

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting Held

September 12, 1978

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

Attendance: Mr. Elmer C. Tate, Jr.; Mr. M. Brian Bergsten, Mr. Dallas Horvath, Ms. Marian Simmons, Mr. Francis G. Cash. Also present: Mr. Jim Snyder, Centerville-Washington Township Park District; Mr. Garth Reynolds, City Planner.:

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. The General Store of Photography - Sign Variance

Mr. Reynolds showed slides of this location at 6236 Far Hills Avenue on which three signs have been erected totalling 87 sq. feet. Permitted in entrance corridor zoning is 56.5 sq. feet. On the south end of the building is a sign 18 sq. feet, on the front roof is one 48 sq. feet, and a yellow sign on the front wall is 21 sq. feet. The sign ordinance permits 1 sq. foot of signage per lineal foot of building. The staff feels the two identifying signs are adequate but the yellow sign is not favorably located to be seen from Far Hills.

Speakers for and against: A representative from Bethany Luthern Village said they do not object to the sign.

Speaker for applicant: They are new to the area and did not realize they needed a variance for the menu board sign on the front of the building. When the original plans were submitted to the Commission large signs on both ends of the building were shown but they did not put up a sign on the north end of the building and just repainted the existing roof sign on the front of the building. Since they are adjacent to the access road and the entrances to that road are some distance from their store, they need the building signs so traffic can turn before getting to the store.

Mr. Reynolds commented the menu board sign may not be in a good location since cars parked in the lot block it from the street. He pointed out people do not stop in a photography store on an impulse but would be looking for that particular shop. He added the entrance corridor zoning was being changed to business, which would allow more signage.

The applicant said he was having a preliminary opening last week and was made to take down some streamers. He asked if he would need a permit for these also. Mr. Reynolds said there is a procedure for requesting temporary signs, etc. The applicant said he would be having his grand opening the end of this week and asked if there would be a way to speed up the process. Mr. Tate advised the applicant this is a problem because the event is usually over before the paper work can be handled in matters such as this.

Ms. Simmons moved to approve the sign variance for the General Store of Photography as requested. Seconded by Mr. Bergsten. Motion approved. Mr. Horvath opposed.

2. Thomas D. Brush Variance - Side Lot Requirement

Mr. Reynolds showed several photographs of this property located at 1043 Hyde Park Drive. The applicant had built a pump house for his swimming pool equipment and it was over the gas and utility easement adjacent to the property. This lot abutts a Centerville-Washington Township park. D. P. & L. has a five-foot easement on this ground, and the pump house was built 3-1/2 feet into the 5-foot wide easement. The applicant plans to move the pump house but would like to move it only five feet from the side lot line. The permitted distance is nine feet.

Mrs. Brush stated they plan to move the building over on the existing slab and breaking up that portion of the slab over the easement. They may just cut off part of the building and break up the slab.

Speakers for or against: The next door neighbors stated they did not object to the variance.

Mr. Snyder stated the Park District has no objection to the variance.

MR. CASH

~~Ms. Simmons~~ moved to approve the Side Lot Variance request of Thomas D. Brush subject to meeting the requirements of the utility easement. Seconded by Mr. Horvath. Approved unanimously.

3. Amendment of Ordinance 15-61 and 28-73 and Repeal of Ordinances 80-71, 39-72, and 70-72 by changing the powers and procedures relative to the Planning Commission and Board of Architectural Review.

Mr. Tate reviewed this ordinance has been reviewed by the BAR and City Council for the past two years and is now being presented for public hearing by the Commission as a final step in getting it approved. He read a letter from Mr. Jim Rippert, a businessman in the APD, who stated he was unable to be at the Commission meeting but wanted to express his feelings, as well as some of the other businessmen, that none of the comments made by them had been considered by the Commission and that he did not feel the Commission should act until it had met with the businessmen.

Mr. Reynolds reviewed the entire ordinance. The Preamble was rewritten to define the intent of the ordinance.

31.02 deals with definitions, which are the basis from which the Commission operates. Definitions have been added which were put forth by the businessmen and BAR, as well as additional information on floor areas, which is what the other districts have.

31.03 on permitted uses is changed considerably. The current ordinance allows those uses that are in R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, including single and multifamily, and B-1. The proposed ordinance includes the four residential classifications, B-1 and Office Space. The current ordinance conditionally permits all variances. In the proposed ordinance a public hearing will not be required. The uses are defined and instead of the public hearing, the applicant goes directly to the Building Inspector. If the use meets requirements the application goes directly to the BAR and not to the Planning Commission. This will speed up an application by about two weeks.

31.04 The planning Commission will continue to review all curb cuts and site plan review as in any district, however, this review will run concurrently with the BAR meetings.

31.05 used to be an involved table on parking. It is now consistent with parking throughout the districts. Because the APD lots are unique, there will be occasions when specifications in the ordinance will not satisfy the situation and a variance will be required.

31.06 deals with buildings and architectural controls. The language was simplified as requested by the businessmen; other wording was changed and the BAR is responsible for this section.

31.06, brick paving, has not been changed.

31.07, Signs. The new ordinance has setbacks and the present ordinance does not. The specifications make it easier to review requests. Although no specification fits every application, the ordinance makes the signage more understandable for the BAR.

31.09 Landscaping and screening is uniform with the rest of the districts and is not changed.

31.10 The current application procedure is not spelled out clearly and the new wording will simplify and help the applicant.

31.11 The major change deals with the variance powers of the BAR and are limited to signage and architectural components.

Speakers against the ordinance:

A member of the audience: Does this mean the BAR will be disbanded? Mr. Tate responded that much of the work in writing the new ordinance was done by the BAR and was originally presented by the BAR, then to Council, and now the Commission.

A member of the audience: Does this mean all the parking lots will have to be paved?

Mr. Reynolds said the grandfather clause would apply to all existing businesses, however, any change in use or sale of property would require the property be brought to current ordinance standards.

Mr. Will Frazee, 26 E. Ridgeway, said he feels the latest ordinance is the best yet, however, the Preamble proposed by the businessmen was complete and meant to replace all the wording in the existing Preamble. He said 31.03 is good in section a., but b. takes away all value of the ordinance since it requires normal processing as for other districts, and the whole purpose of the BAR was to handle the APD since it has such unique characteristics. Mr. Tate said it just says zoning of set backs and side lots will apply. Mr. Frazee said when old buildings are put to that test most do not fit in. Mr. Reynolds said any variance would have to come before Planning Commission.

Mr. Frazee said he did not feel power should be taken away from the BAR since they are appointed by the same people who appoint the Planning Commission and are qualified. Mr. Tate reminded Mr. Frazee the BAR started the whole procedure to review this ordinance and they have brought it before the City Council. The functions pertaining to architecture are going to be handled by the BAR but if there are variances, in zoning, then the Planning Commission will be involved.

Mr. Frazee said most older homes cannot meet the side yard requirements and the lots are usually odd sizes. Mr. Reynolds said if it does not abutt residential there is no side yard requirement and if it does then there is a 10-foot requirement.

Mr. Cash said there were no standards before and you could put up as many buildings and as high as you wanted before the BAR had any guidelines. Mr. Frazee asked why the Planning Commission can't give the curb cut guidelines to the BAR and let them hear the variance requests. Mr. Tate said the BAR has had the power to hear curb cuts for some time and has not used it.

Mr. Frazee said he felt parking should be changed to front rather than in the back. He said 45 degree sloped lawns could act as screening; hedges could be used when there is less than 35 foot frontage.

Mr. Frazee said he felt 31.06 should name 8 colors and have color chips available for anyone wanting to paint their building. Only these would be approved for use on the exterior of the buildings, but an owner should be able to change from one of these colors to another one without having to fill out an application. Mr. Reynolds said color chips will fade, the paint will become obsolete, and there are so many colors to choose from that this is not realistic.

Mr. Frazee said a.6. under 31.07, second paragraph, says the installation of a brick sidewalk may be required with zoning permit change of exterior appearance of the building. This means if the building is painted the owner could be required to put in a brick sidewalk. a.7 states installation of concrete curbing and widening of blacktop roadway where necessary will be required at the same time the sidewalk is done. Since the cost of improvements must be borne by the owner, when someone decides to go to the expense of painting his building he may be hit with the expense of putting in a brick sidewalk and widening the roadway.

Mr. Frazee said the sign ordinance should be rewritten so the sign area is based on the flat message area rather than the scroll work around the perimeter which is strictly decorative but is currently considered part of the sign. He said the current sign area permitted is 12 sq. feet and that is what is proposed, and it is not enough.

Mr. Andy Klimentz commented the interior signs cannot be seen by passing motorists going 35 mph and asked if it was necessary at all. Mr. Cash said if it was not in someone with a large window could completely fill the window with advertising.

Mr. Frazee said some businessmen do not feel the small signs are identifiable and feel single face signs are more obtrusive and should be penalized over the double-faced style.

Ms. Simmons said she was new to the Commission and had not seen the businessmen's recommendations and would like to review them before reaching a decision.

Mr. Bill Ahern, 33 West Franklin, said he came before the Planning Commission six months before there was a BAR and it took six months to get a sign. He said the APD should be more responsive to businessmen. He will not buy another building in the APD, put \$20-30,000 in improvements into it and then have to pay another \$10,000 for brick sidewalks and blacktop. Mr. Tate pointed out it would not be practical for the city to require one 50-foot lot widen the street, that the ordinance is geared toward someone who would buy a block of lots.

Mr. Tate said the Commission would consider the comments made tonight and then make their recommendations to Council. If any extensive changes are made to the ordinance by the Commission then it will be scheduled for another public hearing.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Reynolds showed movies of the Ole Spanish Village, located on S.R. 48. This movie pointed out the signs identifying the shopping center.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Francis G. Cash
Vice-Chairman

CITIZENS FOR COOPERATIVE AND RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENT

C.C.R.G.

196 JOY ELIZABETH DRIVE
CENTERVILLE, OHIO 45459

G. DEAN BRANDT
RUSSELL DUSTMAN
CO-CHAIRMEN

PHONE
513-433-2233

1. ACHOR, EDNA	433-5471
2. BAVER, ROY	433-5153
3. BAVER, SANDY	433-5153
4. BECK, ROBERT	434-4992
5. BECK, MIRIAM	434-4992
6. BISCHOFF, LEO	433-5593
7. BRANDT, DEAN	433-2233
8. BREWER, CHARLOTTE	434-8245
9. BREWER, LARRY	434-8245
10. CASH, CLAUDETTE	433-8877
11. DAVIS, JOHN	433-1269
12. DUNN, EDWARD	433-7278
13. DUSTMAN, RUSSELL	434-2849
14. ELDRED, JOHN	433-5349
15. ELLIOTT, CELIA	433-7348
16. FISH, DICK	433-1220
17. FRAZEE, WILL	433-8985 home 433-8883 office
18. HUSS, DICK	433-8614
19. POGUE, NANCY	433-5612
20. POLANSKI, JOSEPH	433-9676
21. REEVES, PEGGY	435-9693
22. SAND, THOMAS	434-8641
23. SNYDER, CHRISTINE	433-6204
24. WAGNER, CHARLES	434-7429
25. WATKINS, CONNIE	885-2301
26. WILLIAMS, RITA	433-1553
27. ZIEGLER, BRUCE	433-6612 home 299--0406 office

