

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, April 27, 1982

Mr. Horvath called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Attendance: Mr. Dallas Horvath, Col. Stanley Morrow, Mr. Bernard Samples, Mr. Brian Bergsten, Mr. Robert Chappell, Mrs. Marian Simmons. Absent: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr. Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, City Planner; Mr. Karl M. Schab, City Engineer; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, City Attorney; Mr. Steve Feverston, Planner.

Approval of minutes of March 30, 1982, Planning Commission Regular Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Bernard Samples moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of March 30, 1982, as written. Col. Morrow seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1. Mrs. Simmons abstained.

SETTING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

The following was set for public hearing for Tuesday, May 25, 1982, at 7:30 p.m. in the City Building:

Ordinance amending Ordinance Number 15, dated December 11, 1961, the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Centerville, to establish regulations governing the size, character and location of signs within the City of Centerville, Ohio.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Schwab stated that the street map is now in print form and is available at the City Building at a cost of \$2.00 each.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Montessori School of Centerville - Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab made a slide presentation of the sign variance application submitted by the Montessori School of Centerville located at 16 East Elmwood Drive in the City of Centerville. The zoning on the parcel is R-2, single-family residential. The use of the structure is a school which is permitted under the contingent use section of the Zoning Ordinance. The request is for a sign setback from SR 48. Currently, the setback requirement is 25 ft. from the right-of-way. The request is to place the sign 10 ft. from the curb line inside the right-of-way. The Sign Ordinance permits a 32 sq. ft. per face sign for a total of 64 sq. ft. of sign area in a residential district for a school.

In review of the variance checklist, Mr. Schwab stated that the request does meet the standard guidelines for granting a variance.

Staff recommends approval of the variance submitted by the Montessori School of Centerville with the following conditions:

1. The sign not encroach more than 8 ft. into the right-of-way of SR 48.

Currently, the application shows the sign at least 18 ft. into the right-of-way. Staff feels that the variance requested is above and beyond what is reasonable in terms of making the sign visible.

2. The sign area shall be a maximum of 16 sq. ft. in area per sign face and 32 sq. ft. in total sign area.

Staff feels that the sign will be closer to the street and given that the property is smaller, the sign should be limited to 32 sq. ft. The existing Sign Ordinance allows 64 sq. ft. total sign area for a school; however, a school must be located on a minimum 5-acre site. Allowing this size sign would result in the proposed sign being larger than the standard freestanding sign a business is allowed.

Mr. Horvath opened the public hearing.

Mrs. Pat Berardinis, director of the School and owner of the property, stated that the Montessori School has been in existence in Centerville for five years located previously at St. Leonard's for three years and the last two at its present location. She stated that the School is an elementary school approved by the Ohio Department of Education as well as a pre-school. The ages of the children range from 2-1/2 to 7 years of age. She stated that two years ago when they relocated the school to its present location, the sign was placed in the center of the yard and conformed to the setback requirements of the Sign Ordinance. This location of the sign does not make it readily visible. That was done with the intention of submitting a variance at the time the sign would need to be replaced which is what is being done now. Mrs. Berardinis stated that she gets calls asking the location of the facility, and although people drive past it everyday, they are not familiar with the facility because they do not associate the sign with it. She stated that she usually tells people to turn onto Elmwood and then look for the sign, which does create a traffic hazard. She stated she would prefer to have the sign on SR 48 where it makes more sense to have a sign when it is on the corner of a major street.

Mrs. Bernardinis stated that when looking for a design for the sign, she felt that the most attractive signs in Centerville are the low, horizontal signs with plantings around them. She stated that this type of sign is used on the west side of SR 48 directly across the street from the School and feels that it will blend in with the area. The reason the size of 64 sq. ft. total signage was requested was because that amount is the legal size allowed for a school.

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

Mr. Bergsten asked if the City would incur any liability for the sign if it is placed within the right-of-way and at some point in time it must be moved.

Mr. Farquhar stated there would be no liability the City would have to incur.

Mr. Chappell stated that he agrees that there is a visibility problem with the current location of the existing sign. He stated that the only question in his mind is the amount of sign area and the amount of setback to be allowed.

Mr. Samples asked for staff's rational as to the size of the sign.

Mr. Schwab stated that in a residential district all that is allowed is a 2 by 2 ft. wall sign on the building itself for a home occupation. In looking at the property in question which is essentially a residential property being used for a school, staff feels that the standards in the Ordinance which allows a school to have 32 sq. ft. per side--64 sq. ft. total in sign area--was intended for a school like Centerville High School or Magsig. When you look in a business district, the largest commercial sign allowed is 25 sq. ft. per side or 50 sq. ft. total in sign area. The only difference is that the sign for the school is restricted to 6 ft. high and a business is restricted to 16 ft. high. Staff feels that particularly in terms of locating the sign closer to SR 48, in keeping with the residential zoning of the property the sign should be kept somewhat smaller. A concern staff does have on the sign setback is that if the sign is located too close to SR 48, it will cause a site distance problem to motorists trying to gain entrance onto SR 48 from Elmwood.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to approve the sign setback variance for the Montessouri School of Centerville with the following conditions:

1. The sign not encroach more than 8 ft. into the right-of-way of SR 48.
2. The sign area shall be a maximum of 16 sq. ft. in area per sign face and 32 sq. ft. in total sign area.

Col. Morrow seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1.
Mr. Samples voted no.

NEW BUSINESS

Spring Valley Investments (Car Wash) - Site Plan Amendment

Mr. Schwab made a slide presentation of the proposed Car Wash submitted by Spring Valley Investments to be located on the northeast corner of SR 48 and Spring Valley Road directly north of the existing Revco store in the City of Centerville. The zoning on the parcel is B-2. There is no specific parking requirement for this category so a determination must be made by the Planning Commission as to what will be required.

Staff recommends that one (1) parking space per wash bay be provided at the exit area to allow people to wipe off their cars, and two (2) stacking spaces be provided in front of each wash bay. One of these stacking spaces will be used for the vacuum cleaning area and one stacking space used behind the vacuum cleaning area.

The surrounding land use to the north is vacant; to the south and west is business, and to the east is condominiums.

Mr. Schwab stated that when the site plan amendment was reviewed for the K-Mart facility, the issue of fire hydrants was discussed as to the existing coverage. At that time two (2) additional hydrants were required. The Fire Department is requesting an additional hydrant be required to allow better coverage of the proposed facility as well as additional coverage to the existing Revco and Warehouse Paint stores.

The proposal is to construct three (3) buildings with four (4) bays per building. At the present, two (2) of these buildings would be constructed and the third would be constructed in a second phase. The dumpster is to the east side of the site and an earth mound with evergreens planted on top of it to provide screening to the condominium complex is proposed. A guardrail is proposed along the north edge of the asphalt approximately 200 feet in length in front of the slope. The buildings will be constructed with brick and dark brown roofs on which two cupolas will be placed per building. A light fixture is shown on the end of each building with two (2) lights inside each wash bay. The vacuum cleaning area will be lighted with a 10 ft. high down-directed, 150-watt fixture.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan amendment with the following conditions:

1. Building #3, Phase II and the associated vacuum cleaner bays (#5 and #6) be deleted from the plan.

Staff feels that in lieu of staff designing a different layout of the site, the third building in Phase II and the two vacuum cleaner stations be eliminated because of the circulation problems that those cause. Also the dumpster area would not be accessible to the standard trash truck.

2. Building #1 and #2 be relocated east to allow a 20 ft. side yard and two stacking spaces behind each wash bay.
3. A revised pavement striping plan be approved by the City Planner delineating parking spaces, stacking spaces and traffic flow.

Mr. Schwab stated that in looking at the self-service car wash facility that is located in Washington Township south of Alex-Bell Road, it appears that this particular facility has enough room to maneuver but, it is in a haphazard manner. Some striping delineating the isles, stacking spaces and parking spaces, along with directional arrows would much improve the circulation pattern.

4. The freestanding sign be surrounded by a barrier curb that prevents vehicle contact with the sign support.

Mr. Schwab stated that there would also be a possibility in moving the sign to the north.

5. A fire hydrant be required at a location approved by the Washington Township Fire Department.
6. The vehicle guardrail extend to the dumpster area.

Staff feels that the guardrail should be extended to the dumpster because of the significant drop off of land to the north.

7. The dumpster be screened with a 6 ft. high wood fence.

Mr. Schwab stated that this would be recommended other than the proposed chain link fence with slats or evergreens as proposed. Landscaping could be placed around the wood fence which would make it more attractive.

8. The earth mound on the east property be 4 ft. above the adjacent edge of pavement.

Staff feels that without knowing what the grading plan is, the earth mound should be "pinned down" so that it is 4 ft. above the edge of pavement in order to be effective screening.

9. The light shown on the east side of Building #2 be shielded so as not to appear as glare to the condominiums to the east.
10. A revised plan incorporating all of the approved recommendations be approved by the City Planner prior to review by City Council.

Mr. Horvath stated that since blacktop will be put in instead of a grassy area, will it create a problem with the drainage.

Mr. Schab stated that this problem has been discussed with the applicant. The actual area which will be designated for the circulation of vehicles will be slightly "dished" so that it will retain water for a certain period of time. He stated with this type of design adjacent owners would have to agree that precautions have been taken and we have a way to approve this without going against the existing laws of Ohio.

Mr. Ted Hercutt, Hercutt Company which is the contracting firm for the project, and Mr. Rick Faber, attorney for the Hercutt Company, responded to the various staff recommendations. Mr. Faber stated that they would comply with conditions #3 (revised striping plan), #4 (freestanding sign surrounded by a barrier), #8 (earth mound be 4 ft. above edge of pavement), and #9 (light on Building #2 be shielded).

Mr. Faber asked if the additional fire hydrant would be at the contractor's expense or the expense of the Fire Department.

Mr. Schwab indicated that it would be at the expense of the contractor. He indicated that the water line is on the west side of SR 48 which would require bringing the line across the street to the east side.

Mr. Hercutt asked the reason for the additional fire hydrant.

Mr. Schwab stated that when the Goldman site was originally developed, it was developed without fire hydrants. He stated that it is now the policy of the Fire Department to locate fire hydrants every 300 ft. to give better fire service. He stated that the proposed building would be outside the service area from the standards of the Fire Department. With the additional fire hydrant, it would provide service to the proposed facility, but also better service to existing stores in the K-Mart building.

Mr. Faber stated that under the circumstances, they feel condition #5 (requiring fire hydrants) is an unreasonable request in lieu of a car wash having its own natural water system and due to the fact that they will be adding a new location that would not be a basic fire hazard. He stated this request is being made to impose the cost of the fire hydrant on the contractor to give better service to the K-Mart building.

Mr. Hercutt stated that in regard to the extension of the guardrail and the screening of the dumpster, perhaps the dumpster location could be moved half way to the guardrail and the guardrail extended to it.

Mr. Faber asked how far the building must be moved back to comply with the 20 ft. side yard requirement.

Mr. Schwab stated approximately 7 or 8 ft., however even by moving the building back 7 or 8 ft., there is still a question as to whether the proper stacking could be provided.

Mr. Faber stated that the same people own the two parcels involved and under the circumstances, the 20 ft. side yard requirement should not be applicable. He stated if the layout is moved 7 or 8 ft., that would put Building #3 on the drainage line. If a reasonable arrangement could be made to get Building #2 on the inside of the drainage line, they would be willing to move it. He stated that they still want the 12-bay facility to remain competitive in the area.

Mr. Horvath stated that it appears that the site would be overdeveloped with the third building, as he cannot see how the circulation will work.

Mr. Schwab stated that it appears that by straightening the buildings out on the lot, you could have three buildings and still maintain a good circulation pattern.

Mr. Faber stated that the reason the buildings were angled was for security and visibility purposes.

Mr. Samples asked if the third building were built in Phase II, would there be room for the cars utilizing the facility to exit to the right.

Mr. Schwab stated that by moving the buildings to allow the required 20 ft. side yard requirement and provide a parking space for each bay upon existing, the angled layout of the buildings does not allow sufficient room or proper circulation on the site.

Mr. Hercutt suggested that Phase II be eliminated to allow for a drying area and possibly the vacuum cleaning area could be left as shown so customers could sweep out their cars after washing it if they do not elect to do it before.

Mr. Horvath stated that would clear up many of the problems with the layout if Phase II was eliminated.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to recommend approval of the site plan amendment for Spring Valley Investments with the following conditions:

1. Building #1 and #2 be relocated east to allow a 20 ft. side yard and two stacking spaces behind each wash bay.
2. A revised pavement striping plan be approved by the City Planner delineating parking spaces, stacking spaces and traffic flow.
3. The freestanding sign be surrounded by a barrier curb that prevents vehicle contact with the sign support.

4. The vehicle guardrail extend to the dumpster area.
5. The dumpster be screened with a 6 ft. high wood fence.
6. The earth mound on the east property be 4 ft. above the adjacent edge of pavement.
7. The light shown on the east side of Building #2 be shielded so as not to appear as glare to the condominiums to the east.
8. A revised plan incorporating all of the approved recommendations be approved by the City Planner prior to review by City Council.

Mr. Horvath stated that by not including Condition #1, the deletion of Phase II, Building #3 will not be made.

Mr. Bergsten explained that the contractor will then have the opportunity to design the layout of the site to the approval of the City Planner before being submitted to City Council. In this way, they will have the option of eliminating Phase II or proposing the two Phases in a satisfactory layout.

Mr. Schwab asked for staff direction as how to proceed on the third building.

Mr. Bergsten added the following condition to the motion:

11. Building #3, Phase II and the associated vacuum cleaners be approved if a revised plan acceptable to the City Planner is submitted.

Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-1.
Mr. Horvath voted no.

K-Mart - Temporary Permission for Outside Display

Mr. John Vibostok, store manager for K-Mart located on South Main Street, stated that the reason he was attending the Planning Commission was to try to obtain temporary permission for displaying plants along the patio area. He distributed some pictures of the proposed prescribed displays to the Planning Commission for their review. These displays are being requested from May 1, 1982 through June 25, 1982. He stated that they currently have the enclosed patio area and the prescribed displays are strictly corporate displays which are used only for bedding plants as they come in. These displays are made of 8 inch by 16 inch concrete block. Along with them are pressure treated timbers which are also fireproof. The displays are proposed to be located around the existing patio fence between the gate area. The group of six (6) displays across the fence facing SR 48 will be 64 inches deep, 32 inches high and 48 inches wide for a total length of 40 ft. The present length of that section is 51 ft. Along the fence facing Spring Valley Road, will be approximately 24 ft. of display area. These displays will also be made of concrete and pressure treated timbers measuring 16 inches wide and 45 inches high, in eight (8) sections. Each display will be arranged in coordinated colors and according to K-Mart standards which he stated are very high standards.

Mr. Vibostok stated that he was not aware until today that K-Mart needed special approval in order to display the plants and that is why on such short notice he decided to attend the meeting tonight. He stated that the problem he is having is that the plants will be arriving in a few days and he has no room to put them in the enclosed patio area.

MOTION: Col. Morrow moved to recommend approval of the Temporary Permission for Outside Display for K-Mart from May 1, 1982 through June 25, 1982, to City Council. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Vibostok stated that they have many kids that come to the store and park their bikes on the sidewalk area which has proven to be a hazard. He stated that they do have a prescribed bike rack which was out before and they were told to remove it. He asked if in order to use the bike rack, would it have to be approved by Planning Commission and Council.

Mr. Schwab stated when you place anything additionally on the site, it would require a site plan amendment. He stated he would speak with the Building Inspector as to what would be required.

Members of Planning Commission discussed the possibility of holding a work session for the purpose of reviewing the proposed draft Sign Ordinance. It was their decision to hold a work session on Tuesday, May 4, 1982 at 7:30 p.m. in order to review the proposal.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Wallas J. Harvath
Acting Chairperson