

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, May 28, 1985

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

Attendance: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr.; Mrs. Marian Simmons; Mr. David Hall; Mr. Robert Looper; Mr. Robert Hosfeld; Mr. Brian Bergsten (where noted); Mr. Robert Chappell (where noted). Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Steve Feverston, Planner.

Approval of the minutes of April 30, 1985:

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of April 30, 1985, as written. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

SETTING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

The following item was scheduled for public hearing for Tuesday, June 26, 1985, at 7:30 P.M., to be heard in the City Building:

Oxford Development Enterprises - Rezoning from I-1 to E-C

Location: Property Located North and West of the Intersection of
Alex-Bell Road and Clyo Road

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Schwab stated that Mr. Bernard Samples, Chairman of the Zoning Task Force, had requested a joint work session between Council, Planning Commission and the Zoning Task Force in order to discuss the Residential sections of the draft zoning ordinance as recommended by the Zoning Task Force. The City Manager has requested some available dates that the Planning Commission would have for such a work session.

The concensus of the Planning Commission was that any Monday evening would be satisfactory.

Mr. Bergsten arrived at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Richard A. Carson - Variance of Front Yard Setback Requirement

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request by Richard A. Carson for a variance of a front yard setback requirement for his residence located at 9296 Stephanie Lane. The required front yard setback is 50 ft. as the recorded setback shown on the record plan, which takes precedence over the the normal City requirement of 35 ft. The requested setback is 38 ft. The variance is being requested in order to allow construction of a garage area closer to the street area and utilize the existing garage space as a family room.

Mr. Chappell arrived at this time.

Staff recommended that the variance request be denied based on the fact that there is no uniqueness to the property.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mr. Richard A. Carson, applicant, stated that primary reason for the variance is to save the back yard area. He stated that because of the 50 ft. setback requirement, the area of the addition is limited to the area as proposed. He stated further that to construct the room on the side of the house would be unsightly. Mr. Carson submitted a petition to the Planning Commission containing signatures of adjacent property owners stating that they would have no objection to the variance as requested.

Mr. James VanArtsdale, 204 Stephanie Lane, objected to the proposal of building the addition on the front of the existing house, stating that it would not keep with the continuity of the neighborhood. He stated that the size of the lot would allow the applicant to construct the addition on the side of the house. Mr. VanArtsdale stated that if the addition were constructed on the front of the house, a change in the slope of the driveway would be necessary in order to maintain the same amount of runoff.

Mr. Tate suggested that the addition be placed on the back of the house.

Mr. Carson stated that is his only alternative, however, he would lose his back yard.

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

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to deny the variance request as submitted by Richard A. Carson. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

Mr. Tate stated that although the Planning Commission is sympathetic to the situation, the 50 ft. setback should be maintained since there is an alternative to construct the addition to the rear of the house.

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.

Mr. Schwab explained that Council has a concern that in the Industrial Districts, a site plan review is not required when a retail use is involved. Council felt that even though this will be a requirement in the new Zoning Ordinance, some regulations should be adopted as soon as possible since the construction of I-675 will bring a rush of development. This ordinance simply makes it clear that O-S, R-O-I and I-1 zoning districts would require site plan review by the Planning Commission and Council, much in line with the same procedure for commercial zoning districts in the City.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Tate stated that this ordinance is the right way to proceed. He stated these types of developments should be reviewed.

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to recommend approval of the ordinance to Council. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

Mr. Looper stated that the document submitted to the Planning Commission by the Zoning Task Force has some very significant changes in it. He stated that it should be reviewed very carefully in order for the Zoning Task Force to get the Planning Commission's opinion.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

7/16/85
Elmer Tate

