

OFFICIAL MINUTES

DATE 3/27/79
CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
Tuesday, March 13, 1979

Mr. Tate called the special meeting to order at 7:45 p.m.

Attendance: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr., Mr. Brian Bergsten, Mr. Francis Cash, Mr. Dallas Horvath, Mr. Roland McSherry, Mr. Bernard Samples. Also present: Mr. Karl M. Schab, City Engineer; Mr. Alan C. Schwab, Planner.

Thomas Paine Settlement #3 - Preliminary Plan

Mr. Schwab stated that this project had been tabled from the meeting of February 27, 1979, in order to arrange a joint work session with Council. It has been determined that Mr. Darryl Kenning, Mr. Karl Schab and Mr. Alan Schwab should get together and figure what the sewage situation is at this time. Mr. Schwab stated that he wanted to give Planning Commission a progress report and as soon as this situation is determined, staff will coordinate a work session date with Council.

Request for Curb Cut

Mr. Schwab stated that at the last meeting the applicant was requesting curb cuts for the area southeast of the SR 48 and Spring Valley Road intersection. At this point, this is just for curb cuts. The owner has some people interested in leasing the property so this is not a site plan. There is a plan further south that handles access to the parcels to the south as part of the rezoning. That plan calls for a road profile with an access road that is different from what went in at Marco Lane. Also, it's different from what our Thoroughfare Plan shows.

Mr. Schwab's recommendation is that we go with the applicant's request. Perhaps the developer can stagger the buildings over as far as they can to the east property line and still leave them a radius that is on their property line of 15 or 20 ft. and give them full access on SR 48 at this time.

Mr. Schwab switched to a different drawing showing SR 48 as 5 lanes. The drawing shows that if the curb cut is given, it would be just about the minimum distance from the intersection you can have and have some chance of making a left turn bay and not have to make the SR 48 curb cut a right in/right out situation. In the future, this intersection might show more stacking capacity.

Mr. Schwab stated that Mr. Jim Smith, City Traffic Engineer, has done considerable work on this proposal. In referring to the 5-lane drawing, he stated that he and Mr. Smith feel that this plan is at least half way feasible. It would allow left turn movement into the SR 48 curb cut and prohibit a left turn out of the SR 48 curb cut.

The problem with allowing this to go in right now with full movement is that the traffic coming south on SR 48 through the intersection has no way to get around stopped left-turn traffic. In the evening the traffic does stack up. It is a border line situation between giving him a right in/right out or full movement curb cut on SR 48.

Another factor is that the situation is almost the exact situation as Centerville Square.

Mr. Cash asked if this is what the Engineering Department is recommending.

Mr. Schwab stated that this situation (left turn bay) is what could happen in the future.

Mr. Cash suggested that our Street Department could provide some patches along the west side of SR 48 to give traffic the opportunity to go around the traffic turning left at the curb cut.

Mr. Cash referred to the Carriage Trace project some time ago when Planning Commission thought about a right in/right out and instead decided to put up a sign to prohibit left turns. When it went to Council, they required it to put in the right in/right out island. I don't see why these don't work. The island can be constructed in order to make it a right in/right out only.

Mr. McSherry stated it is too close to the intersection to do this.

Mr. Cash stated that there is plenty of room.

Mr. McSherry stated that there is no curbing along SR 48.

Mr. Tate stated the island would have to set back so someone would not come along and hit it.

Mr. Cash stated that the TCC recommendation is to move the curb cut on Spring Valley 20 ft. to the west because of the curve on the site.

Mr. Schwab stated we have no control over the site plan layout.

Mr. McSherry stated why don't we center the one on SR 48.

Mr. Cash stated he would still follow the recommendation of TCC for the one on SR 48.

Mr. Cash read the recommendation that TCC staff recommends that this curb cut be restricted to right in/right out use only and that a properly designed island be constructed in the throat to so channelize traffic movements.

Mr. Schwab stated that he and Mr. Smith had a meeting with Mrs. Evelyn List, Washington Township Zoning Inspector, and they were in agreement with City staff to move the SR 48 curb cut south of center and give it full movement.

Mr. Cash suggested putting in the standard driveway and the developer putting in the blister on the west side of SR 48.

Mr. Schwab stated that when SR 48 is widened, the problem will be taken care of. A left turn lane will be provided.

MOTION: Mr. McSherry moved that a curb cut be provided on SR 48, 20 ft. from the south boundary line of the property with the standard 30 ft. entrance and on Spring Valley Road the entrance be centered on the property and 25 ft. wide. Mr. Tate seconded the motion. The vote was 2-4. Mr. Tate and Mr. McSherry voted for the motion. Mr. Bergsten, Mr. Cash, Mr. Samples, and Mr. Horvath voted no. Motion denied.

Plan Com 3-13-79

Mr. Tate suggested that the Planning Commission try another motion.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the curb cut in accordance with the recommendation of the TCC report with a requirement that the developer put a blister on the west side of SR 48.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve those curb cuts in the same location as recommended previously with the requirement that the developer put a blister on the right hand side for southbound traffic. Seconded by Mr. Cash.

Mr. Cash asked if we should amend the motion to give the developer the choice of putting in the blister or going with the TCC recommendation.

Mr. Schwab stated that it should be in the motion as to what kind of blister you want.

Mr. Cash stated that staff can take care of that.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the curb cuts at the locations previously recommended by Mr. McSherry with the contingency that the developer restrict the curb cut on SR 48 to right in/right out, as per the TCC recommendation or be allowed full movement at the SR 48 curb cut if he puts a blister of pavement which meets staff approval on the west side of SR 48 that will allow southbound traffic to pass stopped cars waiting to turn left. Seconded by Mr. Bergsten. The vote was 5-1. Mr. McSherry voted no. Motion approved.

Standard-Wilmington Subdivision - Record Plan

Mr. Archdeacon stated that this item was tabled from the previous meeting in order to determine if Planning Commission had approved the curb cuts back in June, 1977.

Mr. Tate stated that he did not think that they (Planning Commission) did.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that in studying the matter, the Planning Commission did not and Council did.

Mr. Tate asked for a reaction from staff on that matter.

Mr. Schwab reviewed the background of the project. He stated that the crucial element was the intersection of Olympic Drive and Wilmington Pike back in the spring and summer of 1977. This project was hinging around where this drive would be because of the church property. Mr. Schwab and Planning Commission viewed a plan which outlined the proposed Olympic Drive.

The church at this time has 2 access points on Wilmington Pike. The original preliminary plan drawn in 1977 was focused around the location of this drive and how it was skewed in relation to Wilmington Pike. That was resolved with the Wilmington Pike Task Force.

Mr. Schwab stated that the Planning Commission minutes clearly show that the Planning Commission was approving the location of roadway and even though the curb cuts were shown on the drawing, that those were not being approved. It went to Council and they tabled it for further information

on this driveway. It was tabled for over a year until the spring of 1978. At that time, a new plan was presented which showed an overall view of Olympic Drive and the Wilmington Pike intersection and the curb cuts on the proposed Sohio site. The minutes are the only way staff has of knowing what went on at the Council meeting. The Council minutes showed it was approved as presented as worked out in conjunction with the Wilmington Pike Task Force. In 1977, we have a recommendation from the Wilmington Pike Task Force which said we may not give any curb cuts on Wilmington Pike but that all the access be off of Olympic Drive.

Mr. Schwab stated that in talking with everyone except Mr. Archdeacon, recollection of that Council meeting was essentially the same--that the Council was approving in principle the location of Olympic Drive and a site plan would come in where we would address the curb cuts. Right now we are at the point where we have to decide if Council has already approved the three curb cuts.

Mr. Schab stated that originally, Standard Oil came in and wanted a lot split. The split appeared to be too involved and the City asked that a preliminary plan be filed for review by the Planning Commission. At that time the plan was approved by Planning Commission for location of Olympic Drive but we did not approve those curb cuts.

One year passed from that. At that time, a new plan was submitted and this plan went to Council, not Planning Commission.

Mr. Schab stated that he has strong questions as to whether the curb cuts on this were approved or not. He stated that he has nothing of Wilmington Pike Task Force minutes indicating that the curb cuts were approved.

Mr. Schwab handed Mr. Tate a letter from Mr. Naaman Peleg of TCC dated June 6, 1977. Mr. Peleg's letter stated that the Access Control Plan recommended not to allow any additional driveways directly from Wilmington Pike and to handle all access from cross public streets. It was TCC's feeling that adequate access to the proposed service station is provided from the future Olympic Drive. There is no need to supplement it with right in/right out driveways from Wilmington Pike and they should not be approved.

Mr. Schab presented the Planning Commission with the Access Control Plan to Wilmington Pike. On page 43, it shows that there shall be no future access--it shows where the access should be coming.

Mr. Tate stated that the plan was approved in conjunction with the Access Control Plan.

Mr. Cash stated the minutes indicated the plan was approved as shown.

Mr. Tate stated an easy way to settle this would be to send it back to Council.

MOTION: Mr. McSherry moved to recommend that the record plan for Standard-Wilmington Subdivision permit no curb cuts on Wilmington Pike and that all access be by way of Olympic Drive per the existing Access Control Plan for Wilmington Pike. Seconded by Mr. Cash.

Mr. Robert Slack, representing Standard Oil, stated that this project has been tossed around for several years. He asked if the developers were at fault.

Mr. Tate stated that the procedure they have followed is correct. Mr. Tate stated that Planning Commission is just being consistent with the provisions of the Wilmington Pike Task Force. He stated that there is a difference between what Council approved and what Planning Commission said. The only way to resolve it is to send it back to Council.

Mr. Slack asked if Council did actually approve this, are we able to start building tomorrow.

Mr. Tate stated yes, that Council overrides the Planning Commission.

Mr. Archdeacon asked if Planning Commission is approving everything except the access onto Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Schwab stated that the only problem he has other than the curb cuts is the signage. All of the signage is shown on the drawings submitted to us. It is staff's feeling that it was submitted as part of your approval. The signage does not conform to the sign ordinance. The proposed signage is requesting something over 600 sq. ft. of signage. There are 2 freestanding signs and three wall mounted signs.

Mr. McSherry was excused from the remainder of the meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Cash moved to amend the motion so that the signs comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Schwab stated that Standard-Wilmington Subdivision is asking for a site plan approval for the filling station and a record plan which would parcel off this piece of ground and this piece of road right-of-way also.

Mr. Schab stated that what is actually being done is approving a lot split.

The Planning Commission still is concerned about the curb cut on Olympic Drive being too close to Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Cash asked if that curb cut could be moved further in.

Mr. Slack stated that that would throw the design of the layout off. It is designed for bigger trucks to come in and moving the curb cut would ruin the layout.

Mr. Horvath seconded Mr. Cash's amended motion.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that the signage except for the freestanding signs are a part of the structure.

Mr. Schwab stated that the project gets 1.5 sq. ft. of sign area per foot of building frontage. Really all that is called a building would be the shelter and not the canopy. I would recommend that instead of having two freestanding signs, one sign be placed at a 45 degree angle that can be seen from both directions. It will require a variance because the ordinance does not provide for a structure of this type. Mr. Schwab stated that if the canopy was figured in the signage, it would still require a variance.

Mr. Schwab stated that his recommendation is that our ordinance does not really cover the situation and he would much rather see the signs brought in separately and addressed as a true variance situation.

Mr. Slack asked why this could not be addressed tonight.

Mr. Cash explained that it takes a variance and persons must be notified of the Public Hearing.

Mr. Schwab stated that he doesn't believe that the canopy can be figured in as a building. If this is the case, you are only allowed approximately 15 sq. ft. of signage.

Mr. Archdeacon asked what he needs to start building.

Mr. Cash stated a building permit.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that the standard building has signs on it. Does that mean the building permit is going to be denied.

Mr. Schab stated that the building could begin, however the translucent panel could not be put in.

Mr. Cash stated that by the time the building of the structure would get to that point, the variance procedure would be done with and would create no delay.

Mr. Archdeacon feels that the canopy is a part of the building. Some members of Planning Commission agreed with that opinion.

Mr. Archdeacon asked if the canopy is not a part of the building, do we have to recognize the setback limitations with that canopy.

Mr. Schwab asked when we figure a bank, do we figure the overhang that goes over the drive-in windows in the signage calculations.

Mr. Schab stated that with signage on three sides plus the freestanding sign, a variance will still be needed.

Mr. Slack stated that he has no problem with having only one freestanding sign. At a future date his company will probably come in for a variance in order to get the second sign.

Mr. Tate asked if he had a viable plan without access to Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Slack stated that he could guarantee without access to Wilmington Pike that his company would not build.

Mr. Horvath stated that Planning Commission must vote on the amendment first.

Vote on the Amendment: Amendment approved unanimously.

Vote on the Motion (now includes the Amendment): Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that when the State Highway Department acquired the right-of-way for this land they granted this access point to this

property as part of the compensation of the acquisition of the right-of-way. It is shown on their construction drawings for I-675.

Mr. Tate stated that what you are saying is that we have no control.

Mr. Cash asked why that was not added to the Access Control Plan.

Mr. Archdeacon stated he did not know. The same thing applies to the church across the street.

Mr. Bergsten asked if there is a need for Planning Commission to approve it.

Mr. Archdeacon stated he did not know. Mr. Archdeacon stated that he just wanted the Planning Commission to have all the facts before them.

Mr. Cash stated that Mr. Archdeacon should take all the facts to Council.

Mr. Tate suggested that when you go to Council to explain the State's part of it first. It might save a lot of time. I don't think we would have had nearly the discussion if you had brought this out first.

Salisbury - Preliminary Plan

Mr. Schwab stated that he checked with the County Engineer's office regarding the plans to widen Yankee Street. He stated that the Engineer's office could not give him any definitive information at this time.

Mr. Schwab stated that the record plan for Salisbury has been filed with the City for review at the Planning Commission meeting at the end of this month. The record plan has been sent to the County Engineer's office for review and we should receive some comment from them before the meeting.

Temporary Signs (Clyo Industrial Center)

Mr. Schwab stated these signs are located on the southwest corner of Clyo and Alex-Bell Roads. At the last Planning Commission a 30-day approval was given. Mr. Schwab stated he has checked the information on the signs as Planning Commission had requested and the uses listed are okay.

Mr. Bergsten stated he had received a letter from the Black Oak Home-owners Association voicing concern of the industrial center. Mr. Bergsten stated that the signs are not attractive and look as though they will not stand up for the remainder of the 30-day approval.

Mr. Schwab stated that he spoke to Tarsas Development and they will check the signs and secure them if necessary.

Mr. Schwab stated that the Planning Commission should be aware that a rezoning application has been submitted to the City for that same parcel of land.

Mr. McSherry asked what the rezoning request was for.

Mr. Schwab stated that the rezoning request would be for R-4.

The Planning Commission decided that since the rezoning request has been made and will appear on the next agenda, the temporary sign permit will not be extended beyond the 30-day approval.

Minutes of December 12, 1978

Mr. Cash stated that he had some recommendations for changes in the Planning Commission minutes of December 12, 1978, in order to clarify their meaning. The changes are as follows:

Page 1. Public Hearings. Fourth paragraph.
. "since there are other newer members, it would be helpful to know what the variance requirements are. He was informed they are listed in Ordinance Section 23, Page 3, Subparagraph 1. Mr. Cash then wanted to know whose responsibility it was to see that the ordinance requirements are met by the variance request".

Page 2. Public Hearings. Fifth paragraph.
. "a variance approval could be based on the statements in Mr. Beekman's letter".

Page 2. Public Hearings Sixth paragraph.
. "to allow the variance standards to be more clearly addressed".

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to approve the minor changes in order to clarify the meaning. Seconded by Mr. Tate. Approved unanimously.

Discussion of Voting Procedures

There was a discussion as to whether the Planning Commission should use a roll call voting system. Mr. Tate stated that they had done away with this in order to speed up the meetings; however, he stated if the Planning Commission members would rather use this procedure they could do so.

The Planning Commission concluded that they see no problems with the voting procedures they are using now and decided to leave them as they are.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.