did not feel it was appropriate to zone the east side of SR 48 R-PD and the west side O-PD.

Mr. Schwab pointed out that the 1970 Comprehensive Plan encouraged strip commercial zoning along the west side of SR 48 and multi-family on the east side of SR 48.

Multi-Family Density 6 Dwelling Units/Acre

Mrs. Simmons stated that the material furnished by the Planning Department to the Planning Commission, states that the design of a multi-family project rather than its density makes a project. She stated that she agreed with this statement.

Mr. Hosfeld stated in looking at the developments throughout the City, he could not really tell at what density they were developed. He stated that the projects that appear to be cluttered could have very well been developed within the density permitted, however, he felt that we may give up quality for density standards. He stressed that the placement was more important than the density.

Mr. Tate felt that 6 dwelling units per acre were too restrictive.

Mr. Hall stated that in looking over the recommendations that the Planning Commission has made over the past several years, 8 dwelling units per acre seemed to be a reasonable standard.

Mr. Swartz stated his feelings were that 8 dwelling units per acre were a reasonable standard considering development costs increase year after year. In order to get a quality development, the standard should be increased.

Mr. Looper stated that in reviewing the information provided by the Planning Department and the fact that many developers of multi-family have given significantly to the extension of Cloyo Road, he had come to the conclusion that 8 dwelling units per acre would not be excessive.

Park District Recommendations

Mr. Schwab stated that the Park District is recommending that instead of the fixed amount of lot reduction and the fixed amount of lot width reduction, a percentage of lot reduction (they are recommending 16% of the fixed figures that are proposed in the Zoning Ordinance) be used. The same amount of reduction would be used for the lot reduction as well as the lot width reduction. Further, the Park District is suggesting that there be an option to developers of providing a fee-in-lieu of dedication itself. Mr. Schwab stated that this gives the Park District more flexibility because many developers are willing to dedicate park land within their development, however, that proposed land does not necessarily tie into the land the Park District is interested in acquiring. However, there is a possibility that there is land that would serve the residents of that development acquired with the fees that were given in lieu of dedication. Another concern is that the Park District would like to have multi-family land to participate in lot reduction and fee-in-lieu of dedication as well.

Mr. Jim Hussey, 77 Peach Grove, suggested that perhaps the fees should be greater for larger units since there is more of a financial burden to the City costs (for example, police, fire, school services).

Mr. Hall stated that as the community develops, there will be a lesser need for park land and felt that the fee-in-lieu was a good idea.

Mr. Bill Yeck, Park District, gave some examples of how the program has worked in Washington Township. He stated it has been very beneficial to the development of the entire Park District.

Mr. Bob Archdeacon, Woolpert Consultants, felt that the program was an excellent idea and it should be considered very seriously.

Recreational Vehicle Restrictions

Mrs. Simmons stated that in surveying the City, she found that by restricting the parking of recreational vehicles (RV's) to the side or rear yard, we are sacrificing landscaping. She stated

that she felt this provision was too restrictive based on the fact that it would affect each individual landscape and lot size, and would, in fact, create concrete instead of green space.

Mr. Tate stated that he had not heard any complaints concerning the parking of RV's.

Mr. Schwab stated that the City does get periodic complaints.

Mr. Swartz suggested that perhaps a RV could remain on an individual property in the driveway during the season of usage.

Mrs. Christine Snyder, member of the Zoning Task Force, stated that the Zoning Ordinance is written in such a way that it simply regulates the parking of a RV. She stated that it is not valid to say that the City has not had many complaints since most people know the City does not regulate RV's and there is basically no purpose in complaining. She stated that the purpose of the Property Maintenance Ordinance, parks, Zoning Ordinance in itself is to maintain high quality residential areas for people to live. With this standard included in the Zoning Ordinance, we are not impinging on the rights of ownership. We are simply asking that the parking of those RV's be regulated so that they do not impinge other people in the neighborhood. Mrs. Snyder stated that Centerville is characterized by large front yards, open space, limitation of fences--we do all these things to have attractive neighborhoods. Recreational vehicles in driveways are a detriment to attractive neighborhoods.

Mr. Jim Hussey, 77 Peach Grove, reemphasized that he did not feel that regulating the parking of RV's is appropriate.

Mrs. Sally Beals, member of the Zoning Task Force, stated that she felt large vehicles of any kind are offensive. She stated that the cost of storing a RV, and the Zoning Task Force is not suggesting that, is small compared to the cost of purchasing it.

Mr. Hall stated that he agreed that the City should not get involved with regulating the parking of RV's.

100 Foot Buffer Strip - Davis to Village South

Mr. Tate asked for specific language that should be included in the Zoning Ordinance to protect buffer strips as in the case of Village South in relation to the Davis property along Loop Road.

Mr. Schwab suggested that a requirement could be placed in the Zoning Ordinance that a buffer strip would be left in its natural state even when it is not developed, and would not be disturbed, and vehicular traffic be prohibited between adjacent residential and commercial areas. Further, the design of any improvements would have to be approved as part of a site plan for the development of that buffer strip as well as the remainder of the

land. Mr. Schwab stated that these provisions should be applicable to O-PD and I-PD districts as well as B-PD. He stated that the Davis' strongly object to the B-PD classification based not only on the 100 foot buffer issue, but the requirement that an overall development plan must be filed and approved for future development on that site.

St. Leonards' R-PD from R-1

Mr. Tate stated that this issue was based on the concern of the residents for provisions of a buffer for the St. Leonards development.

Mr. Schwab stated that the concept used over the years by the City for plans of this nature is to provide some kind of buffer, screening and a density transition where single-family is used to abut a potential higher use.

Whipp Road Zoning Changes/Relocation to Wilmington Pike

The members of Planning Commission felt that the relocation of Whipp Road is a good idea and would favor its development.

Sign Ordinance Changes

The purpose of the proposed change to the Sign Ordinance is to allow a sign to be located on the roof area when said roof line is on the same plane as the front of the building.

The members of Planning Commission felt this was a good solution to the problem.

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Bernard Samples, Chairman of the Zoning Task Force, if he thought Council would have any strong objections to what the Planning Commission as reviewed.

Mr. Samples stated that he did not feel Council would have any strong objections; however, he stated that he personally agreed with Mrs. Snyder and Mrs. Beals that RV's should be regulated as proposed in the Zoning Ordinance.

There being no further business, the work session was adjourned.



