

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
Tuesday, June 26, 1979 Meeting

Mr. Tate called the meeting to order at 7:41 p.m.

Attendance: Mr. Elmer Tate, Jr., Mr. Brian Bergsten, Mr. Bernard Samples, Mr. Dallas Horvath, Mr. Jerry Cash, Mrs. Marian Simmons (where noted). Also present: Mr. Alan Schwab, Planner; Mr. Karl M. Schab, City Engineer; Mr. Joseph Minner, Administrative Assistant; Mr. Robert N. Farquhar, Law Director. Absent: Mr. Roland McSherry.

SETTING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

COMMUNICATIONS

Centerville Square Shopping Center - Request for Farmers Market

Mr. Jack Hutton, one of the owners of Centerville Square, stated that he is present at the meeting in order to obtain a temporary permit to initiate a Farmers Market. He stated that they are willing to donate a portion of the shopping center parking area for the purpose of inviting local farmers to come and sell their wares. This would give the local people a chance to sell and also the local people a chance to buy fresh vegetables. There are two places being considered for this use. One would be a vacant area 40' x 100' which is right in back of Winters Bank and the other one is about 200' in length and about 40' wide along West Spring Valley Road. Mr. Hutton stated that he has no preference as to which one is used.

Mr. Hutton stated that this idea is still being investigated and they don't know what kind of reaction it will have. There will probably be about ten vendors who will want to come of a first come, first serve basis. The hours will involve Friday and Saturday from about 9 to 5.

Mr. Hutton stated that there will be a need for a temporary sign and also suggested a temporary permit at this point to see how the idea is accepted. If it is favorable, they will come back to Planning Commission and request something more permanent. Mr. Hutton stated that there is not a whole lot of time because the growing season gets away from us and if we don't do it now, we might not be able to.

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Farquhar what the Planning Commission could do to kick off this idea.

Mr. Farquhar stated that this could be granted on a temporary basis for maybe a period of 30 to 60 days. Ultimately they are going to have to come in with an amendment to their site plan for proposing this kind of use. At this point, the Planning Commission can grant it just so long as it is within the motion granting it that you have perimeters that you want established.

Mr. Samples asked if there are any traffic problems.

Mr. Schwab stated not looking at the sites that Mr. Hutton is suggesting. It seems in looking at this, that West Spring Valley might be the best place.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff can look at this more closely and decide which area might be more feasible.

Mr. Hutton stated that he would also like permission to charge maybe \$5.00 or \$10.00 in order to assure clean-up of the area afterwards.

Mr. Farquhar stated that will not require Planning Commission approval. That is strictly between you and the vendors.

Mr. Schwab stated that if the vendors would sell anything other than food, there would be a zoning problem. It will have to be limited just to food.

Mr. Cash asked if this would be limited just to home-grown, local produce.

Mr. Hutton stated yes, that we don't want any outsiders--this is kind of a community thing. I don't know if we will restrict someone living just on the other side into Warren County, but we will keep it local.

Mr. Horvath asked Mr. Schwab how many vendors this should be limited to.

Mr. Schwab stated that not being familiar with what they intend to do, he is not sure. It depends on if they sell it out of the back of trucks or what. If you put in too much vending there, you will interfere with the shopping center as well as the curb cuts.

Mr. Tate asked if a limit of ten vendors would be satisfactory.

Mr. Farquhar suggested that perhaps a limit of space would be the best thing.

Mr. Bergsten stated that such other limitations than a time period should be addressed by the staff.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to approve the request for Centerville Square for a Farmers Market with the approval of the arrangements of the approval to meet with staff recommendations. This temporary approval is to be granted until August 28, 1979, at which time the request should be resubmitted for a permanent approval (amendment to the Site Plan). Mr. Samples seconded the motion. Mrs. Simmons abstained. Motion approved 5-0-1.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS

Cochran, Virgil L. and Ruth H.  
Mallot, Crystal E. - Variance on Side and Rear Yard Requirement

Mr. Schwab stated that the variance for the side and rear yard requirement is located at 912 East Franklin Street which is situated on the southeast corner of South Suburban Road and Franklin Street.

Mr. Schwab stated that there is some question as to the handling of oil storage facilities as well as the dumpsters. The original proposal was to have a 4 ft. rear yard which would normally call for a 20 ft. rear yard under the current zoning ordinance. We also are

dealing with a lot coverage which is now 47% and would increase to 55% with the addition of this 24 ft. building part. We are also dealing with setback from South Suburban Road which would be 20 ft. which should be 35 ft. under the ordinance. There is also a variance from 20 ft. to 4 ft. on the side yard.

Mr. Schwab stated that he met with the applicants and the proposal he came in with altering their original plan was to try to treat the dumpster area. What they intend to do is to have a screened area. The dumpsters will be placed on concrete pads with a ridge around them to provide for the oil that drains from the metal pieces. This will keep the oil from working its way out towards the street. Also the ridge will allow the concrete pads to be cleaned out once in a while should it fill up sometime. Swinging gates will be constructed in order to facilitate their emptying. The building area that they are requesting is still the same and the addition is to handle the dumpster situation as well as providing an opening.

Staff's concerns are that they probably will be emptied with a truck backing into the street, so there is a possibility of interferring with traffic no more than once a day. That is one concern. The other would be back to the basic variance which is for the building area.

Mr. Schwab stated that regarding the variance checklist, he pointed out that several businesses have been granted variances for side yards in this general area. If this is a justification to some extent, he stated that he would leave that to the discretion of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff's recommendation varies. The situation is very questionable.

Mr. Richard Snyder, owner of the property, stated that first of all a truck could easily come in and empty the dumpsters. He stated also that the materials that they use are basically oil free and the ridge on the concrete pad is there only as a precaution in case something would have to be pumped out. He stated that there is a chain link fence on the adjacent property line. This would be cleaned up to enhance the area. The area would be ten times better than it is now. The area would be used for storage so there would be nothing outside the fence area. With all these assets, Mr. Snyder stated that he didn't see how the proposed request could be detrimental to the City.

Mr. Bergsten stated that his only objection to the requested variance last month was the treatment of the dumpsters and this now seems adequate.

Mr. Cash asked if the City owned the property from the fence over.

Mr. Schwab stated no, that that is owned by the lumber company. Between the City's property and the south end of that property, the lumber company owns that tract and use it to store lumber.

Mr. Tate stated there is no question that adding to the building will clean it up making it more presentable.

Mr. Cash asked to see the variance checklist.

Mr. Cash stated that the variance request does not meet all the guidelines that are set up for granting a variance. He stated he would rather send it to Council and let them overrule the Planning Commission and grant the variance if they want to. That would mean that they really didn't mean what they said when they passed those regulations on the property in the first place and it might lead to an amendment in the ordinance. Apparently, it is the intent of the ordinance that the industrial district be developed more like an industrial park and leave space between buildings and we are violating that intent of the ordinance by allowing everything to be so cramped together. I realize we have given variances on other properties, but we will run into that always.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to grant the variance request for a 24 ft. addition to the rear of the property at 912 East Franklin Street contingent upon the dumpsters being enclosed in accordance with the plan that was shown to the staff and commission.

Mr. Samples amended his motion as follows:

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the request for the variance presented to the Planning Commission by the owners of the property at 912 East Franklin Street contingent upon the enclosure of the dumpsters as illustrated. Mrs. Simmons seconded. Mr. Horvath and Mr. Cash voted no. Motion approved 4-2.

#### Centerville High School - Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab stated that this is in regards to the Centerville High School expansion, primarily the stadium. The location is 500 East Franklin Street. The zoning is R-2. The request is for a sign variance for the stadium and associated buildings that go with the stadium. The permitted signage for the whole site including the high school is one identification sign, 32 sq. ft. per side for a total of 64 sq. ft. It has a maximum height of 16 ft. for the free-standing type of sign. Also directional signs will be permitted on the site. These signs will be placed as necessary with a size requirement of 2 sq. ft. per face. They are requesting a sign that would be 83 sq. ft. on the locker room building which is just south of the main grandstand. Also there is a request for two signs (Gate A and Gate B) that would be a total 156 sq. ft. (78 sq. ft. each). The Gate C sign would be 24 sq. ft. A "Home of the Elks" sign with a big "C" on it would be about 20 ft. by 42 ft. for a total of 840 sq. ft. The grand total of requested signage for the stadium is 1,100 sq. ft.

The prime concern is the residential area on the west property line and to the minor extent on the south property line. There is presently such an elevation difference on the site that it would not affect the area to the south to a great degree. Primarily, the concern is with the west area which is residential. The "Home of the Elks" sign is about 42 ft. long with the "C" being about 20 ft. wide and 16 ft. tall. The lettering is about 2½ to 3½ feet tall. It will be elevated some 25 to 35 feet depending on the location on the sign.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff's viewpoint is somewhat questioning the location of some of these signs and their real necessity. Staff's major questions are, are the size and locations of these signs justified as essential to the site.

The parking area is to the north end of the fields. The "Gate" signs and "Centerville" signs would all be facing directly toward the residents and not toward the parking area. The best view someone would have of these particular signs would be a oblique view as you approach the stadium. The walking traffic would only see them as they come in front of them.

Mr. Schwab stated that as a normal rule, you have 1" of lettering for every 50 ft. of reading distance. With the viewing distance on one side of 600 ft., the letters should be about 1 ft. high and along the other side of 1,000 ft., about 2 ft. high. In regards to the location, due to the nearness of the residents, it would seem that the orientation of the signage ought to be to the northerly direction predomiently to be feasible and useful to direct people unfamiliar with the site so that they can see it from the parking area as they approach and it seems that perhaps something projecting out from the building like a normal projection sign with a hanging "A" would be adequate.

Mr. Schwab stated that according to the variance checklist, the request does meet all the guidelines.

The only sign that staff found that presented a problem to them that could not be reasonably worked out would be the "Home of the Elks" sign. The way the signage is figured, enclosing the whole thing in a rectangle, it would be something like 700 or 800 sq. ft. for the sign. Staff just felt that for six games during the year and the view that would be straight towards these residential buildings at that height in the air, it is not really serving that great of a purpose. We could just not find any justification for that size of sign. If it would be down-sized, it might be acceptable. It seems for six games a year that some kind of banner could be rolled down for the game. It is not known if this is feasible. It seems as though whether Centerville wins or loses would not be geared to this sign. It seems that it should be seen by people entering the stands in which case it would placed on the north face of the building (on a smaller size). This would also be the least obtrusive to the residential area. Staff's opinion is that they cannot agree with what is being proposed.

Mr. Larry Anderson, architect for the project, showed some projection charts of the project. He stated that the only change that has been made is to the smaller visitors ticket booth--the face has been moved to face north. These signs were done in scale with the rest of the project and to add some life to a building which otherwise is going to be kind of plain. As far as the residential property is concerned, with the difference in topography, the residents are not going to be able to see these letters.

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Schwab if he calculated the signage as a rectangle around the whole logo.

Mr. Schwab stated yes, that is the way Centerville's sign ordinance calculates sign area.

Mr. Anderson stated that the size of the lettering is in scale to the size of the building. To make the letters smaller would make them look out of place.

Mr. Bergsten stated that this sign is not a sign in the true meaning-- it is more of a decoration. He stated that the stadium is there and you can't do much with it, just whatever might be in good taste.

Mr. Cash asked if the letters were painted on the surface.

Mr. Anderson stated yes.

Mr. Tate asked if the sign was lighted from one side.

Mr. Anderson stated it is lighted from both sides.

Mr. Cash asked if there was a particular or special attempt to light the sign.

Mr. Anderson stated no.

The Planning Commission members expressed concern as to if the gate signs were visible from the parking area.

Mr. Anderson stated that everyone enters from the west side of the school and the gate signs will be visible at that time.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved that the sign variance for Centerville High School be granted as requested. Seconded by Mr. Samples. Mr. Horvath voted no. Motion approved 5-1.

#### Standard Oil Company - Sign Variance

Mr. Schwab made a slide presentation of the sign variance request. The site is zoned B-2. The request is for a sign variance. The permitted signage on area is  $1\frac{1}{2}$  sq. ft. per linear foot of building frontage or the permitted signage would be 80 ft. on their canopy structure times  $\frac{1}{2}$  for 120 sq. ft. of permitted signage. The request is for 2 freestanding signs which are 126 sq. ft. each including some 3 x 6 price logo that go on the pole of each freestanding sign. That would be a total of 252 sq. ft. of freestanding signage. An additional wall mounted sign would be on the edge of the canopy on three sides of the 80 x 30 ft. canopy. There would be 2 wall mounted signs which would be 205 sq. ft. each for a total of 410 sq. ft. There would be another wall mounted on the end which would read "Sohio" and that would be an additional 75 sq. ft. This would be a grand total of 737 sq. ft. on the project. They are also requesting two freestanding signs instead of one.

In the ordinance, one freestanding sign 16 ft. tall would be allowed with 25 sq. ft. per face. Setback on the freestanding sign would be required of 25 ft. from the right-of-way and they are requesting a 1 ft. setback.

Mr. Robert Albright, representing Standard Oil, stated that they have amended the application request to have one freestanding sign instead of two and have changed the location of the sign to the northeast corner of the project. It will not be over 16 ft. in height.

Mr. Tate asked why they wanted a sign with a price logo. They are not used.

Mr. Albright stated no, they are not being used at this time; however, in the future they will be used again.

Rev. Fred McCall, pastor of the church located across from the Standard Oil site, stated that they have cooperated for years with the TCC regarding the development of the surrounding area. They realize that the area adjacent is zoned commercial, however, they want the commercial area to compliment what is already there. He stated that most of the congregation lives in Centerville so they do have a direct interest in what is going on in the area. Even though the church is located in Greene County, he stated that he and other members of the church are trying to work out some solutions that will compliment everybody's situation. Rev. McCall stated that what they question is the setback. In working with the TCC, they are still not sure what is going to develop along Wilmington Pike. Their concern now is that they would like to delay this a little bit until they see what is going to happen.

Dr. Charles A. Dille, resident, stated that Standard Oil approached him at one time and wanted an option on land. One of the things that they insisted on was the 100 ft. high sign and because he didn't want to look at this all the time, he didn't agree to sell them property. He stated that no one knows what the highway is going to do and until the time that they do, he doesn't see how anyone can plan anything.

The Planning Commission viewed a slide of the site plan. Looking at the proposed sign location, the sign would have a 1 ft. setback according to the City's right-of-way standards.

Mr. Cash asked how far back the sign could be set and still be in the island.

Mr. Schwab stated about 10 ft.

Mr. Cash asked why there has to be a sign facing Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Albright asked if he meant on the building.

Mr. Cash replied yes.

Mr. Tate stated that the building signage is not necessary because you can see the freestanding sign from the corner. He stated further that the signage has to be gotten down to a reasonable request.

Mr. Horvath stated that the canopy signage is not necessary.

Mr. Schwab stated that the canopy signage facing east and west is 205 sq. ft. on each side and another 75 sq. ft. to the south. This would eliminate 485 sq. ft. of signage in the canopy signage if deleted.

Mr. Albright stated that if they were given highway visibility that would eliminate the need for the Sohio and Standard Oil canopy signs.

Mr. Tate stated that they are down to within the talking point of a variance.

Dr. Dille asked what was meant by highway visibility.

Mr. Horvath stated it would not be more than 16 ft. high in the air.

Mr. Cash asked if a big highway sign was in the future plans.

Mr. Albright stated no.

Mr. Schwab stated that in looking at a topography map, this area appears to have very good highway visibility from I-675.

MOTION: Mr. Cash moved to table the variance and it is requested that amended drawings showing which wall signs are now being asked for and the exact location of the freestanding sign be submitted. Mr. Horvath seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

#### Standard Oil Company - Curb Cut Request

Mr. Schwab reviewed the curb cut request that had been tabled at the previous Planning Commission meeting. The project located on the northwest corner of Wilmington Pike and Olympic Drive is zoned B-2. The request is for a curb cut on Wilmington Pike that would be a right-in only and a full movement curb cut on Olympic Drive.

Mr. Schwab stated that on a recent trip, he came across a Sohio Station that had no curb cuts except two curb cuts on a major or minor collector. The station was closed like all the rest of them. Apparently they are selling out their allotment. This could be some evidence that some stations can do it that way although I don't know all the full circumstances.

The submitted drawing shows the 35 ft. road width and the taper off the existing land of traffic approaching this would be about a 42 ft. radius. The other curb cut (Olympic Drive) is a normal shovel approach and a 35 ft. throat width.

At the direction of Planning Commission, Mr. Schwab stated that he spoke to the people at the State as well as TCC. The people at the State were hesitant to put something in writing, but basically what they came up with is that if you just consider moving this to the north, the calculations showed that a passenger car to make this movement would require 12 ft. of throat width to very exactly get through that. The recommendation would probably be 15 ft. Once you get up to a standard semi-rig, their feeling was you would have to have 24 ft. To get through that area comfortably, you would have to have 24 ft. plus, to get through that area. There is some concern about the State regulations on curb cuts. The State has no regulations except that the maximum cut of a curb cut is 35 ft.

Mr. Tate stated that if you have a 35 ft. curb cut, you won't have a right-in only. The more you widen it to make it safer for a larger range of vehicles, then you start encouraging a left-out movement.



The TCC recommendation was to make the curb cut between 20 and 25 ft. They also reemphasized this action would take an amendment to the Wilmington Pike Task Force plan which right now calls for no access on Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Schwab stated that he believes we can get too carried away with the design of the curb cut, when the main issue is still whether we should grant a curb cut on Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Cash stated that TCC's recommendation is still against the curb cut on Wilmington Pike.

Mr. Schwab stated that that is correct.

Mr. Cash asked if the TCC had ever considered a right-in only--if that proposal were taken back to them they may possibly make an amendment to the Access Control Plan.

Mr. Robert Albright stated at the last meeting they had expressed a desire that this matter go to two bodies--the TCC and ODOT for their recommendations on the width and the type of cut and the location for the curb cut. Mr. Albright stated that on behalf of Standard Oil, it is their feeling that they must have and they are entitled to have a cut on Wilmington Pike both by the taking of the State of Ohio and both being essential to the location of the property and the location of the station. In going to the State of Ohio, he stated that Standard Oil met with Mr. Fred Kagler, Division 8, who is the engineer for permits.

Mr. Albright presented a drawing to the Planning Commission. This drawing indicated the recommendation from the State of Ohio, who grants the permit, and shows a minimum of a 24 ft. cut. We stated at the last meeting that we would be able to live with what these bodies recommended.

Mr. Tate stated that that is truly a right-in only.

Mr. Albright stated that it is.

Mr. Tate asked for TCC's recommendation.

Mr. Schwab stated that they are asking for about 25 ft.

Mr. Albright stated that as advised by Mr. Kagler, the State would grant that permit and the State does control that since they have gained access and right-of-way there.

Mr. Schwab stated that the State will take into consideration what the City of Centerville's recommendation is.

Mr. Cash asked if this right-in only could be put on the original tracing and distributed to the Wilmington Pike Task Force. He stated that if they were given a chance to see this plan, they may amend their Access Control Plan. Mr. Cash stated that the Planning Commission could write a letter stating that they are leaning towards approving this proposal and would like the recommendation from the Task Force.

Mr. Tate stated that we have worked with the regional agency this far, he didn't see any reason in not going back to them again.

Rev. Fred McCall stated that the church has a right to maintain their present driveway; however, they have agreed to move them to Olympic Drive as requested by TCC. He stated further that the site distance of the road is very dangerous.

Mr. Albright stated that with all do respect, the church does not have the right to that driveway--it is acquired limited access. Standard Oil does have a right, in the deed in which the State got it, to an access on the property. He stated that the design will be made in accordance with what is shown on the amended proposal. Mr. Albright stated that he would like a decision on this tonight, that being approval of disapproval. Hoping it would be approval and go onto Council, he stated. We would hope also that there would be a recommendation back from TCC by the time it gets to Council.

Mr. Schwab stated that we do need an agreement from the developer to delay action on this again tonight.

Mr. Albright stated that he did not realize that the project would get on the Council agenda so quickly--he thought it would be at least a month or two; but, he would still like it to go to Council during the month of July. He stated that if the project could be scheduled for July 16 and no recommendation is back from TCC, then the project could remain tabled--they would agree to that.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to deny the request. Mr. Bergsten seconded the motion.

Mr. Cash stated that he feels they have made some progress here tonight and rather than deny, he would rather table the project.

Mr. Horvath stated that if they want to move onto Council, then let the Planning Commission give them a denial and let them proceed that way.

Mr. Albright stated that he would agree to table the project.

Mr. Tate stated that we still have a motion to deny.

Mr. Albright stated that to remind the chairman, that issue for a motion to table it carries precedent over the motion (as in Roberts Rules).

Mr. Tate asked if there was a motion to table it.

Mr. Albright stated that if someone does make a motion to table, it does carry precedent over the motion to deny.

Mr. Tate stated that no one has made that motion.

Mr. Albright stated that he knows that. If someone were to make a motion to table, they would agree to that.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to table the curb cut request. Mr. Tate seconded the motion. Mr. Horvath voted no. Motion approved 5-1.

At this time, Mr. Horvath excused himself from the meeting.

Thomas Paine Settlement #3 - Preliminary Plan

Mr. Schwab asked Mr. Samples to give a report of the meeting that the committee had with the developer.

Mr. Samples stated that the concensus of that meeting was that there was no reason to have another meeting.

Mr. Karl Schab stated that Mr. Samples was authorized to bring to Planning Commission whatever the committee decided.

Mr. Minner stated that it was his understanding that the matter is before Planning Commission and a letter to the developer should be sent by them. The approval of the project is based on the issue of who is going to pay for the extension of Clyo Road. You have to come to that decision, you will have that decision, and then you can take action from there.

Mr. Samples asked if verbal communication is sufficient.

Mr. Minner stated yes, that it will be reflected in the minutes here and that will be sufficient.

Mr. Samples stated that the concensus of the committee was that the development could not proceed under any currently recommended plans unless the cost of putting Clyo Road through was assumed by the developer. The developer stated that he saw no way of doing it.

Mr. Minner stated that technically the Planning Commission's decision on whether it can develop or not, the committee's conclusion was that the developer needs to pay for Clyo Road 100%. It is your decision as to whether you will let them develop any further.

Mr. Cash asked how this project came about.

Mr. Schwab stated that the project was a tabled preliminary plan to put in an additional 64 units. It would be the last 64 units that would use up the allotment under the current zoning. The preliminary plan shown no improvement for Clyo Road.

Mr. Cash asked if the Planning Commission should be taking action tonight then.

Mr. Samples stated yes, that that was the request of the developer according to the letter that Mr. Samples received today. The letter stated that as a reminder, the original request was to approve 64 units.

Mr. Cash asked if the Planning Commission wanted a motion.

Mr. Tate stated yes.

MOTION: Mr. Cash moved to disapprove the developer's application for the preliminary plan that was submitted to the City showing no improvement to Clyo Road. Seconded by Mrs. Simmons. Approved unanimously.

Litsakos, Betty - Conditional Use Request

Mr. Schwab gave a slide presentation of the conditional use request located at 7266 Far Hills Avenue. The zoning on the parcel is R-3 which is normally doubles. The lot size is one acre. The use requested on the application is for a professional office. The category that is intended is for a residential office. The parking requirement under the ordinance is 5 spaces. The parking requirement is for rear yard parking and the proposed parking is for the front yard. This property is the last R-3 property fronting on a thoroughfare which does allow a conditional use office or residential office. It does abut residential property to the rear and to the north. To the south there is already a medical building and multi-family use.

On the particular parcel as it exists on the auditor's map, it currently is a one acre parcel with a house on the north section of this parcel and the south section of this parcel is vacant. The application addresses this particular parcel as if this were a separate parcel with a house on it 100 ft. wide by 218 ft. long in depth. The application is somewhat in error that it doesn't address the whole parcel--it addresses half of it as if it were already split which is not the case. The proposed parking is the existing driveway. There would be two spaces in front of the existing garage and three spaces off of the driveway area to the south. There is some potential conflict with the parking layout. If all parking spaces were filled, for someone using the existing driveway spaces there would be no where to turn around forcing them to back onto SR 48. Really the only feasible spaces are the three spaces just south of the existing driveway.

In this district we also require rear parking. In viewing the R-3 parcels from the rear of the medical building from Zengel Drive, it appears to have the intent to link all of these rear building areas together to provide this rear access.

Mr. Schwab stated that if the parcel is one acre, the application should be amended to read as such. Also we need to work out a better solution for rear parking.

The staff recommendation would be to look at the whole parcel and the access and the front yard parking moved to the rear.

Mr. Robert Buckingham, representing Mrs. Litsakos, stated that the parcel is currently one full acre. He stated that he was under the impression that you could not bring in a vacant piece of land without a specific building in mind. These parcels should be designed in unison.

Mr. Tate stated you would have to get a lot split. He stated further that you are in a residential district. In order to develop the vacant area, the parcel must be split. After this is done, you will have to come back in and get a conditional use approval. Whatever you propose to build on the other parcel will have to come in also.

Mr. Farquhar stated that after the lot is split, you can apply for the conditional use on the vacant parcel. You do not have to build the building first. You do have to have plans showing what you are going to do.

Mr. Tate stated that the application should be modified and the parking situation should be worked out.

MOTION: Mr. Cash moved to table this request pending the submission of a revised plot plan. Mr. Bergsten seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

#### Barnes, Tom - Conditional Use Request

Mr. Schwab stated that the building being requested for a conditional use is located on the first lot east of the old Centerville High School. The zoning is currently R-3. The lot size is 11,425 sq. ft.

The required parking is 5 spaces. There is a strip of land going to Weidner Lane. Probably the old pad from the burned out building will be used and an addition will be made to the south. The existing driveway would be repaved and reused.

Mr. Schwab stated that there will be additional vegetation to that already existing. Most of it will be low shrubs. Staff recommendation would be to find out what the intent on Weidner Lane is here adjoining the driveway. The recommendation would be to add to the screening on the south property line, something of an evergreen variety which would buffer the adjoining uses particularly the rear parking area.

Mr. Tom Barnes, applicant, stated that there is an 11 ft. right-of-way to Wiedner Lane. He stated that they do intend to blacktop that area and use it. A parking space is shown in that area on the plan because he provided more parking than is required. Mr. Barnes stated he did fail to include the shrubbery, but they do intend to do such. They have an agreement with the south property owner that there will be a fence put up for their dog and plantings will be put along that area. All along the school those plantings will be kept there and updated.

MOTION: Mr. Cash moved to approve the application for the conditional use being contingent on approval of the property owner to the south of the landscaping of which should be evergreen trees. Also there should be a wooden fence, 5 ft. high or chain link fence and a dense living hedge as approved by staff. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

#### David Holzen Plat - Preliminary Plan

Mr. Schwab reviewed the preliminary plan for the David Holzen Plat located north of Social Row Road and west of Paragon Road in Washington Township. The acreage is 9.3 acres. There is an existing house on the parcel which is not a part of the plat. The plat consists of a single street coming back and forming a cul-de-sac. There will be a stub street to the north. To the south, there is a sort of lagoon with some cattle grazing around it. To the west, there

is sort of a drop-off and it would appear to staff that what they are proposing with a stub in the northerly direction is a reasonable request.

The major condition is that the general subdivision regulations call for a maximum cul-de-sac length of 500 to 600 feet. This particular one is approximately 1100 feet. The given number of units at this particular time is only 4 units. That would not appear to be a problem. You should be well aware that this is a jump development.

Mr. Tate asked what the units are.

Mr. Schwab stated that they are single family. He stated that he did speak to Evelyn List, Washington Township Zoning Inspector, and she sees no problem with the plan.

Mr. Schwab stated that in talking with the applicant the intent is to relocate his residence to the lot at the rear of the cul-de-sac and build some houses on half of the lots. There is currently no water or sewer available in this area. At some point in time when the water and sewer are available, he intends to divide the lots in half and build on those lots.

Staff recommendation is that even with the excessive cul-de-sac length, the number of units on it, and the stub street to the north, that at this stage in the development we approve it as submitted.

Mr. Cash stated that once you have the cul-de-sac, when the lots are split there will be a larger number of units in there.

Mr. Schwab stated yes, but he will need a change in zoning to split those lots.

Mr. Cash stated that you could shorten the cul-de-sac and save a lot of money. There is no need to make it that long.

Mr. Chris Shaffer, Miami Engineering representing Mr. Holzen, stated that if the Planning Commission had any questions regarding the layout of the plat, he was available to answer them.

MOTION: Mr. Cash moved to disapprove the Preliminary Plan for the David Holzen Plat due to the violation of the subdivision regulations regarding the length of the cul-de-sac as presented.

There was no second on the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the Preliminary Plan for the David Holzen Plat. Mr. Bergsten seconded the motion. Mr. Cash voted no. Motion approved 4-1.

Mr. Tate stated that the next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 31, 1979 at 7:30 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

*Elmer Tate 7/31/79*