

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, August 28, 1979 Meeting

Mr. Tate called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

Attendance: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr., Mr. Brian Bergsten, Mr. Dallas Horvath, Mr. Bernard Samples, Col. Stanley Morrow, Mrs. Marian Simmons (where noted). Absent: Mr. Francis G. Cash. Also present: Mr. Alan C. Schwab, Planner; Mr. Karl M. Schab, City Engineer; Mr. Joseph S. Minner, Assistant City Manager; Chief Randall Staley, Washington Township Fire Department; Mrs. Evelyn List, Washington Township Zoning Inspector.

Approval of minutes of July 31, 1979, Planning Commission Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to approve the minutes of July 31, 1979 as written. Mr. Samples seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0-2. Mr. Bergsten and Col. Morrow abstained.

SETTING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS - none

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Schwab if there were any communications.

Mr. Schwab stated that there were none.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Tate stated that due to a problem of timing for the representative of the Burger King Corporation, the Burger King site plan would be discussed as the first project. After the review of Burger King, the order of the agenda will be resumed.

Burger King - Site Plan

Mr. Schwab made a slide presentation of the proposed site plan for the Burger King restaurant. The location of the restaurant is to be east of SR 48 (South Main Street) and north of Spring Valley Road in the existing Goldman parking area.

Mr. Schwab stated that this project is actually a site plan amendment of the Goldman shopping center. The zoning on the project is B-2. The proposed building size is 2,417 square feet.

Mr. Schwab stated that the parking space requirement is as determined by the Planning Commission for this particular use. The developers have requested twenty-seven (27) spaces.

Staff recommends a minimum of forty-two (42) spaces or seventeen (17) spaces per 1,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area. This recommendation is based on a actual survey out of Chicago on parking needs for fast food restaurants.

Mr. Schwab located the placement of the building site in the parking area, adding that the Foto Fair building will be removed in order to facilitate the Burger King restaurant. There will be no additional curb cuts for the project.

Mr. Schwab stated that the signage is not a part of this submitted plan even though the plan does show some signage.

Mr. Schwab showed the proposed site plan stating that there will be a one-lane drive-thru with a call-in box on the south end of the property. There will be a pick-up window on the east side of the property.

Staff is concerned about the curb cut for the dumpster area for deliveries and to pick up refuse from the dumpster. This curb cut would allow potentially, if this is not controlled properly with just striping, this would allow access through to the call box from the south entrance. The problem is that you will get conflicting traffic movements due to the convenience of the dumpster curb cut area which fits directly into the drive-thru lane.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff's recommendation would be that for visibility purposes, with the dumpster area being exposed to SR 48 with the doors that get in all kinds of conditions after a time, with that reason and more seriously the potential traffic conflict, that this dumpster be reversed with the screening around the dumpster and that access be provided from the east side of the property instead of from the west side. Then you wouldn't have the visibility problem of the dumpster looking straight out onto SR 48 and also it would be very unlikely that any movements would occur between the call box and the pick-up window. That would seem to be a better arrangement of the site plan. Mr. Schwab stated he understood there may be some technical problems with that, but is it staff's opinion that those could be worked out.

Mr. Schwab reviewed staff's recommendations:

1. On this particular site plan within the bounds that they are leasing, they show a minimum of forty-two (42) spaces on that leased ground or sufficient evidence that they have obtained an absolute right to common space on the Goldman shopping center property. Otherwise, we are in a situation where they are showing twenty-seven (27) spaces on the property and staff's opinion is that that is totally inadequate.
2. Mr. Schwab stated that the dumpster should be moved to the east side of the facility.
3. The Fire Department has requested that a fire hydrant be placed to facilitate this site. Mr. Schwab stated that he understood the applicant has no problem with that.

4. Mr. Schwab stated that an amended site plan should be submitted for the Goldman Shopping Center that shows how all this parking and all this circulation dovetails in with the existing site plan. He stated that staff has not seen exactly how Goldman's is going to restripe their parking lot to facilitate this development that is going to occur within their shopping center. That still remains a problem.
5. Mr. Schwab stated that there are some signs shown on the elevations. He stated that at this point in time, signage is not being considered.

Mr. Schwab stated that staff recommendation was completed.

Mr. Walter Zahn, representing Burger King Corporation, stated that he had gone over an overall site plan with Mr. Schwab that showed the shopping center incorporated. He submitted copies of this plan to the members of the Planning Commission. Mr. Zahn stated, however, this plan does not designate how the parking spaces are laid out. It just specifies that there are a certain number of parking spaces in a given area. Mr. Zahn stated that he does have aerial photos that were taken of the site during peak hours. He stated that you can see visibly how the cars are parked. Mr. Zahn stated that the area they are leasing will have no effect on the shopping area itself.

Mr. Tate asked if there is a problem with the forty-two (42) spaces.

Mr. Zahn stated yes, it is totally impossible to contain forty-two (42) spaces on this particular site. The site is only 22,100 square feet--a little bit less than a half acre and there is no way you can get our building on there and have forty-two (42) parking spaces.

Mr. Tate asked if Goldman would give them more area.

Mr. Zahn stated that he did not know.

Mr. Tate asked what is going to happen when people park in Goldman's and go into Burger King.

Mr. Zahn stated that he did not know, he does not have a copy of the contract with him as to the lease agreements between Burger King and Goldman.

Mr. Tate stated that the Goldman lot is by no means the most crowded lot in the area.

Mr. Zahn stated that he was aware of that, as the aerial photos clearly show. However, they do have to maintain a certain number of parking spaces, in order to meet specifications.

Mr. Horvath stated that if we cannot meet both standards, he did not see how this site plan could be approved. Centerville has made certain standards and if those standards cannot be met, perhaps this is not the place to have a Burger King.

Mr. Zahn stated that he believes that there is an overabundance of parking places in that shopping center in which to have common parking.

Mr. Tate asked about the dumpster relocating.

Mr. Zahn stated that the dumpster relocating would mean quite an extensive research into that because on the back part of the dumpster is located the electrical vault for the underground service. That is the only immediate area that is available to put the electrical vault. It is too big to be contained in the building.

Mr. Tate asked if Dayton Power and Light had designated the spot for the electrical vault as to where they are going to put it.

Mr. Zahn stated yes.

Mr. Bergsten asked why does it have to be there.

Mr. Zahn stated both for convenience and for an economical standpoint view from Dayton Power and Light, which pays for the run to the facility, and also from the Burger King Corporation which pays from the vault into the building.

Mr. Zahn stated that as he understood it, Mr. Schwab's only concerns are the doors on the dumpster enclosure and the traffic conflict which will be controlled.

Mr. Tate stated he did not see how.

Mr. Zahn stated that he did not believe Mr. Tate would want to crash through a chain.

Mr. Tate asked if a chain will be put up.

Mr. Zahn stated yes, a chain will be put up there or a couple of saw horses that will only be removed to allow the deliveries to be made and refuse to be removed.

Mr. Tate asked if the fire hydrant is a problem.

Mr. Zahn stated no. Also a total overall amended site plan will be provided.

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Schwab if the entrance is blocked off, does that take care of staff's concerns.

Mr. Schwab stated that does not sound very attractive facing SR 48.

Mr. Tate stated that something is going to have to be done with the parking situation. Mr. Tate suggested that Mr. Zahn submit an amended site plan in order to determine how many spaces are left for Goldman and work something out.

Mr. Tate suggested tabling the project until the dumpster area and the parking concerns can be resolved.

Mr. Zahn stated that if they were granted approval tonight, they could submit the necessary documentation that the Planning Commission would need for approval.

Mr. Tate asked if that would be forty-two (42) parking spaces.

Mr. Zahn stated that would be whatever is over and above the twenty-seven (27) spaces on that site which would be common parking with the shopping center. That is the only way it can be done. There is no way you can get forty-two (42) spaces on the site.

Mr. Schwab stated he did work with an architect from the Burger King Corporation in the preliminary site plan stage and the parking situation was resolved with forty-two (42) spaces shown with sixteen (16) spaces along the east side of the building.

Mr. Tate asked why come in with a plan that is with substantially less parking than was worked out with the architect.

Mr. Zahn stated that the only type of plan they can submit to a Planning Commission is that which is contained on the lot or site which they are leasing. We cannot go out beyond our site.

Mr. Tate asked where the architect got the idea that you have more parking space on that site.

Mr. Zahn stated that was outside the property line.

Mr. Zahn asked Mr. Schwab if he was under the impression that those additional sixteen (16) parking spaces were contained on the site.

Mr. Schwab stated that he reviewed two (2) different drawings and they showed forty-two (42) parking spaces on them. He stated he did not know where the architect fits into the Burger King Corporation, but that was one plan that they reviewed.

Mr. Zahn stated that was reviewed prior to the lease being agreed to.

Mr. Schwab stated that the purpose of the preliminary plan is to show Centerville's parking requirements.

Mr. Zahn stated that the Burger King Corporation was not aware of Centerville's parking requirements at the time of the preliminary plan.

Mr. Schwab stated that he does not agree with Mr. Zahn. Mr. Schwab stated he could show those plans to Mr. Zahn as were discussed with the architect.

Mr. Zahn stated he would agree to tabling the item until an agreement could be submitted from Goldman and Burger King Corporation.

Mr. Horvath stated he wants the dumpster worked out also.

Mr. Schwab stated that if you go look at the dumpster area at the Burger King on SR 741 and imagine that fronting onto SR 48, it is not particular pretty even with the doors closed.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to table the site plan for Burger King. Seconded by Mr. Horvath. Motion approved unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Reynolds, Kenneth W. - Variance on a Rear Yard Fence Height

Mr. Schwab reviewed the request for the rear yard fence height located at 7785 Park Creek Drive. The zoning on the property is R-1. The request is to vary the rear yard fence height from the ordinance, which is a maximum of seven (7) feet, to ten (10) feet. The purpose of this request is to accommodate a tennis court on the property.

Mr. Schwab stated that corners of the court will be angled. The ten (10) foot fence height will occur only on the ends of the court. The fence along the sides will be somewhat reduced.

The staff recommendation is to approve this variance application with a suggestion to amend the zoning ordinance to specifically direct guidelines that would allow tennis courts or not allow them.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Reynolds if he had anything he wished to say.

Mr. Reynolds stated not if you approve it.

Mrs. Simmons asked what type of fencing will be used.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he is working through Bellbrook Fence Company. The fence will be vinyl green. The side will be only four (4) feet high.

Mr. Tate closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the variance for rear yard fence height for the tennis court backstop as presented. Mr. Horvath seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Centerville Builders - Variance on Front and Side Yard Setback Requirements

Mr. Schwab made a slide presentation of the variance request for Centerville Builders Supply which is located at 948 East Franklin Street near the intersection of Franklin and Clys. The zoning on the parcel is I-1. The request is for a variance on the part of the parcel that faces South Suburban Road for setback and on the southern property line which abuts with the City Annex property line next to the Recycling Center to the north.

The front yard setback required to South Suburban Road right-of-way is thirty-five (35) feet. The requested setback is five (5) feet by the applicant. The side yard required is twenty (20) feet minimum. The requested side yard is five (5) feet.

The proposal is to build a building to be three-sided steel building to enclose a lot of the lumber that is outside presently in their front yard.

Mr. Schwab stated that the northwest corner of the building would be twenty (20) feet from South Suburban Road right-of-way line, on the southwest corner of the building will be five (5) feet from the City property line to the south.

According to the variance checklist, staff did not feel that all the areas to be considered in order to grant a variance were a hardship on the applicant.

Mr. Schwab stated that the property is not unique in area, size, or configuration. Also, the spirit of the zoning ordinance is being violated based on the inequity that might result in granting such a variance.

Mr. Bill Rogers, attorney for Centerville Builders Supply, stated that members of the management of Centerville Builders Supply were also present.

Mr. Rogers stated that Centerville Builders Supply is a major supplier of building materials to the Washington Township/Centerville area and has been for many years. A need for materials on-hand has become a continuing problem. It has become a problem of how to inventory, of handling it, and more particularly how to store it. Right now, if you go down South Suburban Road, it is not a very attractive site. It is very difficult to make open storage of lumber and building materials attractive. Obviously, it is not the best way to store large quantities of material because of the weather. The application was geared to several particular concerns that we felt applied to the property under City standards.

There is a curve in the road that begins commencing at the property of Centerville Builders Supply. We realize that we are asking for a substantial variance. We are in effect asking for fifteen (15) feet at the northern corner and thirty (30) feet at the southern corner. There would be a considerable amount of square feet lost

if the building had to be moved in to meet the setback on the South Suburban Road due to the curve. The fence will be built directly into the building so there will be no storage on South Suburban Road frontage.

Mr. Rogers stated that the spirit of the ordinance concerned them a great deal. He stated that they have only one way to expand and that is in a "L" shape. Even though the business office faces East Franklin Street, the front yard of the business is considered South Suburban Road. We would like in some way of insuring the City that this cannot at a later date be converted into a permanent building for office or whatever.

The construction of this building will have no floor. It will be strictly on a foundation wall to wall and a metal construction prefabrication steel building. It will have no plumbing--nothing of that nature. We have proposed in our application that we will voluntarily restrict our property by appropriate deed restrictions so as to eliminate our capability of being able to convert this to anything other than an accessory building for the purpose of storing building materials. This would provide for selling off that portion of the parcel and turning it into offices. We would make a provision that that building would come down so it would not be in gross violation of the ordinance since it would then be considered the front yard.

The main reason, of course, is to have an organized way of storing and handling the building materials. In order to grow and stay here, we have to have good storage and this is a beneficial way for both the City and us.

Mr. Tate asked where the building entrance would be.

Mr. Rogers stated that it is a three-sided building with the one open wall towards the east.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

Dr. Connair asked about the upkeep of the area between the building and the property line.

Mr. Rogers stated that that area will be filled in with blacktop or gravel, whatever staff wants to be used.

Dr. Connair stated that in another variance that was granted, the area in this same situation is not being kept up and he suffers because of it.

Mr. Tate suggested that Dr. Connair should speak with the Building Inspector regarding the violation.

Mr. Tate closed the public hearing.

Mr. Tate stated that he doesn't like the five (5) foot, however, considering the way you are situated and the fact that it certainly is going to be an improvement to what is there now, he would vote

in favor of the variance. It is a considerable variance.

Mr. Bergsten asked the purpose of the pole barn. It seems that it causes inefficient use of the property unless it is an important part of the facility.

Mr. Rogers stated that it is used for storage and one of the pleasures the new building will give us is that it will block the existing pole barn.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to approve the variance for the Centerville Builders Supply subject to planting schedule and blacktop to be determined by staff. Mr. Horvath seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-2. Mr. Bergsten and Mr. Horvath voted no.

Ordinance 80-71 Amended to Increase the Membership of the Board of Architectural Review from Five (5) Members to Seven (7) Members

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Schwab if this needed any real explanation. It seems rather clear to increase the number of the Board of Architectural Review from five (5) to seven (7) members.

Mr. Schwab stated that that is correct. It just basically increases the number of the members.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

There were no speakers for or against the ordinance.

Mr. Tate closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to accept the ordinance as presented. Mr. Bergsten seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-1-1. Mrs. Simmons voted no. Mr. Samples abstained.

Ordinance 24-79 Amended to Increase the Membership of the Board of Architectural Review from Five (5) Members to Seven (7) Members

Mr. Tate stated that this ordinance was not approved by Council.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing. He stated that since we do not have an ordinance, it is very difficult to amend it.

Mr. Tate closed the public hearing.

Ordinance 28-73 Amended to Include Regulations Concerning Signs and to Provide Definitions Therefor, Within the Architectural Preservation District

Mr. Tate stated that the recommendation is to table this ordinance.

Mr. Schwab stated that currently under the Architectural Preservation Ordinance there are very vague rules concerning signage. The intent of this ordinance is to provide more direction to the Board of Architectural Review to administer their signage policy.

This was a part of the ordinance Council denied. Seeing that that ordinance has been denied by Council and staff is working diligently on drafting a new ordinance, it would be staff's recommendation that this be tabled.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

There were no speakers for or against the ordinance.

Mr. Tate closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to table the Ordinance. Mr. Tate seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously.

City of Centerville - Rezoning from E-C to R-4

Mr. Schwab stated that this is a City initiated rezoning from E-C to R-4. The land is presently occupied by the entire Villager Apartment complex. The location of this area is southeast of the SR 48 and North Village Drive intersection. The acreage of the area to be rezoned is 18.4 acres.

Mr. Schwab stated that the purpose of this rezoning is not to change the land use or the requirements, but to reflect E-C which is a very general conditional use district which permits a variety of uses from commercial to industrial. This R-4 zoning would be to allow easier administration of the district or the type of use that has developed within this E-C zoning.

This is a part of a program that has been talked about through staff for a number of years--to take these E-C zoning districts and rezone them to something with definite guidelines.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

There were no speakers for or against.

Mr. Tate closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to approve the rezoning as presented. Mr. Horvath seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

City of Centerville - Rezoning from R-O-I to R-4

Mr. Schwab stated that this parcel is currently owned by Mrs. Dietz and is again a City initiated rezoning. The acreage on the parcel is .25 acres. The existing zoning is R-O-I. The proposed zoning is R-4.

Currently, this parcel has an existing use on it. It would be non-conforming under the R-O-I classification. The location of the parcel is south of East Alex-Bell Road just east of the Penn Central Railroad.

Mr. Schwab stated that due to a recent rezoning by Council of approximately a twenty-five (25) acre parcel, this rezoning was

initiated. It was determined that given the natural dividing line of the railroad tracks, that this small parcel should not be left R-0-I. This also eliminates the spot zoning effect. By changing this zoning to R-4, it will also make this a conforming use.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

There were no speakers for or against.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to approve the rezoning from R-0-I to R-4, location south of East Alex-Bell Road and just east of the Penn Central Railroad. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

City of Centerville - Rezoning from WT R-4 to Centerville R-1

Mr. Schwab stated that this rezoning involved the area of Mount Vernon Estates located north of East Whipp Road and west of Wilmington Pike bounded by Kettering Corporation Lines. This is a City initiated rezoning from WT R-4 to Centerville R-1. The area to be rezoned is approximately 152 acres.

Mr. Schwab stated that the purpose of this request is that when the City annexed these areas to the then Village of Centerville, the Washington Township zonings on these properties were obtained at that time so that any zoning changes from Washington Township to Centerville could not be an issue of the annexation. Since that time, ten years have elapsed, and considerable confusion in having this Washington Township zoning and Centerville zoning existing co-terminously throughout the City has occurred. This whole area is almost totally developed. This would cause less confusion. Again, this is a City initiated rezoning to help us more clearly address the zoning throughout the City. The WT R-4 zoning classification is equivalent to the R-1 zoning classification.

Mr. Tate opened the public hearing.

There were no speakers for or against the rezoning.

Mr. Tate closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Samples moved to approve the rezoning of 152 acres from Washington Township R-4 to Centerville R-1 classification as presented. Mrs. Simmons seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Samples excused himself from the remainder of the meeting due to illness.

Terrace-Creek - Preliminary Plan

Mr. Schwab stated that this project was tabled from the July, 1979 meeting. He stated that staff, as well as members of the Planning Commission, participated in a field trip looking at various other projects that would be somewhat similar in certain aspects to this project and reviewed some of the parking requirements, street widths, etc., that are built in those projects. Mr. Schwab made a slide presentation reviewing of the project located north of Rahn Road and east of Alex-Bell Road. There are about 32.8 wooded and topographic acres on this site. There are twenty-one (21) proposed detached single family houses and twenty-six (26) units arranged in seven (7) clusters for a total of forty-seven (47) units proposed on the plan. Thoroughfare improvements will be required at the time of the record plan on Alex-Bell and Rahn Roads. There will be an access across from Brittany Hills Drive. The proposed streets are to be private.

Staff recommendations are as follows:

1. All lot lines be clearly defined with buildable areas clearly defined.

It is staff's opinion that we ought to be looking at specific pad locations giving separations. There has been correspondence regarding acceptable building separation from Montgomery County and Washington Township Fire Department. Mr. Schwab stated that this is basically a zoning problem; however, we are still looking at potential road layout and it is staff's feeling that we should clearly define what these clusters and their configuration will be and what buildable areas will be on those clusters.

2. All condominium ownership areas be specifically designated on the plans.
3. Pedestrian walkway be provided across lots 1 through 8 out to Rahn Road.
4. The sharp bend in the drainage channel on lot 6 and 7 be eliminated.
5. Revised parking plan be submitted.

Mr. Al Wahby, representing the developer for Terrace-Creek, stated that a lot of investigation has been done on the points that were raised earlier. One point does concern him now that was not brought up before and that is the pads for the structures. This was a matter that was discussed with the Washington Township Zoning as far as building locations. There was a document that accompanied that application that specified that the amount of square footage that would be built on no more or no less than that on each cluster. In this way the clusters square was defined. This was part of the presentation to the Zoning Commission. This is a matter of subdivision regulations. We are not prepared for this now. We had studied it however, for the zoning documentation.

Mr. Tate asked Mr. Schwab what the Planning Commission should be looking for at this point.

Mr. Schwab stated that we are looking for street layout, lot layout, utilities, street right-of-way.

Mr. Wahby stated that specific lot lines cannot be determined until the time of architectural design. That is why the specific square footage was given in order to give an idea of what is being proposed.

Mr. Schwab asked Mrs. List if the Township is approving three (3) units of some size on each of these clusters.

Mrs. List stated that is correct.

Mr. Schwab asked if there would be some zoning problem if a replat were submitted to change one of these cluster lots to a separate lot. As part of this special use zoning, has this been given approval.

Mrs. List stated it is to be a section of land with a number of units on it.

Mr. Tate asked if she considered what is shown on the plan now as what was approved by the Township.

Mrs. List stated yes. She stated that they have no zoning problem with the clusters as they are shown.

Mr. Wahby stated the exact parking spaces will be designated during the construction of the streets. They have revised the plan with adequate additional parking spaces and more even distribution among the single family lots. He stated that concerning the drainage channel if the neighboring property owners will agree to an easement, that will be acceptable. Concerning the sidewalks to provide for children walking to school, Mr. Wahby stated they will look into it. If providing a sidewalk is the best solution, they will be happy to provide it.

Chief Staley stated that because the Township is going to review this project on a per cluster basis, the question of building separation will be worked out at that time prior to issuing a zoning certificate.

MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to accept the preliminary plan for Terrace-Creek. Col. Morrow seconded the motion. The vote was 5-1. Mr. Horvath voted no.

Mr. Tate stated the motion was approved without the conditions for approval.

Mr. Tate restated the motion to read as follows;

The preliminary plan for Terrace-Creek is to be approved subject to the conditions discussed here tonight (walkway system on lots 1-8 and work to obtain an easement to eliminate the sharp bend in the drainage channel on lots 6 and 7, and subject to a revised parking plan).

FINAL MOTION: Mrs. Simmons moved to amend her original motion to read as stated by Mr. Tate. Col. Morrow seconded the amendment. Motion approved unanimously.

Centerville Square - Site Plan Amendment

Mr. Schwab stated that the Centerville Square Shopping Center is requesting a site plan amendment to provide for the Farmer's Market on a permanent basis. The shopping center is located at the northwest corner of Spring Valley Road and SR 48.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved that the site plan amendment for Centerville Square be approved as requested. Mr. Tate seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

Walnut Hills Estates, Sec. 2-A - Record Plan Amendment

Mr. Schwab reviewed the project located south of Centerville-Station Road and west of Wilmington Pike. Staff has been working on lot separations, narrow lots, and exceptions to the building code. The Planning Commission apparently granted, by virtue of the covenants, zero lot lines on one lot and 10 foot side yards on the other side of the lots abutting the park area. This is a replat of a portion of those lots. The previous plan showed fifteen (15) lots. The revised plan shows twelve (12) lots. Three (3) lots are being eliminated in order to make some of the lots larger. This replat covers lots 50-54 and 55-64. They are eliminating one (1) lot between 55 and 64. The compromise that has been reached on the original plan is that the zero lot lines have been changed to two (2) foot lot lines for a twelve (12) foot minimum separation between all buildings. The Fire Department is stressing that they would like to see 20 feet between buildings as a minimum without fire wall construction.

Staff recommendation is to: 1) change the covenants to allow zero side yard on the southeast side of the lot 53 and the northeast side of lot 55; 2) change the 2 foot side yard requirement on lots 50 and 52 and 58 through 64 by 5 feet which would give a minimum 15 feet separation; and 3) easement language would specifically state Cable T.V. as a utility.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to approve the replat for Walnut Hills Estates, Sec. 2-A, record Plan, including staff's recommendations 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Tate seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Washington Creek, Sec. 5-A - Record Plan Amendment

Mr. Schwab reviewed the record plan for Washington Creek, Section 5-A, located north of Spring Valley Road and east of Clio Road in

Washington Township. Mr. Schwab stated there are four (4) lots involved in the record plan replat. The purpose of the replat is to shift a foot or two (2) of property between the lots.

Staff recommends that the covenants specifically provide for the walkway easement between lots 320 and 321.

MOTION: Mr. Tate moved to approve the record plan replat for Washington Creek, Section 5-A. Mr. Horvath seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Centerville Place - Identification Sign

Mr. Schwab stated that there was a sign variance granted to the shopping center at the time of site plan approval. That variance was a setback variance and allowed a 25 foot high sign instead of a 16 foot high sign. It allowed 115 square feet total instead of a total of 50 square feet, plus one (1) marquee sign for a movie theater.

Mr. Schwab showed a slide of the sign that is now being proposed for construction. The material to be used is an aluminized material, dark brown in color for the sign base. The sign itself will be internally aluminated with brown and white lettering on top of it. The size of the sign now being proposed is now in accordance with the sign ordinance.

Mr. Horvath stated his concern is about the sign being closed at the base and conflicting with traffic site distance.

Mr. Schwab stated that the sign does not affect any visibility.

MOTION: Mr. Bergsten moved to accept the sign as requested with plantings to be approved by staff. Mr. Horvath seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Washington Township Public Library - Site Plan Amendment

Mr. Schwab stated that the Library had a slight variation in the parking layout. He stated should the High Hazard Project go on SR 48, a crosswalk should be provided to the Library. Mr. Schwab stated that staff has no problems with this particular plan.

MOTION: Mr. Horvath moved to accept the site plan amendment for the Washington Township Public Library. Mr. Tate seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



