

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, April 30, 1985

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

Attendance: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr.; Mrs. Marian Simmons; Mr. Robert Looper; Mr. David Hall; Mr. Brian Bergsten. Absent: Mr. Robert Chappell; Mr. Robert Hosfeld. Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney; Mr. Steve Feverston, Planner.

Approval of the minutes of March 26, 1985:

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of March 26, 1985, as written. Mr. Hall seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mrs. Simmons abstaining.

SETTING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

The following items were scheduled for public hearing for Tuesday, May 28, 1985, at 7:30 P.M., to be heard in the City Building:

Richard A. Carson - Variance of Front Yard Setback Requirement
Location: 9296 Stephanie Lane

An Ordinance Amending Ordinance Number 15-61, The Zoning Ordinance, As Amended By Ordinance Number 79-73, Clarifying The Requirement For Development Plan Review By The Planning Commission And Approval By City Council Prior To The Issuance Of Zoning Certificates In The O-s, R-O-I, And I-1 Zoning Districts.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Schwab stated that Council was referring an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to the Planning Commission for their recommendation. He explained that the proposed ordinance would require site plan review for the I-1, R-O-I, and O-S zoning districts.

St. Leonards Center - Lot Split

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request by St. Leonards Center to divide the 14 acre parcel, previously approved by the Planning Commission for development of cottages for the elderly, from the 50 acre tract. He explained that the reason is basically for mortgage purposes, in order to give St. Leonards Center some property to use for collateral. The request by the applicant is to have the deed stamped "No Plat Required". Mr. Schwab pointed out that normally staff could stamp the deed, however, since the parcel would not have frontage along a public right-of-way, the Planning Commission must direct staff to approve the request should they so desire. Staff recommended that the request be approved subject to the dedication of a 25 ft. easement to allow access to the parcel.

Mr. Tate expressed concern as to the use of the property should the mortgage company foreclose.

Mrs. Simmons pointed out that the property is zoned E-C and any use for

that site would be reviewed by City Council as a conditional use application.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to authorize staff to stamp the deed "No Plat Required", as requested by St. Leonards Center. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-1 with Mr. Hall voting no.

Mr. Hall stated that his reason for voting against the motion was due to a lack of information.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Lawton C. Gerlinger, Jr. - Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab reviewed the sign variance application submitted by Lawton C. Gerlinger, Jr., concerning the medical building located at 450 North Main Street. The zoning on the parcel is R-3 which allows a residential office to exist as a conditional use.

Mr. Schwab explained that at the time the permit was issued for the existing sign, the use was considered an office use which was permitted a maximum of 50 sq. ft. of total sign area. The permit that was issued was for a double-faced sign measuring 4 ft. by 6 ft. Approximately one (1) year after that approval, the sign ordinance was changed to include not only the information part of the sign as sign area, but also any frame or scroll work as part of the sign area. The existing sign as the sign ordinance measures it now, is 28 sq. ft. per face for a total of 56 sq. ft. Under the current ordinance, the zoning on this property would be considered residential and would, therefore, not permit any signage other than a 2 sq. ft. wall sign. The applicant is requesting to relocate a new sign on the north side of the entrance driveway and increase the sign to 34 sq. ft. per face for a total of 68 sq. ft.

Mr. Schwab pointed out that the new sign ordinance which will be the subject of a public hearing before Council on May 20, 1985, would allow this property to have 15 sq. ft. of signage per face and a total of 30 sq. ft.

In review of the variance checklist, staff felt that the situation was unique since the property was granted a conditional use for a residential office. It was, therefore, the staff recommendation to approve the variance application for the location requested and the sign area not to exceed 15 sq. ft. per face for a total of 30 sq. ft.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Dr. Lawton C. Gerlinger, Jr., applicant, stated that including the support structures on the sign, the request is for 5 inches more in width and 9 inches more in height. He stated that the reason for the request to relocate the sign on the north side of the driveway entrance is due to a number of complaints that people miss the driveway entrance. He stated he would at least like to keep the sign the same size as what currently exists. Dr. Gerlinger stated that the proposed sign will be much more attractive and will have a brick base around it rather than bushes. He stated that they intend to maintain the same setback. He pointed out that the proposed sign is somewhat smaller than the sign on the adjoining property to the south for State Farm Insurance, and somewhat larger than the sign to the north for Ambassador Realty. Dr. Gerlinger felt that the

proposed sign would blend with these other signs in the same block.

There being no other speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Looper asked Dr. Gerlinger his feelings of keeping the new sign the same size as that of the current sign and relocating it as requested.

Dr. Gerlinger stated that would be acceptable.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to approve the variance request of Lawton C. Gerlinger, Jr., to relocate the sign to the north side of the driveway with the condition that the sign not exceed 56 sq. ft. in total sign area. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Mr. Hall abstaining.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

5/28/85



