

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, May 25, 1982

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

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

Approval of minutes of April 27, 1982, Planning Commission regular meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of April 27, 1982, as written. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1. Mr. Tate abstained.

Approval of minutes of May 4, 1982, Planning Commission Work Session:

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 4, 1982, as written. Col. Morrow seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1. Mr. Bergsten abstained.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Schwab stated that City Council has directed the Planning Commission to resume broadcasting its meetings on Cable TV. He stated that the Planning Department is checking into equipment availability and personnel to operate it. The current plan is to tape the meeting on Tuesday evening and replay it at 7:30 p.m. on the following Wednesday evening.

Mr. Schwab stated that Mr. Joe Minner has accepted an Assistant City Manager position with the City of Casper, Wyoming and will be leaving the City of Centerville on June 11, 1982. He stated that the City Manager has assigned Mr. Steve Feverston to take over staff assistance to the BAR. All records will move to the Planning Department since project review will be done by the Planning Department.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

An 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.

Mr. Schwab stated that this draft of the Sign Ordinance includes the Architectural Preservation District (APD) signage in setting more detailed requirements of that district. Major changes in the Ordinance for the remainder of the City are the elimination of roof signs and restricting freestanding signs to a maximum of 6 ft. in height.

Mr. Horvath suggested that possibly a formula could be developed to allow a 16 ft. height with a 25 ft. setback. As a sign is reduced in setback, it could be reduced in height.

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

Mr. Horvath stated that he feels that the Work Session was quite adequate in review of the proposal and the minutes should be forwarded to Council.

Mr. Farquhar stated that the Ordinance should be redrafted with those changes that the Planning Commission votes on and a new document be submitted to Council as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Tate stated that the current proposal could be sent to Council with no recommendation from the Planning Commission and a separate document noting the changes that the Planning Commission came up with in the Work Session could also be sent.

Mr. Farquhar stated that in order to be technically correct, the Ordinance should be reviewed in a public hearing with the changes that the Planning Commission desires incorporated in the Ordinance and send that to Council also.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to not recommend the Sign Ordinance proposal previously reviewed by the Planning Commission at the May 4, 1982, Work Session and a public hearing be held on a redraft of the Sign Ordinance incorporating the changes as directed by the Planning Commission. The recommendations of the Planning Commission should be sent to City Council in draft form for their review prior to the public hearing of Planning Commission. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

MedFirst Physician Care - Site Plan

Mr. Schwab made a slide presentation of the proposed site plan for the MedFirst Physician Care facility to be located on the northeast corner of Main and Franklin Streets which previously occupied the Way-Lo station. The zoning on the parcel is Architectural Preservation. The site would provide a medical office building. Parking for a medical office building requires one (1) space per 500 sq. ft. of floor area which would total 7 spaces for the proposed 3,500 sq. ft. building, for a bare minimum. The proposed plan has provided 20 spaces on the site. The proposed building is a one-story brick building with a false second story. The 7/12 pitched roof will be constructed with false dormer windows. A canopy is extended on the south elevation which provides a drop-off area for persons at the main entrance of the facility.

Of the 4 existing curb cuts, the 2 closest to the main intersection will be closed. The 2 remaining curb cuts as well as the existing alley will be utilized for access to the property. A dumpster is to be placed off the alley in a screened enclosure with gates opening out onto the alley. Mr. Schwab emphasized that the existing alley is a one-way lane alley approximately 10 ft. wide. This alley has been incorporated into the traffic circulation pattern on the site at two points creating circular type movements.

Staff recommendation is to disapprove the site plan based on the following reasons:

1. Building setback is too far from the street.

Mr. Schwab stated that if you look at the adjoining buildings to the north and east, they are set right up on the sidewalk. In the APD, one of the unique characteristics of the area is that the building setbacks are much different from the way buildings are typically set back now and in the other zoning districts of the City. The short setbacks in the APD gives the district a much different feeling from the way buildings would normally be placed on lots throughout the rest of the City. That is one of the unique things that the APD Ordinance is trying to preserve in this section of the City, by bringing the building out to the corner to more closely approximate the setback of the other buildings on the block. The asphalt drive that ties the two curb cuts together gives more the impression that the front yard is basically asphalt. Staff would find this situation is not keeping with what has been intended for the district.

2. Traffic circulation has numerous conflicts.

Mr. Schwab stated that when you look at how the traffic circulation moves, you see that a primary exit from the parking area is now on the alley. The alley is approximately 10 ft. wide and is really a one-way traffic pattern. When you start using the alley as a primary entrance and exit point, then you get conflicting movements in and out of the alley which will essentially require backing up. If the alley was a normal width street, this situation would be desirable.

Due to the higher traffic volume along Main Street, it will result in the Main Street curb cut becoming the primary entrance to the site. A good site plan traffic circulation would allow a vehicle entering the site to follow a drive area directly to the parking area. In the proposed site plan, a vehicle upon entering the site must make a decision as whether to turn to the left (north) or right (south). If a left turn movement is made (north), the alley will be utilized which is not desirable because of its narrow width. If a right turn movement is made (south), the single-lane canopy area can be utilized. This situation, however, creates a conflict when a vehicle enters from Franklin Street and enters the canopy area only to find that one of the vehicles must back up.

The combination of the Franklin Street curb cut, the southernmost drive, and the drive to the canopy drop-off area creates a complex "T-Y" intersection within the site's circulation pattern. This intersection offers too many maneuvering options creating a potentially dangerous situation.

3. The dumpster location is not accessible.

Mr. Schwab stated that aesthetically this is a good location for the dumpster. Staff questions whether a dumpster truck could really empty a dumpster in that position because of the narrowness of the alley and the severity of the angle for access.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff tried to address the applicant's concerns in the way the building is laid out internally by drawing up something quickly as an alternative and yet address some of staff's concerns as well. The proposed site plan located the main drop-off entrance on Franklin Street which is the lowest traffic volume street. The side of the building will be facing the highest traffic street. In the alternative staff developed, the building was moved out towards the corner and removed the asphalt area on the corner so that it could be landscaped more effectively. He stated in moving the building 90 degrees, the main entrance and windows would be located toward the highest volume street. The drop-off area would be located on the north elevation of the building which would tie into the waiting room as would the main entrance on the west side. This layout would create an "L" shape parking circulation which makes the alley a minor circulation instead of a primary one. By placing the dumpster in the northeast corner of the site it not only places it as far away from the street as possible, it also allows a truck turning into the alley to approach the dumpster head-on using the alley pavement to empty it, back up and come out on Franklin Street.

Mr. Schwab stated that although there are some problems with the staff plan, they are few in comparison to the traffic pattern conflicts created by the submitted site plan. He stated with those thoughts in mind, staff recommends disapproval of the submitted site plan. He stated that staff is just showing the staff alternative site plan as something for Planning Commission and Humdeco to look at in order to address the concerns staff has in meeting the requirements of the APD Ordinance.

Mr. Gary Greenwell, Director of Development for Humdeco, and Mr. Bradley Barker, Design Coordinator, reviewed the proposed site plan for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Greenwell stated that Humdeco is in the business of providing medical facilities to communities such as Centerville on an extended hour basis. He stated that the facilities are open 7 days a week, 12 hours per day, and 365 days per year. The operating hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on an appointment or non-appointment schedule, providing private practice as well as minor emergency care. He stated that the building is designed with that in mind. There are many things that have been developed and have been tested over some period of time as to what this facility needs to do. One provision needed is the covered drop-off area. He stated that their usual site plan is somewhat different than what is being proposed in Centerville due to the facility being located in the APD. He stated that they want to be good citizens of the community and are approaching this project from the standpoint of trying to comply with the desires of the City in terms of architectural style, site plan, signage regulations, etc.

Mr. Greenwell stated that in meetings with the BAR, they have come to an agreement on architectural style, signage, lighting fixtures, but have failed to come to an agreement with the City Planner on the site plan. He stated there are several reasons for that. He stated that they feel that the building has been positioned as far toward Main and Franklin Streets as practically possible. The circulation under the canopy is a very important issue. The only reason a connection is made from the Main Street side of the access drive to the alley was because it was a request of the BAR, giving the ability of a person entering Franklin Street to utilize the drop-off area and circulate through the alley to the parking area without having to enter onto Main Street. The intent of the circulation through the alley is only on a minor basis.

Mr. Greenwell stated that the alternative proposal presented by the City Planner turns its back on the main intersection. He stated that this is a very prime, expensive piece of commercial property, and therefore, they want to orient the entrance and canopy to the intersection. Should the building be reversed as suggested by staff, the waiting room would be facing the alley. He stated if a person were dropped off at the canopy area, they still would not have the benefit of the canopy. A separate entrance is not possible as there is no room at that particular location since the restrooms are located in that area of the building.

In regard to the dumpster location, Mr. Greenwell stated that they have found that waste collection agencies prefer to be out of parking areas and traffic flow.

Mr. Greenwell stated that the staff proposal does not allow the flexibility of traffic flow that the original proposal does. He stated that the alternative only places the building less than 10 ft. closer to the intersection. He stated that they plan to do extensive landscaping in either alternative, but the staff proposal turns their back on the main intersection that they are investing in. Mr. Greenwell stated that they are perfectly willing to discuss this situation, however, they feel that they have made an awful lot of compromises and agreements to become a willing partner to this community. He stated as planners they understand the goals of the community, however, they have needs and requirements as a business enterprise. In light of the problems with both plans, they requested approval of the submitted site plan.

Mr. Tate asked where the main entrance to the facility is located.

Mr. Greenwell stated that the main entrance faces Franklin Street.

Mr. Tate stated if a person were to use the drop-off area, he would have to enter the site from Franklin Street.

Mr. Greenwell stated the Main Street entrance can be used also to enter the 12 ft. wide drop-off lane as it is intended to be used in either direction.

Mr. Tate and Mr. Horvath agreed that a two-way access for a single lane drive is not desirable.

Mr. Horvath stated that he does not see much change from the proposal to what is currently there which, he stated he finds objectionable in the first place. He stated it is not in the design of the APD to have the asphalt out in front of the building.

Mrs. Simmons asked what the dashed line was to the north of the building.

Mr. Greenwell stated that is a possible addition if the business should be successful.

Mr. Horvath stated that he could not vote for the site plan with the "sea of asphalt" in front of the building.

Mr. Greenwell asked if the alternative plan were more favorable.

Mr. Horvath stated it is not perfect, but it does address the setback and character of the APD.

Mr. Schwab again pointed out that staff is not advertising their plan as a solution. It is only a sketch to point out that there are alternatives which could be incorporated into the site plan.

Mr. Greenwell stated that reviewing the site plan with the construction, marketing, etc., people in their company, they cannot turn their back on the main intersection which they are paying a premium price for.

Mr. Horvath stated that he does not think the public could tell the front of the building from the back.

Mr. Greenwell stated that it is not easy to change the construction drawings to accommodate a second entrance.

Mr. Tate asked for additional comments from Planning Commission.

Mr. Bergsten stated that a "sea of asphalt" around the building, although it is certainly better than what we have now, is not what we want in the APD.

Mr. Greenwell stated that their marketing and construction people have reviewed the staff alternative and should the Planning Commission elect to not allow circulation under the canopy and frontage on both Main and Franklin, they would be forced to withdraw their application and seek a site in other locations of the Centerville area.

Mr. Tate stated that even if the Planning Commission would reject the proposed plan, it will be reviewed by the City Council for final approval or disapproval.

Col. Morrow stated that he has a problem with bringing the building out closer to the intersection. He stated that the street is brought up to the fronts of the buildings where it is not safe to walk and the businessmen in the district are suffering from it. He stated placing the building closer to the intersection will further obstruct the view of the intersection.

Mr. Schwab pointed out that the setback on even the staff proposal is 35 ft. which is a standard minimum setback in a regular business district.

Mr. Samples stated that he has no problem with the plan as submitted. He stated that is not saying there are no problems with it, however, staff's proposal makes the parking visible from the south side of the site, and the setbacks of the existing buildings are very poor. He stated he would be willing to trade the additional asphalt in front for the additional green space as shown on the plan.

Mr. Schwab stated that when you are working with the APD, it is a unique district because it does not look like any other 1975 development. It is unique in the fact that it looks different from the average building lot.

Mr. Greenwell stated that the City has a unique opportunity to develop the northeast and southeast corners of the Main and Franklin intersection and set a new precedent.

Mr. Bergsten stated that aesthetically this intersection is the most important intersection in Centerville. He stated that we have a terrible situation there now, and it would be wrong to not improve it totally.

Mr. Samples stated that he thinks we are weighing the value of the APD, the value of business and perhaps a needed medical service readily accessible to us. He stated that he feels that the applicants have made reasonable compromises to the City. He asked what is wrong with the City giving a little when they have done so.

Mr. Bergsten stated that they said they would pursue a different location in the Centerville area. This being the prime intersection of the City, we have to protect it.

Mr. Tate stated that if the Planning Commission is being overprotective with this site, then in the recommendations to Council, they will take that into consideration.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to disapprove the site plan for the MedFirst Physician Care facility for the following reasons:

1. Building setback is too far from the street.
2. Traffic circulation has numerous conflicts.
3. The dumpster location is not accessible.

Mr. Bergsten seconded the motion. The motion resulted in a 3-3 vote. Mr. Horvath, Mr. Bergsten and Mr. Tate voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Samples, Mrs. Simmons and Col. Morrow voted against the motion. The site plan will be forwarded to Council with no recommendation.

Elimination of Three-Mile Jurisdiction

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons made the following motion:

Whereas, the Planning Commission of the City of Centerville pursuant to Section 711.09 Ohio Revised Code previously adopted a plan for the major streets or thoroughfares and for the parks and other open public grounds for the unincorporated territory within three miles of the corporate limits of the City of Centerville and within Washington Township, Montgomery County, Ohio; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission of the City of Centerville, Ohio is now of the opinion that it is not in the best interests of the City of Centerville for the Planning Commission to exercise its authority under Section 711.09 Ohio Revised Code within the unincorporated area of Washington Township;

Now, Therefore, it is hereby moved that the said plan previously adopted pursuant to Section 711.09 Ohio Revised Code is hereby rescinded and the authority of the Planning Commission of the City of Centerville to exercise its rights under said Section is hereby relinquished.

Mr. Horvath seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Country Manor Apartments - Illumination of Flags

Mr. Schwab stated that an application from the Country Manor Apartments located on Westerfield Drive south of West Franklin Street has been submitted for the purpose of installing lighting fixtures in order to display flags of various countries. The flags are to be placed in front of the pool area for the apartment complex. The apartment complex is located in a residential district which does not allow the illumination of signs without the approval of the Planning Commission.

The proposal is to place 10 flag poles with 4 ground-mounted light fixtures on the west side of the site in front of the above-grade pool area. The poles will be 12 ft. in height and the proposed fixtures are quartz halogen lamps to be aimed at the direction up toward the flags. This will be away from the street and away from the residences on the other side of the street. The lamps will be activated by a photocell and will be turned on all night during darkness to illuminate the flags as well as the existing sign placed just south of the proposed poles.

Staff recommends to approve the request as presented.

Mrs. Simmons stated her concern regarding the glare of the lights to the residences on the west side of Westerfield Drive.

Mr. Schwab stated that the lights will be sitting on the bank area aiming up at the flags away from traffic and also away from the residences on the other side of the street. He stated that the flags will be visible from the west side of the street, but you will not see a glare of the light bulb or a light shining directly onto the residences.

Mrs. Simmons asked if the residents are aware of what is being proposed.

Mr. Schwab stated that the City is not required to contact any property owners in this type of application.

Mr. Horvath asked if the Planning Commission can require some type of bushes as screening around the light fixtures.

Mr. Schwab stated that the question is flags being illuminated and there is no practical way to screen the flags.

Mrs. Simmons asked if using flags is a way of getting around the sign restrictions.

Mr. Schwab stated that political flags are exempted from the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Horvath asked if the flags have to be illuminated.

Mr. Schwab stated that they do not have to be illuminated and that is what requires the Planning Commission's approval.

Ms. Mary Brubaker, representing the apartment complex, stated that just east of the proposed flag area is a galvanized fence and pool area which is illuminated all night at the present time. She stated that their only effort is to display international flags to somewhat depict the international trade of the complex. She stated that most of the international residents from the Centerville area live within the Country Manor complex.

Mr. Tate stated that the only question is the actual light and whether it is going to be a problem to the neighbors.

Ms. Brubaker stated that the number of lights could be reduced and screening could be provided for each fixture. She stated they would be willing to accept staff's recommendations. She stated that the flags have to be illuminated in order to display them properly 24 hours per day, adding that the United States flag must be displayed in the northernmost position.

Mr. Tate stated he would like to leave it to the discretion of staff to determine whether the light will bother anyone and if not, it will be all right with the Planning Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to approve the request by Country Manor Apartments for the installation of 4 light fixtures in order to display the 10 political flags to be placed west of the existing pool area. This approval is subject to staff's approval to insure that illumination is not offensive and to the satisfaction of the neighboring residents. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

6-29-82

Alan Tate

