

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
Tuesday, August 13, 1985

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

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

Approval of the minutes of July 30, 1985:

MOTION: Mr. Looper moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of July 30, 1985, as written. Mr. Tate seconded the motion. The motion was approved 2-0-3, with Mrs. Simmons, Mr. Chappell and Mr. Hall abstaining.

Mr. Hosfeld arrived at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

Rocky Rococo Pizza - Conditional Use/Site Plan

Mr. Schwab reviewed the Conditional Use/Site Plan for Rocky Rococo Pizza to be located in the Cross Pointe Centre at SR 48 and SR 725. The exact location will be one of the outlots just east of main entrance into the shopping center. The zoning on the parcel is B-3. Seventy-five (75) parking spaces are required for this restaurant facility and the developer is proposing 50 spaces on the outlot site. The drive-thru stacking spaces required are 8 and 2 spaces are proposed. Mr. Schwab pointed out that this plan does not take into consideration the additional parking available in the shopping center area on the north side of the existing ring road in the shopping center. The design of the building is somewhat contemporary with stucco walls and cedar siding trim.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff had concerns primarily with the circulation pattern as proposed on the original site plan. The review of the original plan resulted in the following staff recommendation.

A revised site plan, including all building and sign elevations shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission, for their review, incorporating the following changes:

1. The site shall be limited to a one-way vehicular circulation pattern.
2. A twelve (12) ft. lane shall be added to the eastern portion of the site in addition to the drive-thru lane.
3. An additional 25 parking spaces shall be added to the site and shall be angle parking.

4. A dedicated lane shall be established for the drive-thru, to accommodate a minimum of eight (8) stacking spaces behind the menu board.
5. Accurate building elevation of each exterior wall shall be submitted.
6. Trash dumpster shall be screened including gates.
7. All signs shall be in conformance to the provisions and requirements of the sign ordinance.
8. Elevations of the directional signs and the menu board shall be submitted.

Mr. Schwab stated that the applicant had since submitted a revised site plan, this date, addressing some of these concerns. He stated that the one-way circulation was now a part of the site plan with angled parking that would help establish a one-way flow of traffic. Two (2) separate lanes have been proposed--one for stacking and utilization of the drive-thru window and one for exiting the facility. This revised plan reduces the parking spaces to 39; however, to utilize this revised layout, the building size has been reduced from 120 customer seating capacity to 99. In consideration of the revisions made to the site plan, staff would still recommend the following:

1. Trash dumpster shall be screened including gates.
2. A fire hydrant be installed, the location to be approved by the Washington Township Fire Department.

Mr. Schwab further reviewed some revisions to the proposed signage which would be of plastic, internally illuminated construction. The ground mounted identification sign is within the permitted size limitations. The menu board is usually not included as signage since it is in most cases placed at the rear of the building; however, this menu board would face SR 725 and does include some identification. It was the feeling of staff that as long as the identification letters do not exceed the size of the menu items, it should not be calculated as sign area. The proposed directional signs would be approximately 4 sq. ft. per face which is double the amount that is permitted. The proposed wall signage would include a silhouette of Rocky Rococo on the south and east elevations and would be calculated as signage. The sign area of each of these silhouettes is approximately 15 to 20 sq. ft. Also proposed as wall signage would be "Rockey Rococo" signs which would amount to 47 sq. ft. on the east elevation and 55 sq. ft. on the west elevation. The permitted amount of wall signage for this project would be 72 sq. ft., to be placed on the south elevation only.

Mr. Schwab stated that by approving the signage as proposed, the Planning Commission would be approving a variance as a part of the site plan.

In reviewing the construction drawings for Alex-Bell Road (SR 725), it appears that there are some significant problems with the setback requirements of this proposed structure from Alex-Bell Road. As a part of the approval for Cross Pointe Centre, 60 ft. of right-of-way dedication was a condition of that approval. Mr. Schwab stated that the proposed site plan appears to be drawn based on the previous 45 ft. right-of-way instead of the current 60 ft. right-of-way. He stated further that with the intention of sidewalks and landscaping in front of these areas, it seems that the layout as shown on the site plan will not fit in the outlot area and the parking would encroach in the right-of-way.

Staff recommended that the issue needs more clarification.

Mr. Hall stated that he was not comfortable in voting for an issue that needs considerable clarification.

Mr. Harry Misel, architect for the project, stated that the additional 15 ft. of right-of-way dedication was not shown on the survey drawings supplied by the Linclay Corporation, and therefore, he was not aware of it. He stated that he would have to field measure the site since there is a storm sewer at the rear of the building. It would depend on the location of the manhole as to how far the building could be backed up from Alex-Bell Road.

Mr. Tate suggested that perhaps the 8 parking spaces along Alex-Bell Road could be deleted. He stated that the green space would be more attractive anyway.

Mr. Misel stated if those 8 spaces were deleted, meeting the setback requirements would not be a problem.

Mr. Hosfeld agreed that the 8 spaces should be deleted and a green space area maintained.

Mr. Hall pointed out that by using parking spaces in the shopping center area itself was not necessarily convenient and would possibly lose potential customers.

Mrs. Simmons stated that some of these concerns should be researched and reviewed at the regular meeting on August 27, 1985.

Mr. Misel stated that if the 8 spaces could be deleted and solve the right-of-way problem, they would like it to be resolved tonight.

Mr. Hosfeld stated that he felt that the project could fit into the City, however, responsibility should be taken by the applicant to see that the details are worked out.

Mr. Tate asked what determined the narrowness of the lot.

A representative from the Linclay Corporation stated that there is a sale pending on the other outlot which requires the remainder of the area available.

Mr. Tate stated that with a new area starting development, this facility should not be squeezed onto the lot which would complicate future development. He suggested that whole project be reviewed together in order to look at the area as a whole.

Mr. Schwab stated that the next Council Work Session would be held after the next regular Planning Commission meeting and, therefore, should this project be tabled, it would not delay the review process by Council.

The major concerns of the Planning Commission were the narrowness of the lot, the parking, the setback of the building from Alex-Bell Road, the screening of the dumpster area, and a fire hydrant by installed as requested by the Fire Department.

The members of the Planning Commission felt that the proposed wall signage was justified since the building was situated as a corner property.

Mr. Hosfeld requested that the Linclay Corporation supply the Planning Commission with the plans for the development of the other outlot adjacent to the proposed Rocky Rococo facility.

The representatives from Linclay Corporation indicated they would supply these plans at the next meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to table the Conditional Use/Site Plan application for Rocky Rococo Pizza. Mr. Looper seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

*Chun Tate*

8/27/85