

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

April 30, 1974 7:30 p.m.

Those Present - Messrs Myers, Tate, Wells, Maxton, McCrabb & Mrs. Lake.

Also Present - R. Winterhalter, City Planner, K. Schab,

City Engineer & R. N. Farquhar, City Attorney.

Absent: Mr. Baker.

The Minutes of the April 9 special meeting were corrected and Mr. Maxton moved,
Seconded by Mr. Myers to approve as corrected. Approved unanimously.

Public Hearings - None

Unfinished Business -

1. Review sign application for Cambridge Inn Cafeteria

Applicant was not present. Mr. Winterhalter reviewed the application. The applicant's basic proposal is for 87 square feet of sign area. One way to do this would be to exclude the fascia. The applicant proposes three choices for freestanding signs:

- 1) 31-1/2 sq. ft./side to equal 87' including 24' of fascia sign.
(double-faced)
- 2) 63 sq. ft. plus 24 sq. ft. fascia (single-faced)
- 3) 43-1/2 sq. ft. per side plus the fascia sign. (double-faced)

Mr. Winterhalter recommended the approval of the double-faced, freestanding 87 sq. ft. sign and waive the addition of the fascia sign. It was pointed out that the freestanding double-faced sign would be visible from the South as well as from the North.

Mr. McCrabb asked how far the sign was from the Right-of-Way. Answered by Mr. Winterhalter: 100 ft.

Mrs. Lake asked if the fascia sign will be lighted. Mr. Winterhalter stated it would be dimly lit from the rear.

Mr. McCrabb asked about the size in comparison to others in the area. Mr. Winterhalter stated that it will be the smallest restaurant sign in the block.

Mr. Myers asked when the cafeteria will open. Mr. Winterhalter said the plans are for opening in the next 30 - 60 days.

Mr. McCrabb asked about the strict application for all signs. Mrs. Lake said she thought the sign on the front of the building was not counted as it was not to be lit. Mr. Winterhalter stated that it was his recollection that the applicant was to have a lit fascia sign. Mr. Myers asked if it was significant whether or not the sign was lit. Mr. Winterhalter replied that it was not.

Mrs. Lake questioned the visibility of the sign to traffic both North and South bound. Mr. Winterhalter stated that the variable is the size of the free-standing sign. The problem we have here is the reasonableness of applying the sign ordinance in the strictest sense after all the other uses have been established in this District.

Mr. Tate moved, seconded by Mr. Maxton to accept the variance to allow 43-1/2 sq. ft per side as well as the "dimly lit" fascia sign.

Mrs. Lake asked about the size compared to others in the area. Mr. Winterhalter gave the comparison that it is approximately 65% the size of the Steak and Ale, and they both have the same size building.

The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Sycamore Canyon - review grading and erosion plan.

Mr. Karl Schab reviewed the plan. The area is located on the East side of Centerville Corporation line. This plat is on the South side of Pavlak plat, with the main access to Wilmington. There will be a road to connect this plat to the other one as proposed. The idea is to make it possible for the owner to excavate any material available at this site to the lots as shown. The preliminary plat plan has already been approved. It was suggested to show the grades at a certain bond. Mr. Schab said the top would be put back so the lots can be used as a residential plat. He also stated that they do not want to destroy this for future use.

Mr. Wells asked about houses now in the area. Mr. Schab stated that there were none at the present, there will be as shown in the preliminary plat all of which are dependent on the sewer, which will be a few years hence.

Mr. Wells feels that if the heavy equipment would get the job done faster there would be nobody around to see the work in process and the equipment use cannot be objectionable.

Mr. Robert Archdeacon stated that normal grading equipment will be used.

Mr. Myers asked if they would be using elevators or sieves. Mr. McCrabb asked how they would be picking up the material. Mr. Archdeacon stated that they would load it into trucks.

Mr. Winterhalter explained his concern regarding an open space connection with the ground at the 860' - 890' elevation.

Mr. Archdeacon was asked if this would change the elevation considerably. He replied that the drawing shows this will not be changed and that they are working with the Park Board and plan to have a five acre park when this is completed. They also have plans for erosion control to keep the mud and debris from going into Sugarcreek. They will be erecting a retention wall to control any mudding, which is normal in grading a subdivision. They believe that they will end up with an attractive area.

Mr. Myers asked about the grading - will it be terraced? Mr. Archdeacon stated that it would have 'steps', and will be terraced.

Mrs. Lake asked how long this project will take. Mr. Archdeacon said they did not know and stated some variables: (1) Sewer availability (2) The time it takes to put this plan into effect.

Mrs. Lake asked if the sewers were not years away. Mr. Archdeacon indicated that it could be several years away.

Mr. Schab stated that a time for the project should be suggested. Mr. Myers suggested that if a time limit is on the bonds it could present a hardship.

Mrs. Lake asked for clarification as to what the sewers have to do with the grading.

Mr. Archdeacon answered that as soon as sewers are available there will be pressure to get the project done.

Mrs. Lake asked that if this takes five years, what is the necessity of starting now?

Mr. Archdeacon commented on the fact that the gravel will not be for sale. B. G. Danis will be doing the work, and the gravel will be used by the grading operation.

Mrs. Lake said that five years seems excessive to allow this at this time. This could be tied up indefinitely with a hole in the ground. Mr. Archdeacon stated that this will not be a 'hole', it will be a grading process.

Mr. Wells stated that this decision will not be the final one.

Mr. Schab made some comments regarding the special grades.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that they have preliminary approval contingent on a grading plan. They are offering to post the bond and when this is done they will come back with the street plans, etc., and get Record Plan approval for that.

Mr. Wells suggested that this project could have a time limit of 2-5 years, the time to be selected as to when this ground should be restored for use. He suggested that perhaps the approval could be renewed if necessary.

Mr. Myers did not feel a renewable feature was necessary, perhaps we should just allow the required time. There was a discussion regarding the desirability of a renewable factor.

Mr. McCrabb asked how much gravel will be removed. Mr. Archdeacon answered approx. 150,000 yds.

Mr. Winterhalter asked if this was the preliminary subdivision plan. Mr. Archdeacon answered that this is the preliminary grading plan, the preliminary subdivision has been approved.

Mrs. Lake asked for clarification that the board is not approving the plan as necessary, just that the grading plan itself is acceptable. She was told that this was the case. She then asked when this area could be restored. Mr. Archdeacon answered approx. 5-7 years.

Mr. McCrabb asked if it is usual to establish grades on plats, and was told that this was an exception. He then asked what was going to be done about the 'attractive nuisance' feature.

Mr. Wells stated that that was not this Board's concern. Mr. Archdeacon said that this approval is required to guarantee that the area will be restored. Mr. McCrabb reiterated his concern about the 'attractive nuisance'.

Mr. Wells commented that 5-7 years was excessive and suggested 3 years would be an acceptable time limit for this area to be renewed.

Mr. Archdeacon asked that the required time limit be written into the motion.

Mr. Myers suggested four years, rather than giving any sort of renewable option

Mr. McCrabb asked Mr. Schab if he was in accord with this general grading plan. He answered that he agrees with the grading plan, the implementing plan and agrees that setting a time limit is valid.

Mr. McCrabb asked about the value of the bond. Mr. Schab answered \$45,000.

Mrs. Lake asked Mr. Schab if he felt four years was appropriate. He believes it is appropriate but would like to see the renewable aspect for this bond. Mr. Wells agreed with four years.

Mr. Wells suggested four years

Mrs. Lake moved to approve the grading plan for Sycamore Canyon with bond at \$45,000 and the work to be completed within four years.

Mr. Winterhalter mentioned the back of the adjoining lots and asked if there is enough room for a pathway. Mr. Archdeacon stated that the grading plan is inside the plat, the park is outside the grading plan.

Mrs. Lake asked about the Park Board's position regarding this plan. Mr. Archdeacon answered that there was no problem.

Mr. McCrabb asked if \$45,000 is adequate bond.

Mr. Schab stated that there should be an additional stipulation that the topsoil be stored at the site or off the site, but available at all times so that a simple grading will restore the area.

Mrs. Lake added this to her motion, which now reads:...to approve the grading plan for Sycamore Canyon with bond at \$45,000, the work to be completed within four years, topsoil is not to be removed from the site. Seconded by Mr. Myers. Approved unanimously.

3. Set date for public hearing for rezoning of three lots along north side of West Franklin Street from "R-1" to "O-S".

Mr. Winterhalter pointed out the A. P. District and the lots in question on a drawing. He stated that Dr. Glanton has agreed that if this area goes "A. P." he would be willing to submit his plans to the Board of Architectural Review.

Mr. Wells asked if at this time one lot would be excluded. Mr. Winterhalter clarified that there are two lots in question, who don't wish to be included.

Mrs. Lake said she didn't find the difference between interim and spot zoning.

Mr. Wells said he would rather see this 'spot' zoned rather than delay Dr. Glanton's situation any longer. Mr. Winterhalter said he is not sure this is the most desirable planning answer but we do owe some explanation to Dr. Glanton.

Mr. Wells feels that until some action is taken on this zoning (by the P. C.) we should go on with it.

Mr. Maxton stated that he feels we must realize that spot zoning is not the best, but we have to get this set for public hearing as soon as possible.

Mr. Winterhalter said if it is the desire of the Planning Commission to have the whole block go "A. P." that at such time as the excluded lots want to make application they could be approved.

Mr. Wells stated that Planning Commission can make changes to the application. He asked if anyone sees any reason why the public hearing should not be set.

Mrs. Lake said that other than the fact that those people involved may be wasting their time. The one applicant (Dr. Glanton) has a time problem.

Mrs. Lake wants to see the "O-S" in the A.P. District and would like to see an applicant who wishes to get this go to the A.P. Board and get their recommendation as if they were in the A.P. District.

Mr. Wells suggested that if we set the hearing at the end of May they (the applicants) can go to the A.P. Board and get their opinion in the meantime.

Mrs. Lake feels that it is a good idea so that at such time as this land does go "A.P.", it would not be outstanding in its appearance.

Mr. Maxton reminded the board that it was his recommendation in December to zone this A.P. He doesn't know where the delay is, it certainly isn't with this Board. None of the P.C. Board members seem to believe this area should be kept residential.

Mr. Wells set the Public Hearing for May 28, 1974 at 8:30 p.m. and stated that if the applicant wants to get the opinion of the A.P. Board in the meantime it is OK.

Mr. Wells and Mr. Tate agreed that the A.P. District should be extended from the present border to Hampton. There should be continuity.

Mr. Tate suggested that the board either give Dr. Glanton the approval or not, he does not feel Dr. Glanton will want to do anything contrary to the good of the area.

Mr. Myers agreed that the A.P. Board should have an opportunity to review this.

Mrs. Lake agreed that she would like to see Dr. Glanton go to the A.P. Board.

Mr. Wells said "if Planning Commission is willing to make spot zoning, it is OK".

Mr. Maxton asked about the other two applicants.

Mr. Winterhalter said the "A.P." text changes were submitted to him and returned to Council. He talked with Dr. Glanton and told him that one of the possibilities would be to rezone the whole block. If we had the whole block in a single zone it would be better.

Mr. Tate would like to find out what Dr. Glanton needs and 'go with it'.

Mr. Winterhalter was asked if the City should be involved with the one lot change from "R-1" to "O-S". He said perhaps we have the burden of this change.

Mr. Tate stated that he believes it is a perfectly reasonable request to allow this use.

Mr. Wells reiterated this is a temporary zone and we must realize this. Someone should get the A. P. Board recommendation upon which the changes can be based. He asked Dr. Glanton if he had any objections to getting these recommendations. Dr. Glanton indicated that he did not have any objections.

4. Review application for permit to build Foto-Fair in Goldman's shopping Center at Spring Valley Rd. & South Main Street.

Ms. Meridith Rainey, Real Estate Manager for Foto-Fair, submitted a photo of the proposed building. She wanted to answer any questions the board might have and stated that the photo shows exactly what this building will look like.

Mr. Myers asked about the proposed location and asked if this was firm.

Ms. Rainey stated they are trying to get as close as possible to the electrical source, which is directly behind the service station. (The photo showed the location further North on the lot). Mr. Myers said he would prefer to see it behind the service station.

Ms. Rainey said they would like to be visible from both directions and she did not feel they would be visible behind the service station.

Mr. Myers commented that this design is out of architecture with the existing building. He also felt the building would be readily visible behind the service station.

Ms. Rainey stated that this design is their advertising and their trademark.

Mr. McCrabb asked why this was being reviewed by this board. Mr. Winterhalter said that any variance to the site plan must come before this board. Mr. Wells said this requires a site plan review for this modification. Mr. Winterhalter said it is not in line with the approved site plan due to the architecture.

Mrs. Lake asked if the top (sign) would be lighted. Answer by Ms. Rainey: Yes. Mrs. Lake then asked if the lighting would be underground and Ms. Rainey said basically, that is what we hope.

Mr. McCrabb asked about the (possible) parking space problem. Mr. Winterhalter said this will be a drive-through type business, it will not create a parking problem and there is now an excess of parking spaces on the lot.

Mr. Myers indicated that he agrees with the trademark-type of building, but we must think of the area and I would find it more desirable to place it behind the service station.

Mrs. Lake said she did not have any objection to this business, but she does to the building. It is rather like a free-standing sign under an umbrella. The color is also too vibrant for the area.

Mr. Wells suggested that perhaps the top sign could be removed.

Mr. McCrabb asked if Foto-Fair was leasing space from Mr. Goldman and therefore acting as his agent. He indicated that we have other problems with this property and perhaps we need a new site plan. The property owner has been uncooperative in the past.

Mr. Wells said that we must not get confused with the duties of the Council, these other problems are the responsibility of Council.

Mrs. Lake said the overall 'carnival' look does not appeal to her.

Mr. Myers moved that we approve the application based on the photo and the location to be in the area to the East of the service station. Seconded by Mr. Wells. Motion denied 2-4. Those in favor: Mr. Wells & Mr. Myers. Those opposed: Mr. Maxton, Mr. Tate, Mrs. Lake & Mr. McCrabb.

Mr. Winterhalter then told the applicant that she could call the Clerk of Council if she would like and ask for an appeal to Council since it was denied by this board.

5. Final review of Be Am Co site plan (a) Landscape (b) Access Road Curb Cuts & (c) Architecture.

Mr. Archdeacon reviewed the final site plan for this bowling alley. Everything has been preliminarily approved except a modification of the site plan. Due to the concern about the view from Bigger Road, the front of the bowling alley is now facing South with the shops along Bigger Road.

There was a discussion regarding the modifications made on the plans: turning the bowling alley around, the number of curb cuts were reduced, landscaping identified by type, and the access road construction was delayed until "when the expressway (675) goes through".

Mr. Myers asked if the North (back) of the bowling alley will be concrete block. The plan was reviewed extensively by the members.

Mr. Archdeacon said the back will be textured block. Mr. Winterhalter said this could be required in the final plan approval.

There is great concern as to what will be visible from the expressway and Bigger Road.

Mr. Archdeacon said the building would be blocked by the Olympian Club and the overpass for 675.

Mr. Maxton & Mr. Myers asked about landscaping on the side (North) in question next to 675. Mr. Archdeacon said they would definitely have landscaping. Mr. Maxton asked if they plan to have Sycamore trees. Mr. Archdeacon said that not much of the North wall would be seen.

Mrs. Lake asked if the landscaping plan has been approved.

Mr. Winterhalter answered that the only approval was the planting and not the type of trees, etc.

Mr. Myers asked if the drive at the North is the limit of the ownership. Answer: Yes, the adjacent land is the Olympian Club land.

Mr. Myers said that he had thought that all four sides were going to be architecturally the same, not one side with building blocks. Mr. Winterhalter pointed out that the shop fronts and the front of the bowling alley would be of the same architecture.

Mrs. Lake, Mr. Myers and Mr. McCrabb asked to have this clarified (the S. side of the bowling alley will have the same architecture as the shopping area.)

Mr. McCrabb asked how they are going to make the block side fit the architecture. This is generally used in a modern setting. He asked about the colors and that perhaps a Williamsburg paint could help the appearance. He feels the color should be a part of the approval motion.

Mr. Maxton asked about the previous alcohol permit request. Mr. Winterhalter said this was tabled indefinitely at the owner's request.

Mr. Myers moved to approve the landscaping, 24' access road, curb cuts and architecture with the provision that the N, W & E sides are to be covered with a textured block wall and painted an appropriate color to blend in with the architecture. Seconded by Mr. Maxton.

Mr. McCrabb asked if the landscaping has been approved. Answer: Yes. Mr. McCrabb feels that it is 'skimpy' - appears to be two trees in 200'. Mrs. Lake commented that it doesn't appear to have anything along the one side.

Mr. McCrabb asked Mr. Winterhalter for his opinion. He told him we don't have any standards regarding this type of plan (landscaping). To screen the adjacent industrial area would require a far more detailed plan and does not seem necessary.

Mr. Haverstick said they felt the Woods would be a self-screen. We are 115' back, (W. of Bigger) the proposed development will have an elevated Bigger Rd. screening the land next to its West.

Mr. McCrabb feels that with landscaping we can get more the effect we want with little expense.

Mrs. Lake asked about the tabled alcohol permit request, said that since this is a conditional use, she can see that they will come back and say they cannot make a profit without a liquor license.

Mr. Wells said that Council should be aware that if they approve the bowling alley, they are implicitly approving the liquor license. He then asked if we are going to approve the landscaping.

Mr. Maxton feels, too, that it is 'skimpy' in the back (North) but that it is not that important. Mr. Myers said that we do not have anyone in attendance who can say that this is or is not adequate landscaping.

Mr. Winterhalter said that we realize that the landscaping could vary greatly. There could be a landscaping ordinance prepared and we could have specifications for future projects.

Mr. Archdeacon said that they felt the landscaping would certainly not be the minimum possible.

Mr. Myers motion was approved unanimously.

6. Review Goldman's request to speak before Planning Commission regarding reconstruction of a destroyed freestanding sign.

10. ~~Mr. Farquhar was asked his opinion and he replied as follows:~~ Assuming ~~structure~~ that more than 50% of the structure was destroyed, then they do not have an absolute right to restore or replace. They do have the right to apply for a variance.

Mr. Wells read O. R. C. 713.15 and asked for Mr. Farquhar's comments and Mr. Farquhar replied that this provides that there may be reasonable restrictions regarding restoring, etc. This is based on the constitution.

Mr. Wells set a public hearing for May 28, 1974 at 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Joe Shipiro, Goldman's Attorney, asked Mr. Farquhar for his interpretation of 713.15. Farquhar said he thinks that Planning Commission can properly prohibit it to be re-erected when the damage exceeds 50% of the current value. Mr. Shipiro said that he did not interpret the O. R. C. the same. Mr. Farquhar said Planning Commission may grant a variance.

7. Mr. Farquhar then was asked his opinion regarding the 'three-mile jurisdiction'.

The procedure is not the same as for Centerville plats regarding: (1) approval of plat. (2) acceptance of streets. For Centerville plats, Planning Commission reviews the plat and Council only accepts the streets. Since our Council will neither accept township streets nor review those plats and since we are going to see that this is done, somebody has to approve the bond. The developer should not be held up by City Council since they don't review Twp. plats therefore Planning Commission should make all of these decisions. You are not passing on zoning, just reviewing the lot shape and the street sizes as they relate to our thoroughfare plan.

Mr. Schab said we received a letter from the zoning inspection in Washington Twp. regarding lot sizes, etc. Should we get into this or do we take the word of the Twp. zoning inspector?

Mr. Farquhar said the Twp. Inspector is just giving you information, if she misses something you can point it out.

Mr. Winterhalter asked if we are subject to any litigation if there is a mistake by the Twp. zoning inspector or should we review the information. Mr. Farquhar said that just as we accept a statement from the Engineer, we should accept Wash. Twp. inspector's recommendation.

Mrs. Evelyn List spoke regarding the special use district - "Where do you want to come into this?" Mr. Winterhalter said we probably should be working hand-in-hand all along.

Mr. Wells asked Mrs. List if she sends copies to the park district, or fire department, etc. Mrs. List said she did if they are involved.

Mr. McCrabb asked Mr. Farquhar about the subdivision requirements without a subdivision. "There is nothing to come before you because the only time you will come into street dedication or improvement is when someone wants to build a plat, if they want to build without subdividing, cannot be made to conform to the subdivision standards.

Mr. McCrabb asked what are we going to do with the plats that have been previously approved, or that are under the jurisdiction of the Twp. under special use. Are you bound to go along with whatever was approved as far as a plat?

Mr. Farquhar said that if this were started prior to the time the three-mile jurisdiction was started we are bound by that.

Mr. Schab asked if we have a right to change anything that has been approved prior to the three-mile jurisdiction.

Mr. McCrabb mentioned that he owns property which is in this three-mile jurisdiction and asked if subsequent sections within an approved preliminary plan are subject to Centerville's new jurisdiction.

Mr. Farquhar said he doesn't think we have a problem unless someone waits, two years, and then tries to get final plan approval.

8. Group Housing Standards, prepared by Planner, to be set for discussion at later date.
-

Mr. Wells commented that since the Supreme Court ruling, we felt that our present definition did not prohibit Group Housing.

Mr. Farquhar suggested that we define 'family' and define Group Housing to include the desired types.

Mr. Wells set the item for discussion at the May 14 meeting.

9. Preliminary plan Franklin East at northeast corner of Clyo and Centerville-Station Roads.
-

Mr. Archdeacon pointed out that the plan as shown is the same plan used in zoning application. It includes (12) R-1 lots, (14) R-2 lots, offices, (16) R-4 lots. He also pointed out the open space and mounds next to the roadway (Clyo).

Mr. Wells asked if the open space would belong to a Homeowners Assoc. or to the City. Mr. Archdeacon replied that it is available if the City wants it for a park.

Mrs. Lake asked about the width of the street. Mr. Archdeacon pointed out the proposed new streets and defined the existing ones.

Mr. Wells read some comments from the Centerville Park Board. They recommended that the park not be: (1) too close to the road and (2) little could be done with the proposed park except for a grassy area.

Mr. Winterhalter pointed out that if this were going to be a park it should be in the middle, not the linear approach.

Mr. Wells commented that this was not intended to be a park.

Mr. Archdeacon mentioned the small park (corner of Edenhurst & '48') as being much smaller than the two acres they are offering, and also this "middle of development park" would not be feasible.

Mr. Wells asked about the proposed walks, whether they should be in the park area or not, or if the walks would be concrete.

Mr. Ned Haverstick said they would be asphalt, not concrete - they expect sinking problems in the area.

There was a discussion regarding the placement of the bikeway/walkway along the top of the mound. Mr. Archdeacon pointed out that they will be building the mound from the topsoil removed during construction and leave time for it to settle. It was agreed that the bikeway/walkway (min. 5') would be aesthetically placed. There was also a discussion concerning a public bikeway on private land. It was pointed out that will be the case in the 'Walnut Walk' area.

Mr. Schab asked if the sidewalk could be put on a public right-of-way or if left on private park could it be maintained by the Homeowners Assoc.

Mr. Farquhar said that he doesn't think you have to extend the right-of-way to include sidewalk but you could have an easement to include the bikeway/walkway. Maintaining this is a question to be answered later.

Mrs. Lake asked if the sidewalk is to be on top of the mound. (The mound is to act as a buffer from Industrial view) She asked about the grade drop to corner. Mr. Archdeacon stated that this would be a gradual slope to the sidewalk along Centerville-Station Road.

Mr. Haverstick stated that this would not be a high mound, it would be mostly decorative. Mrs. Lake asked 'how high'? Mr. Haverstick answered 2' - 4' rather than 6' - 7'. In response to an additional question, Mr. Haverstick said there will be concrete, grass & landscape near the office building. The mound will give a change in pattern to give a more pleasing appearance.

Mr. Winterhalter mentioned Mr. Schab's recommendation to consider a wider pavement for the street 500' east of Clyo. Mr. Winterhalter feels that we should consider this a 50' right-of-way with 60' right-of-way street standards.

Mrs. Lake asked about the widening of Clyo and Centerville Station Roads.

Mr. Schab mentioned that the Railroad prevents Clyo from being widened evenly on both sides, and asked why this developer should have to bear all the assessment, since he is dedicating excess right-of-way on his property.

Mr. Wells feels that the road costs should be the burden of property owners on both sides.

Mr. Winterhalter would like road development (engineering) plans for Clyo and also Centerville-Station Road.

Mr. McCrabb asked what engineering has been done regarding this widening.

Mr. Schab said that the horizontal lines were started by the previous engineer, but the vertical lines have not been started. The road should be made adequate for the next 10 - 20 years when changes are made.

- Mr. Wells commented on the requirement to meet thoroughfare standards on Clyo if there should be a plat there.
- Mr. Archdeacon asked that the development not be delayed because of the cost sharing, etc., on Clyo as the development will start on the East of the property.
- Mrs. Lake asked if there is a likelihood that this project will be completed without the widening of the two roads. Mr. Archdeacon indicated there isn't.
- Mr. McCrabb asked if this project actually needs a park - commenting that there really isn't any need to move the park to the center, if it is not required at all.
- Mrs. Lake asked if the lots were being reduced to allow the park. Answer: yes.
- Mr. Wells remarked that the Park District master plan shows no park in that location. Mr. Winterhalter commented that he doesn't think it is wrong to accept additional park land.
- Mr. Wells said this plan was developed by the developer and the commission to come up with something acceptable for this corner.
- Mr. Archdeacon commented that these are the same plans as shown with zoning request, with only the minor changes as mentioned regarding lot size, etc.
- Mr. Winterhalter said the mound is a separate issue - if it is thought that the park is not necessary, the mound can stay.
- Mr. Archdeacon commented that with the open space that is created with the mounds, they are asking for credit (a lot size reduction) on the four family lots.
- Mr. Haverstick said they reduced the lot sizes to create the mound, to say: "This is a defined line - here starts residential and ends industrial". He stated they are not going to build marginal four families and the people will be just as concerned with what they see as will single family residents. The mound will be, when it goes up, a good view.
- Mrs. Lake feels the mound was a very smart plan by the developer, but to put the mound in for a lot size reduction was not a former issue, but the mound was solely approved as a method to get the buffer.
- Mr. Archdeacon explained that all four families could share the park.
- Mr. Myers & Mrs. Lake commented that one could not have a mound and no ground around it, the park is a desirable feature.

Mr. Winterhalter stated that the zoning established only the R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 and our only commitment is to the zoning... this can be considered as the first review of the plan. Mr. McCrabb asked for an explanation. Mr. Winterhalter said that the plat shows a lot size reduction with the balance of this land put in the park land. Mr. McCrabb asked if there was a density change caused by this reduction. Answer: No (Winterhalter).

Mr. Haverstick commented that there are still the same number of lots - the park is for Homeowners Assoc. Mr. McCrabb asked how the Homeowners Assoc. would be developed. Mr. Haverstick said they will do this through a Homeowners Assoc. whose only function will be the maintenance. It could include a pool, etc. - or whoever owns the building or the buildings and there would be a fee based on the number of units or sq. ft. of land. Mr. McCrabb asked if the four families would own this park. Mr. Haverstick answered yes, probably, unless it would be a pool (which is given as a possibility, not shown in the plan) then there could be other owners such as some of the single families, but the four families would probably own it.

Mr. Maxton moved to approve the preliminary plan as presented. Mr. Tate seconded. Approved unanimously.

10. Preliminary plan Madrid Estates (Wash. Twp.) near southeast corner of South Main Street and Spring Valley Road.

Mr. Wells read a notice received from Washington Twp. (There will be another development by another developer and owner to the East of this section which is in the Twp.).

Mr. Maxton asked if these are single families. Mr. Archdeacon said they are four family - zoned (Wash. Twp.) R-5.

Mr. Wells asked if there was any objection from the Twp. Mr. Schab said there is a suggestion that Mandel Dr. should have a temporary turn around during construction.

Mr. McCrabb asked what Mr. Schab thought of the curve on Mandel. Mr. Schab believes the actual curve of the street is adequate. Mr. McCrabb asked about possible high speed on this nearly right angle curve. Mr. Schab indicated there was no concern.

Mr. Winterhalter reviewed the thoroughfare plan. He would like to study this after it has been taken to Twp. Mandel would ultimately go to Sheehan and would be an "extra" collector street. Mr. McCrabb asked about the width of the loop street. Mr. Winterhalter said it is 28' back-to-back at the curb for the 50' right-of-way.

Mr. Archdeacon said a 60' right-of-way for Mandel is part of the preliminary plan.

Mr. Winterhalter said we do not need to require a 37' right-of-way which is minimum for a collector street, since this is not on our thoroughfare plan.

Mr. Wells suggested perhaps we should know what will be done with the Twp. property adjacent to this.

Mrs. List said there are six lots on the West side.

Mr. Wells stated that this area is supposed to be high density use, not residential.

Mr. Wells and Mr. Winterhalter discussed the width of the streets. These items will be covered in the final plans.

Mr. Maxton moved to accept the preliminary plan as presented. Mr. Myers Seconded. Approved unanimously.

11. Review Record Plan 2, Sheehan Road Estates (Wash. Twp.)

Mr. Archdeacon reviewed the plan.

Mr. Wells asked about lots 11-27 on Kimbary regarding sidewalks on one side, and asked Mrs. List about the Twp's requirements for sidewalks. Mrs. List indicated that it depends on each individual case.

Mr. Winterhalter suggested that a letter be sent to Wash. Twp. to see if they would like to recommend a policy of sidewalks on one or both sides of the street.

Mr. Wells commented that he thinks Council has said that we should have a policy of sidewalks on one side.

Mr. Miller said that he feels this will probably be preferred to be reviewed (by the Twp.) on an individual basis.

Mr. Wells asked if our policy would be to require sidewalks on at least one side and require sidewalks on both sides on an individual basis for schools, etc.

Mr. Maxton feels that whatever we have in the City we should continue through the three-mile jurisdiction, although he supports the sidewalk on one side only.

Mr. Wells said the commission can pass their own recommendation.

Mr. Myers said he would like to see sidewalks on both sides as the purpose is not complete with sidewalks on one side only.

There was a poll taken of the members regarding their preference on sidewalks with mixed reactions:

Mr. Maxton - one side

Mrs. Lake - mostly two

Mr. Tate - I go along with Centerville regulation and go to two,
but I feel this (regulation) should be changed.

Mr. McCrabb - I would go to two sides ONLY because this is the
City policy now. However, I go along with one.

Mr. Myers - two sides

Mr. Wells - one side

Mr. Archdeacon commented that he can see the need of sidewalks in some
cases but he feels the people should have a choice. If they are on
one side and you want them, buy there.

Mr. McCrabb stated that if we are an instrument of the Council we are
obligated to go with two sides.

Mr. Wells said - but we are talking about the Twp.

Mr. Wells asked where the sidewalk is on this plan. Mr. Schab answered that
it is on Sheehan Rd. (S. W. side) and should be shown on the N. side
of Kimbary Dr.

Mrs. List commented that the sidewalk was one condition of the re-zoning.

Mr. Schab stated there would be a \$50,000 bond requirement.

Mr. Myers moved to approve the plan with a \$50,000 bond. Seconded by
Mr. Tate. Motion approved unanimously.

12. Preliminary Plan - The Village Commons - near southeast corner of Alex-Bell
and McEwen Roads (Wash. Twp.)

Mr. Archdeacon reviewed the plan. This is the remainder of the Grant farm,
24.8 acres, 70 lots includes R-1, R-3 and the balance R-4 Twp. zoning.
12.2 acres of open space will be dedicated to the Twp. Park board and
they have been working with Mr. Yeck and Mr. Taylor on that.
The park would then go from Normandy Lane to McEwen road with
several walkway entrances.

Mr. Wells read a notice from the Twp. The three lots West of Grants Trail
do not have adequate frontage, the other lots meet the requirement.

Mr. Winterhalter asked if a decision by the Twp. Board of Zoning Appeals is
required regarding zoning. If so, he feels that the Twp. would be
cornered to approved these three lots. Mrs. List said they can get this
later if they can get approval tonight on the balance of the plat. The
members reviewed the plans as presented.

Mr. Winterhalter said it is not only Wash. Twp. zoning but a variation to our Subdivision Regulation with regard to street frontage. If we accept this plan except for these three lots, the only thing that the land could be used for other than residential is a park because of the creek. There are cases in the Twp. where people have sold the front of their property and where the driveway comes out has been a problem.

Mr. Archdeacon asked why this was a question here. Mr. Winterhalter said if we approve this we are precluding any other use of the land. Mr. Archdeacon said if this is not approved tonight they can exclude this area from their preliminary plans. Mr. Winterhalter feels that we cannot approve the plans knowing the land is there and in question.

Mr. Maxton moved to table this until May 14th.

Mr. Dale Smith (one of the owners) said regarding the three lots: if Wash. Twp. doesn't want them, they will not be on the plan. They will not be taken as open space transfer for the park.

Mrs. List said the Twp. doesn't want them, and these three lots can be deleted from the plan.

Mr. Myers asked about the Dr. Hugh Henning's property. Mr. Schab pointed out the property line, and said Dr. Henning was going to keep the land as it is.

Mrs. List said that if she would have seen this before she did, Planning Commission would not have seen those three lots on the plan.

Mr. Winterhalter questions approving the plan as shown, or without the three lots.

There was a discussion regarding the fire department turn around radius and school bus turn arounds on some of the proposed cul-de-sacs. Mrs. Lake questioned the turn around on the cul-de-sac, and Mr. Archdeacon said they could make some of them wide enough to turn around.

Mr. Winterhalter suggested some should be loop roads, not cul-de-sacs.

At t

At this point Mr. Winterhalter asked for 19 days rather than 10 days to preview all proposed plans.

Mr. Wells said the cul-de-sac, school district wants, etc., seem to be in a state of flux. We should get the statement from the school district and the other items brought up.

Mr. Myers asked about the Park District land purchased by the County and leased to the park district. This is on a 99 year lease, \$1/year.

Mr. Maxton's move to table this until the 14th was seconded by Mrs. Lake and approved unanimously.

13. Earlier Submittal time requested by City Planner

Mr. Wells asked for recommendation from the City Planner regarding submittal time.

Mr. Winterhalter asked for 19 days to get the information submitted and out to review agencies, then to Commission Board Members with recommendations and back to discuss with the developer a week before meeting. This was put on the agenda for the May 14th meeting.

14. Plymouth Notch, Section 2, Record Plan approval.

Mr. Winterhalter reviewed the plan and recommended approval subject to a pathway between preferably lots 15 and 16 or lots 16 & 17 to connect with driveway to park.

Mr. Maxton asked if this road was a private road. Mr. Winterhalter said Mr. Barnett owns road from Centerville-Station to park.

Mr. Taylor said he talked with Mr. Barnett and Mr. Barnett is going to plant a garden on that portion of the road and would probably not want a pathway there.

Mr. Bob Scott, builder, asked who this walk, off the cul-de-sac is supposed to serve. Answer: your people. He then asked how it will be kept from being an access for 150 other people (Black Oak South). Answer by Mr. Winterhalter: there is no way, if it is there, people can use it.

Mr. Scott then stated that they are trying to 'do nice things' in the development with his 28 lots and did not want this to be a 'race-way'.

Mr. Wells pointed out that this is a proposed walkway or bikeway not a road.

Mr. Scott said he knew that, and asked what other access there will be into this area. He wants a nice area for his 28 lots, not a through road.

Mr. Myers suggested that perhaps he is concerned about children going to the Black Oak pool.

Mrs. Lake feels that some of the builder's residents will want to join the pool. She said that his 28 lots cannot be divided from the 528 already there.

Mr. Scott said he cannot see a 'funnel' opening up to Black Oak South's development through his subdivision and his 28 lots. He thinks the park is fine and doesn't object to a few using this access but does not want it used by the masses.

Mr. Taylor suggested that he would not have to worry about that, the present accesses will probably be used rather than the general public going through the proposed area.

Mr. Schab does not believe there would be many users of the proposed walkway.

Mr. McCrabb suggested using the sewer easement between 16 & 17 as the walkway site.

Mr. Scott pointed out the sidewalk proposal and mentioned that last year when he discussed this with Mr. Yeck he was asked about a water line through his property line to the park. If the park wants them to run a water line to connect to the park land, it would be agreeable, they would like to do it on the Northwest corner.

Mrs. Lake asked if the easement should include sidewalk rather than just an easement. Mr. Myers asked about the sidewalk location. Answer: the sidewalk is on Centerville-Station Rd. and Braewood Trail. Mrs. Lake commented that the sidewalk should continue on down. Mrs. Lake said that if we would be requiring sidewalks in the future on Streamside Dr. we should be requiring it now.

Mr. Schab said we have sidewalk on the west side of Braewood Trail and that there should be sidewalks on cul-de-sacs of 600' and on the easement to park.

Mr. Maxton moved to approve the plan to include sidewalks on Braewood Trail down to the park access and a sidewalk or access to the park between lots 15 and 16 along lot 16.

Mrs. Lake asked about Streamside residents access to park, in lieu of local walk. It was shown that it was approx. 400 yds. to the closest access.

Mr. Tate Seconded Mr. Maxton's move. Approved unanimously.

15. Review revised Record Plan #1 Carriage Square - to include storage building.

Mr. Winterhalter reviewed the plan asking for revision to include storage building (to be the equivalent size of a 3-car garage) for maintenance and pool equipment. It will be located West of the pool.

Mr. Myers moved to approve the revised plan. Seconded by Mr. Tate. Approved Unanimously.

16. Review resubmitted shopping center for Carriage Square.

Mr. Archdeacon reviewed the status of this plan. They want the approval of Planning Commission, ^{5/11} not having received approval previously (3-2 vote), before presenting to Council.

Mr. Winterhalter pointed out that copies of the new plan are in the board members packets along with the environmental impact study, for their review before the meeting.

This subject will be on the agenda for the May 14 meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:50 p. m.

