

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of
Workshop Session
June 6, 1978

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

Attendance: Mr. Francis G. Cash, Mr. M. Brian Bergstein, Mr. Dallas Horvath, Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr. Also present: Mr. Garth Reynolds, City Planner.

Mr. Reynolds announced the purpose of the workshop session was to review the recommendations of businessmen, and the Board of Architectural Review, concerning the current Architectural Preservation District ordinance. The City Council has requested the Planning Commission's comments on the proposed changes by these groups.

Section 31.01, comments from the BAR and the businessmen are that they want to take out the preamble and insert a new one. The Planning Commission concurs with this request if the Law Director feels the wording is correct.

Section 31.02j, floor area. Mr. Reynolds pointed out the other zoning districts consider gross floor area in some cases, such as a shopping center, and net square footage for other uses (a doctor's waiting room as opposed to the entire office space), and this district should be consistent with other districts. Mr. Tate said sections a-i under 31.02 will have to be checked under the Definitions section.

Mr. Tate said the BAR's letter was not clear on whether they were agreeing with all the businessmen's comments or with the existing ordinance so the Commission's comments should be directed to the ordinance rather than concurring with either group, so the Commission's position would be clear.

Section 31.03b. Mr. Reynolds said this section is used to control height of buildings, setbacks, and lot coverage. He said this provides protection for any single family homes in the AP District which may abutt a property used for business. The Commission recommends leaving the ordinance as it currently stands.

Section 31.04, The Commission feels the wording should remain the same as the existing April 11, 1977 ordinance.

Section 31.05, parking, The commission wants no change in the parking ordinance because an applicant can seek a variance in special circumstances, and the parking should remain consistent otherwise.

Section 31.05b, location of parking areas. Mr. Reynolds commented the parking site can be a delicate problem with the small lots in the District, the limited curb cuts, and required spaces and feels it should remain the same as the ordinance presently reads. The Commission concurred. Mr. Tate said it would appear the BAR does not agree with the businessmen either and wants the ordinance to stay the same.

