

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Workshop - January 14, 1975

7:30 p.m.

Those Present: Messrs. Gillingham, McCrabb, Maxton & Baker. Mrs. Lake.
Absent: Mr. Tate. Also Present: Robert Winterhalter, City Planner,
Karl Schab, City Engineer and Darryl Kenning, City Manager.

1. Ferguson/Woodley Shopping Center site plan review for former Magsig parcel, adjacent to new high school building, E. Franklin Street.

Mr. Ralph Woodley explained that he, Bob Ferguson & John McKinney own the land (5-1/2 acres) and the existing stone house. He explained that they had asked for and been granted re-zoning to B-1 (recently). At the time of the re-zoning, he continued, we indicated that we would come in with a plan to save as many trees as possible in keeping with their development and had said they would keep the house.

Mr. Woodley continued to explain that there is a 15' grade drop from the southwest corner of the property to the northeast corner and that is why they came up with a series of smaller buildings, so that they would not have to take out all the trees and have a better plan. We are here tonight, he said, to review this plan and get the thoughts of Planning Commission members and try to get an acceptable plan so they can proceed. We want to complete this according to City specifications. We have planned 40,000 sq. ft. with 320 parking spaces, he said. The trees as shown on the plan are existing trees they plan to save, not new plantings.

Mr. Ferguson said they are planning to have a walk-through to the next store, etc. (from one store to the other).

Mr. Maxton said that when this initial request for re-zoning came up we (P. C. members) thought that there was a strong case to change from residential to business. At that time there was an indication made that you wanted to work with the existing house and preserve the trees. I felt, Mr. Maxton continued, that this plan was showing maximum asphalt and buildings and a token amount of trees. During conversations with your attorney and yourself, the indication was that the house would be used as a focal point and I feel that these plans use the house at the minimum and that the plan is unimaginative

Mr. Woodley said the existing house will be used and be visible from the road. We said we would use it and save it and we are. We are trying to leave the best trees and to have used the house with a

row of buildings beside it - we felt this would look better. Mr. Maxton asked the elevation of the house. Answer: (Woodley) below the trees. Mr. Maxton said anyone would have to look hard to see the house from the street with this plan. Mr. Woodley conceded that in the summer, with the trees, it would not be as visible. He said that they felt this plan would be better than putting the buildings at the rear. This plan would be a convenience for the stores and the customer parking

Mr. McCrabb asked if this plan had gone to Council. Mr. Ferguson said that it had not - a workshop had been suggested. Mr. Ferguson continued that the P. C. board is looking at this differently than they (owners) are looking at it. He said this is valuable property. He said they wanted B-2 zoning and had been told that this probably would not be acceptable - so they asked for B-1. He said they did not know how this property would be used at the time of the re-zoning. I had said, he continued, that possibly a restaurant would be here - perhaps this is where you felt you were misled. Mr. Maxton said that he thought that when they were talking about preserving the house, they were talking about restoration and use similar to the Routsong Funeral Home on N. Main Street in Centerville, not surrounding the house with buildings.

confirmation

Mr. Gillingham asked for and received from the owners/that the plan being presented at this workshop is the same plan that was before Planning Commission previously. One of my objections, he said, was the alignment of the curb cuts. I see no reason why they cannot be lined up with the curb cuts on the opposite side of the street, he said. Regarding the visibility of the existing house - I don't know how it could be better camouflaged so you could not see it, he said, with an 8,000 sq. ft. building between the street and the house, you wouldn't be able to see that the house is there. The center building should be moved back if we have to have that many sq. ft. I don't feel this is preserving the historical value of that building.

Mr. McCrabb asked if the property was owned by the present owners when the zoning was R-1. Answer: It was bought contingent on the re-zoning. Mr. McCrabb said he understands their concern to make a profitable piece of property but he also understands the feelings of this board. The board would like to see the house as a focal point and create a "commons" type center and retain the residential atmosphere in a commercial project. Mr. McCrabb said he feels they will have difficulty creating this atmosphere with the square footage as shown, but he feels this was the board's intent (at the time of the re-zoning) and the board felt that was also the intent of the owner-developers. The board is trying to avoid all the parallel and perpendicular lines and to make the project interesting.

Mr. Baker asked if an aerial photo were available. It was established that Mr. Winterhalter had an outline and Mr. Woodley had a topo, but they did not have either with them tonight. Mr. Baker said that he had heard their story that they were going to do beautiful things with that piece of property and said he would rather see alternative plans rather than just this one. With alternative plans the Board members could say what aspects of different ones they prefer, rather than the applicants bringing in just one plan and asking what is wrong with it. Mr. Baker said this plan has a lot of blacktop and buildings on a beautiful piece of land. He continued that perhaps four buildings would be a nicer plan for the Centerville area and stressed that he would much prefer to have alternative plans presented.

Mr. Maxton said that the applicants had been advised at the last meeting on this what the objections of the board members were & at that time the applicants were asked if they understood what the objections were and P.C. had been told by the applicant that they understood.

Mr. Ferguson said that they thought they had a beautiful plan and he did not hear any specific reason for not liking it.

Mr. Woodley said they have had perhaps a dozen plans for the area and felt this was the best - perhaps we should have brought those with us, he said. Mr. Woodley added that he now has some ideas that might be tried.

Mr. Gillingham asked if it has been decided for economic reasons that they must have 40,000 sq. ft. Answer: not necessarily. Mr. Gillingham suggested the sizes of the buildings might be reduced, with perhaps individual small shops (similar to Franklin Square in Franklin, Oh.) only with the buildings disconnected and scattered through the woods to create something attractive rather than the buildings lined up the way they are on this plan.

Mr. Harry Mizel, Architect, was asked to speak and he said he agrees with Mr. Gillingham - they had started with something similar. He then referred to the required sizes for cars to turn around and the difficulty in designing around the trees, he said they have actually worked with more than 12 plans - perhaps as many as 50. He said that he is not entirely happy with this plan. He added that the house is not really worth saving, it is not an architectural gem and the interior design is 'cut up'. He said commercial buildings in the rear would dwarf the house. He said all the (shown) trees are 'saved' trees, not new trees. There is almost a 20' drop from one corner of the property to the other - and they are not certain how this can be overcome. He said they are trying to keep the parking at the level of the trees. They cannot grade differently around the trees or they will die. The buildings have to be on flat ground, but parking doesn't so they are trying

to work this out and not destroy the trees. He said this plan would loose some 6" trees, but not the larger ones.

Mrs. Lake said she feels that P.C. was specific about their comments the first time (the applicant appeared) and at this time we should be seeing some alternatives. She said she was not on this Board when the re-zoning was granted, and probably would not have supported it and these problems are the reason she would not have supported it. However, we (now) have to deal with the B-1 zoning regardless of what I would like to see, she added. She said she would like to see a better design - she feels this is over-blacktopped and has too many buildings. I cannot see, she said, gerrymandering the buildings across the front to save a house we cannot see. I would rather you come in with some of the 50 plans and find out what parts of any we might like, she said. She would rather see a quality development than worry about the house.

Mr. Winterhalter said that this plan shows the right-of-way line and many of the trees are in the right-of-way and if we get in sidewalks those trees would come down. Also, the parking space requirement may be changed, depending on the specific uses proposed and perhaps different parking angles could be accomplished. Mrs. Lake said she does not feel trees on the outside of the applicants property should be shown.

Mr. Mizel said that if parking could be reduced it would leave a lot more to work with. They will be back with alternative plans.

2. Review plans for "R-3", Son's rezoning on Lyons Drive. (Resubmission after Council denied appeal and suggested Planning Commission re-review.) This property is one lot west of Wythe Parish on Rt. '48'. The plan did call for 3 units on the south connected and 3 units on the north, two of which are connected. The connection of the units is in question as is the density - only 5 units, not 6 should be permitted.

Mr. Robert Seeley, representing the applicant, pointed out that each member had a copy of the plan. He said they have gone to the 5 units which fit under the proper classification for which they are asking. He said they are trying to make something which is appropriate and will lend to the community. He displayed a drawing of an idea of the exterior. Mr. Seeley asked that the zoning be changed to R-3.

Mr. Maxton asked how they plan to work with the existing building. Mr. Seeley said the home that is there is a fine architect. (He later conferred with Mr. Son who said the exterior design would be changed too.

Mr. McCrabb said that the plans mention 10 parking spaces and he asked Mr. Seeley where they are. Answer: the 5 in the garage and 5 on the 'aprons'.

Mr. Winterhalter stated that this has been set for Public Hearing Tuesday, January 28.

Mr. McCrabb said that one of P.C.'s desires before was two car garages and you say that was not changed. Mr. Seeley said the questions was asked before about the value of the homes with one car garages. I did not understand that that was the requirement of the board, he said. He said he did not get the chance to answer that question at the previous meeting. Two car garages are not planned, he added.

Mr. Maxton said that on the application one of the questions is that justification be given for the rezoning and the only answer is that the applicant wants to develop the property. He asked Mr. Seeley what has changed.

Mr. Seeley said that the entire area surrounding this property was residential and years ago the string of property immediately in back of this property was changed and we now have service stations and the Wythe Parish and we feel with the situation around us, this would be compatible with it. Mr. Maxton asked if it would not be compatible to use this land for single residence. Mr. Seeley said this would not be the best and highest use as things are today. Mr. Maxton suggested that if the single families might object to the service station the multi-families might also object. He added that he sees no screening on the plan to screen the service station. Your only justification is that the applicant wants to develop the property, he said.

Mr. Seeley said they are here to see what is best for this community and if this is what you feel would be helpful in making a presentable project for the community - this is why we are at a workshop.

Mr. Gillingham asked for location on the map of the commercial buildings and this was clarified. Mr. Gillingham then said he would like to see green screening or a combination of green and fence to screen from business on the easterly line. He said that regarding the condominium, the applicant is asking to extend R-3 down one property length and he doesn't know that there would be sufficient difference.

Mr. Winterhalter commented regarding the elevation, saying that it is such that screening would have to be at the level of the commercial. It would not do much good at the lower level of this property. What would be effective would be green plantings at the rear of the businesses on the elevated level.

Mr. Gillingham stated that the average in Centerville is two cars to a house. He said there is a possible hazard regarding the planned parking, i. e. : fire trucks. He suggested this should be looked into. Mr. Seeley said they would do so.

Mr. McCrabb asked the price range of the planned units. Answer: (R. Seeley) \$50,000 range. Mr. McCrabb said that, from his own experience, he feels that it would be difficult to market a single car garage in that bracket. If you did, we would have a car in the apron all the time. This would create a tight situation with regard to traffic. This would be my only reason for not approving this, he said. Mr. Seeley said they would take this under consideration.

Mr. Baker said he is also not satisfied with the width of the road (it appears to be about 15' he said). The main thing I would like to see would be an equivalent to Wythe Parish.

Mrs. Lake said she is concerned with the lack of two car garages and lack of general parking spaces for 5 homes on a day-to-day basis plus visitors. She added that she would also like to see an overall landscaping plan. She said with regard to the screening that she does not feel we would be able to get the people at the rear to do anything since they are not the ones wanting the re-zoning. However, this could be an opportunity to come up with something unique, she said. With regard to the rezoning question, she said that some have questioned that R-3 sometimes has offices or other uses permitted and what we should do here is to maintain the residential. If the applicant could assure that this would be only residential, it would help the neighbors to know that this is truly your intent.

Mr. McCrabb asked if they could have greater separation - if one has a guest, for example, it would not be possible to accommodate them. Mr. Seeley said they would look into it, and asked if he was suggesting that the two units be moved over. Answer: yes. Mr. Seeley said they would see what they could do. Mr. Winterhalter said we want the optimum on the blacktop and said he would work with them on that

Mr. Maxton asked if Mr. Seeley was clear on what the desires of P. C. was. Mr. Seeley said he had written down the comments and hopes to come up with some, if not all, of what is wanted when we come back.

3. Zengle Office Building at the northeast corner of Zengle Drive and S. R. '48'. This property is zoned R-3 but conditional use does allow office and Mr. Zengle was granted a conditional use. Previously access off Zengle Dr. was discussed in addition to the then proposed access of '48'.

Mr. Maxton said that when we (previously) discussed the existing building, he thought we talked about putting the traffic away from '48'.

Now I see another curb cut on '48', he said, and I am opposed to a curb cut on '48'.

Mr. Karl Zengle said that if this were residential he would have a right to have a curb cut to the garage. There is no way possible to keep a curb cut from this property because you are basically land-locking the property, he said. If Centerville wants to purchase the land, that is their prerogative.

Mr. Maxton asked about the curb cut out of Dr. Gerlinger's building (immediately to the north). Mr. Zengle said this property he has is R-3 and it could be developed into apartments or townhouses. I have combined the piece of property into two and have a common drive. You are defeating the zoning if you have a building facing a collector street with no access to the collector street. The ordinance reads, Mr. Zengle continued, that this is permitted. Here I am proposing sharing one access for two properties. With reference to re-zoning - it was granted on Dr. Gerlinger's building. Nothing was implied that there would be restrictions as to what I do with the remaining land. We went along with the plan trying to do the right thing and to eliminate traffic. Entering from '48' and exiting on Zengle would be advantageous, but you must remember that the whole purpose is to have access off the collector street. Mr. Maxton said he would do all he can to eliminate (additional) curb cuts on '48'. Mr. Maxton continued that he had not had the opportunity to review the minutes of the previous meeting wherein this was discussed, but he did recall discussing a road to the rear. Mr. Zengle said that it was not said that we would not have access off '48'. Your ordinance does not say that and you should abide by the ordinance, Mr. Zengle said. Mr. Winterhalter asked what ordinance he was making reference to.
^ nswer: R-1.

Mr. Gillingham asked what objections Mr. Zengle has to putting a curb cut opposite the Bank on Zengle Drive. Mr. Zengle said that on the opposite side of the street, it is one way - exit only. Mr. Gillingham described a plan for access and exit that he feels would not be a hazard any more than the bank. (Basically it would have access off '48' and exit on Zengle Drive.) Mr. Zengle said he would be agreeable to this plan if that would be the recommendation of the P. C. - I think we could do this, he said. Mr. McCrabb asked Mr. Schab if the distance from the corner would be sufficient if Mr. Gillingham's plan were adopted. Mr. Schab answered that it would be a minimum space. Mr. McCrabb expressed concern regarding the possible danger with two cars turning and Mr. Schab concurred that this could be a problem. There followed a discussion as to possible alternatives. Mr. McCrabb said he does not object to the entrance only off '48', if there would be some way to control the entrance only.

Mr. Zengle said he has heard the past City Manager talk about having a traffic light at the corner. He continued that the light that is there belongs to the Incarnation Church, and they pay the utilities on it. He feels that a light should be added at Zengle Drive in conjunction with the one at the church. Mr. Winterhalter asked if Mr. Schab would answer that - between Alex-Bell and Zengle there is approximately 1/3 mile and is this appropriate? Mr. Schab said that we have a plan at the present time to coordinate the lights from Franklin Street all the way up to Whipp Road - it does not provide for a light at Zengle Drive - just provides for platoons of cars at a time to create a good flow of traffic, to allow breaks in the traffic to allow exiting from the side streets. There is not now a plan to provide a light at Zengle, it is too expensive, this is a result of studies taken by consultants hired by the City. Mr. Zengle asked if the present light at the church would be on all the time. Mr. Schab said that when the sequential lighting is in effect this light will be needed to help the smooth flow of traffic.

Mr. Baker said this is an example of where Council 'hurt' P.C. He does not think Dr. Gerlinger's plan passed the P.C. We (now) must work with a situation that has been created. We have a bad choice, he said. I would like our planner to give us some guidance as to what his opinion would be regarding relative safety (police department might be consulted) of Mr. Zengle's plan versus, for example, Mr. Gillingham's plan.

Mr. Winterhalter said it appears that the conditional use was only for that one office building. I will request that some traffic recommendations regarding lights be presented, he said. There is nothing in our ordinance that requires a curb cut along '48'. It is not technically possible to have another curb cut along '48' if we follow our ordinance to the law, due to the available frontage. (this was previously established as being 264') Our subdivision requirements do now apply. Mr. Baker said that is a very difficult left hand turn off Zengle Dr.

Mr. Zengle said that an access is required off a collector street. Mr. Baker said that '48' is a thorofare. Mr. Winterhalter varified that '48' is classified as a 'thorofare' and Zengle Drive would be a collector street. He added that it would be very difficult to control the flow (of an access off '48') even though it would say entrance only. He gave as an example the traffic at Dr. Archdeacon's office. (This is designated Entrance only, but is also used as an Exit to '48'.) He continued that once this project is developed we could eliminate the traffic exit onto '48' from Dr. Gerlinger's property and the exit from Dr. Gerlinger's could be off Zengle.

Mr. Baker said that to make a left turn from the southbound lane of '48' in that area is hazardous because of the hill and the fact that someone can come over the hill and suddenly be upon a car waiting to turn left.

Mrs. Lake said that although P.C. tries to do a good job, too often there are regrets because of what happens later. P.C. tries to cooperate and be logical but this Gerlinger entrance and exit is an example of what can happen. She said she would like to see that additional entrance eliminated with traffic similar to what is at the Bank. She would like to see some type of mutual arrangement. She is not at all satisfied with additional curb cuts on '48', even though she does appreciate the internal traffic problems, etc. She feels people will be appreciative of having a safe place to park. (When she stops she is very mindful of being hit from the rear.

Mr. Zengle said he agrees to some extent. Regarding Dr. Gerlinger, he said he had approached him and he said no. You cannot try to force him to use my driveway, he added. The other situation is, he said, that I do not think you should look at a plan and say that because it is not perfect and 100% safe, you say that it is bad. Mrs. Lake said she is concerned about not creating an additional hazard. Mr. Zengle said that every time he builds a house, you are creating a hazard.

Mr. Winterhalter said he thinks all the exits and entrances (off Zengle Drive) should be as far east as possible to line up with the Bank on Zengle. They should exit out to Zengle Drive.

Mr. Maxton said if you (Mr. Zengle) say that this is what you have to have and you are going to present this that is your prerogative, or you can take our suggestions and come up with an alternative - if you don't think our suggestions have any validity you can submit it as it is.

Mr. Gillingham asked if conditional use will be required. Answer: (Mr. Zengle) yes. Mr. Winterhalter confirmed that conditional use will be required - the property is still zoned R-3.

Mr. Baker asked Mr. Winterhalter to provide an outline of left turn lane off southbound '48' and Mrs. Lake requested an outline of Dr. Gerlingers drives. Mr. Baker asked if P.C. or Council minutes are available from when the Gerlinger property decisions were made. Mr. Winterhalter said P.C. does not have detailed minutes of the meetings at that time and Council minutes do not go into the future plans as discussed at that time. Mr. McCrabb asked to have accident statistics for Rt. 48.

4. Elder-Beerman Shopping Center layout on St. Rt. '48' and Sheehan Road. Mr. Robert Archdeacon represented the applicant.

Mr. Winterhalter said that this plan is not entirely unlike the one P. C. looked at last fall. It was previously said that 'rather than an asphalt jungle, let's have some landscaping'. This plan also goes along with the past requirement of 125 sq. ft floor space equal 1 parking space. Except for peak periods - such as Thanksgiving and Christmas, this is not necessary. If we want to go to the maximum use requirement at the peak period of the year, we would have to go along with the maximum parking.

The P. C. members had a copy of the plan and it was reviewed briefly. Mr. Archdeacon said 290 sq. ft equal 1 parking space is proposed here. The size of the building and the parking should be related. If the buildings are free-standing, he thinks you need more parking than when they are connected stores. He said this plan should be studied - they have eliminated the north access and created a boulevard at the center and added an entrance (3 entrances to the total mall). They have also added a banking facility. They have shown an access to Spring Valley which is utilizing the existing drive to the Centerville garage, we have tied into the existing driveway, he said, rather than putting in an addition driveway. We thought it would be best, he continued, to work with the City and utilize this one drive. They have reserved approximately an additional acre immediately to the south for possible acquisition by the City. Rather than have a 'sea of asphalt', we have tried to have several small rather than one solid area, he said. He said that no access has been provided to this center from Centerville plat. He asked if an opening is desired, perhaps at Joy Elizabeth. Mr. Maxton said he does not like the idea of opening the area to the Center. Mrs. Lake agreed with Mr. Maxton. Mr. Winterhalter reviewed the history of the re-zoning. Mr. Archdeacon said that many years ago this was proposed for a single family subdivision along with the remainder of Centerville and the four houses that are on '48' now were the models. The land was re-zoned and at that time it was the desire of P. C. that those streets remain closed. Elder-Beerman is basically a two-story structure and they propose a two-story building as an anchor building at the other end. He said there is a grading problem and the north side of the proposed building would have a second floor entrance.

Mrs. Lake said that, regarding landscaping, several residents of that area have in the past commented about the lack of landscaping. When Elder-Beerman's was built, they were told how beautiful it could be and the residents are upset that they ended up with the present building, grocery store and auto parts store. Mrs. Lake continued that she thinks the applicant is capable of doing very good things and would like to see that it is actually going to come about. You have your integrity at stake, she said, with the community as to how well you are going to buffer that. This should not be just token trees, but a forest, she said.

Mr. Archdeacon said with this B-3 and B-2 land as it is now permits this with minimum landscaping. He said the buffer between the residential and commercial was a covenant that went with the original rezoning, in the buffer area, lands and screening can be controlled. Mrs. Lake said that what they had said they could do, they could - but they did not do it. I think they have a commitment to the community and I think they want to create an image and this is one of the biggest ways they can do so, she said. They are asking for our support. One thing not liked by the residents with regard to commercial is that it doesn't make it a desirable area to live in. She feels it is a matter of commitment on the part of the people doing the building. She feels that Beerman's has the opportunity of showing how a project like this can be done to the advantage of all.

Mr. Archdeacon asked if rather than plantings a mound might be considered. Mrs. Lake said that if it is a mound, it should be planted heavily. Mr. Archdeacon said he feels mounding can be effective. Mrs. Lake said only in part - you are talking about putting this next to homes and it calls for more density - not only because of seeing the structures, but because of the lights, etc. She feels this will not get much community support the way it is planned now - it is not attractive and has no asset other than commercial.

Mr. Maxton said in the proposed ordinance we have overlooked landscaping. Mr. Archdeacon said they have provided the 100' buffer but with the proposed ordinance they can go beyond the 100'. Mr. Winterhalter said that it was his understanding that the buffer was a covenant that went with the zoning. Mr. Archdeacon said he could not find a covenant in existence - they plan the 100' buffer.

Mrs. Lake asked if there were any open drainage ditch plans. Mr. Schab said this would be brought in with the eventual widening of '48'.

Mr. Maxton said that in looking at the plan he has no objections, the wall is really to the front of the parking. The land to the west was discussed, some felt it would be best suited to residential. It was established that except for the service station (Bonded), Beerman has all or part of the land, some of it is held in trust. Mrs. Lake asked whose bank was planned for the mall. Answer: (Mr. Archdeacon) No specific bank - he does not think 3rd Nat'l expects to use the land they hold in trust.

Mrs. Lake asked if the land in trust would eventually be serviced by an access road or would a curb cut on '48' be requested. She asked what we might see in the future as to how to service the properties at the corner. (Beerman also owns the property the car wash is presently located on). Would you be in a position to go over that at a future

date, she asked Mr. Archdeacon. If we are going to talk about the access road we should be far sighted enough to look into all the uses. Mr. Schab said that a 10' (one lane) would not be sufficient.

Mr. Gillingham had no questions. Mr. McCrabb said he is concerned about the dead end streets - he suggested perhaps that if we had a way to tie the three dead end streets together we might get away from the 'dumpster-type' of back end. We could create a street. Mr. Winterhalter said that his personal recommendation would be to try to obtain right-of-way at the end and make them cul-de-sac rather than dead end. Mr. McCrabb said that if the management of the commercial buildings realized they had a back view (as they would if this were something other than a dead end, they would have) perhaps they would keep it better than if we just have the wide buffer. Human nature, Mr. McCrabb said is that if it is visible from the shopping center you will take care of it - if not you won't and it could become undesirable. Mrs. Lake suggested requiring maintenance. Mr. McCrabb is concerned that the buffer could become a trash heap and said we do not have the jurisdiction or the policing to require maintenance - we could build in some features to make the management want to keep it up because it is visible. Mr. Maxton said if we have trouble with the trash we can take care of it at that time. Mr. Gillingham said that the Airway Shopping Center (east of Dayton) has a 8-10' high split rail fence as a buffer and in 12 years there has been no trash problem. Mr. Archdeacon said this is not a strip center but a mall and it would all be visible. It will be similar to but not the same as the Dayton Mall - the 'dumpsters' would be shielded.

Mr. Baker asked if there is a plan for a gas pumping facility. Mr. Archdeacon said there is no provision for a gas pumping facility. Mr. Baker suggested getting approval of the circulation pattern. Mr. Winterhalter said free-standing buildings (such as gas stations and film outlets, etc.) now have to be approved initially - they cannot be added later. Mr. Archdeacon said there had been no discussion of gas stations or film outlets.

Mr. Baker asked if this plan were approved, would that be the way it would be? Mr. Winterhalter said that unless it is brought back for changes, it would stand. Mr. Baker was concerned with circulation of the traffic and the later addition of gas islands, etc.

Mr. Maxton asked if Mr. Archdeacon's client was prepared to comply with the existing requirements and if, when they are ready to build, they would present market analysis, financial reports, etc. Mr. Archdeacon said they would like to get a preliminary plan approval. They may not develop this for a number of years and at that time a market analysis would be more appropriate. Mr. Maxton said that if

they were not ready to start this project, he would not want to go along with this plan. Mrs. Lake said that sometimes we plan too far in advance - if you feel that 5 - 10 years is what you are talking about, I would be reluctant to commit ourselves to preliminary approval at this time.

Mr. Archdeacon said the possible rezoning of this property is the reason for this request. Mr. McCrabb said that this plan would stay any action on his part to rezone the property. He feels that at the time they are ready to develop, that is the time to give the market analysis. Mr. Maxton said that as far as this property is concerned - what has been shown is enough for us not to rezone the property at this time. However, if it stays vacant for 3 - 5 - 10 years, this may not be the case. Mr. Archdeacon said that regardless of how much further they went (with their plans at this time) it would not affect anything P.C. might do five years from now - if we get everything approved and don't do anything for 7 years, P.C. would have to look at it again. Mr. Schab added that any building permit has an expiration date.

Mr. Winterhalter suggested that something might be done regarding the land due west of Elder-Beerman's. Perhaps a commitment could be made regarding mounding, trees, buffer or plantings. Mr. Maxton said no, because if they don't develop for ten years, B-3 may not be the best. Mr. Winterhalter said this would be for the existing businesses and commitments made ten years ago. Mr. Maxton said he does not think we could (enforce this) unless they volunteer to do so. Mr. Winterhalter said he feels a little stronger about it than that - if in fact the ordinance did say or there was a commitment regarding a buffer. Mr. Winterhalter said before this is put to rest, perhaps this should be reviewed. Mr. Baker feels this would be a show of good faith by the developers. Mr. Maxton asked Mr. Winterhalter to look into this - he said he agrees but is concerned about the legal ramifications. Mr. Maxton asked if Mr. Archdeacon's client would look into this and see what could be done - Mr. Archdeacon said he would ask him. Mr. Archdeacon added that the rezoning did not affect the land at the rear of the present Elder-Beerman store.

Mr. Gillingham feels they could be required to do something about a buffer to the rear of the present store. Mr. Maxton asked Mr. Winterhalter to check into this in the files and to review it with the Attorney.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Next Meeting - Tuesday, January 28, 1975.

