

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Special Meeting

April 9, 1974 7:30 pm

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

Also Present R. Winterhalter, City Planner,

K. Schab, City Engineer and J. Smith, City Manager.

Absent - Mr. Baker & Mr. McCrabb

Mr. Maxton commented on a letter to the editor which appeared in the newspaper concerning Council's dissatisfaction with the Planning Commission. He asked Mr. Winterhalter for an explanation, who mentioned a few items, such as minutes, absence, etc.

Mrs. Lake commented that Council was concerned with attendance at Planning Commission meetings during the past year. They are also concerned that Planning Commission have enough present to hold their meetings. Commented that Council does not always let Planning Commission know just what they want.

Mr. Wells commented on Council being displeased, and stated that Planning Commission has not received any indication as to when Council wants Planning Commission to meet. Planning Commission is now doing many different jobs and has a big workload.

The Minutes of the March 12 meeting were corrected and Mr. Maxton moved, Seconded by Mr. Myers to approve as corrected. Mr. Wells abstained, rest of members voted to approve.

The Minutes of March 26 meeting were corrected and Mr. Maxton moved, Seconded by Mr. Tate to approve as corrected. Approved unanimously.

Public Hearings -

Z-74-4 - Request for rezoning from Washington Township R-4 to Centerville O S for 1.72 acres at the northeast corner of Alex-Bell and Bigger Roads. Proposed use to be developed by owner is a small animal hospital.

Dr. C. Ackley, 1695 E. Alex-Bell Road owns and resides on 12.89 acres on this corner and the proposed changed zone applies to 1.72 acres to be O-S. Dr. Ackley stated that pictures have already been presented to Commission Board. The architecture of the proposed building would blend in with the surrounding residences.

Those speaking in favor - None.

Those opposed:

Mr. Carl Milbrandt, 7111 Bigger Road, commented that he felt we need residential

only in the area and does not like to see so many businesses. He would like to see this kept residential, they moved to area because it is residential. He is concerned that if this corner is changed it will be the start of more businesses as no more residences would be built there. Also concerned with the possible noise of animals.

Mr. Richard McSherry, Ambridge Road, is concerned that this might turn the area into a large commercial area.

Dr. Ackley stated that O-S indicates that there will be no boarding of animals. Only sick for treatment, etc.

Mr. McSherry is concerned as to what it will look like, if it will blend with the residential area and asked about the set-back conforming to the residential standards, etc.

Mr. Winterhalter read the description of the O-S zoning and stated that the proposed small animal hospital met the requirements. The set back would be 45', the equivalent to requirement for homes. He also noted that the setback from future right-of-way would be applied. This requirement would be given before the permit would be issued. There will be only a small sign, no neon sign and it will appear like a residence. No animals would be living there.

Mrs. Black, Bigger Road, stated that they are not as concerned with the hospital as they are with the possibility of things that could be included in the O-S zoning. She is concerned with the areas around this site.

Lois Vandermeier, 7220 Bigger Road is concerned for the same reasons as Mrs. Black.

Mr. Winterhalter read the description of O-S zoning, and mentioned that this zoning would only apply to the 1.72 acres involved for the hospital.

Mr. Bill Martin, 7185 Bigger Road is concerned that if this is approved it would leave it 'wide open for that whole section to be business'. He would like business to go on Clyo and leave this area residential. He feels the whole section will go business.

Lois Vandermeier commented that the land across the way from this is so nice she feels it should not be business. She feels the business and apartments should be there as a buffer and this should be kept as residential.

Pat Hudson, 1450 Alex-Bell Road is greatly concerned about business going in as she moved there (across the street from this property) because she wanted to get away from the city.

Jim Singer, 1408 Ambridge questioned the need of an animal hospital here at all. There are already two in the city and one between Centerville and The Dayton Mall, he stated.

Mr. Wells stated that we cannot consider the need in this application.

Dr. Ackley pointed out that this is good residential area, but the amount of traffic on Bigger and 725 is such that if his home was not located as far back on the property as it is he would not care to reside there.

Emerson Vandermeier, 7220 Bigger Road commented that if Clyo Road goes through there, all the traffic will/ He also feel we have enough animal hospitals in the area. go through.

Mr. Wells closed the public hearing at this point.

Mr. Maxton asked Dr. Ackley if the picture represents what he is planning to build.

Dr. Ackley stated that he plans to duplicate the building in the picture, only it will be a little bigger.

Mr. Wells described the picture and passed it around for those interested to see.

Mr. Myers asked Dr. Ackley where he is currently doing business.

Dr. Ackley answered that he was currently in the Kettering Animal Hospital

Mr. Myers asked if he would close that location. Answer:

Dr. Ackley stated that he is currently in business there with two others and that he would plan eventually to sell his portion to them and conduct his business only at the proposed location.

Mr. Myers asked about the proposed driveway location.

Mr. Winterhalter stated that the site plan review would cover this at the time the plans are submitted. He also stated that there would be a cyclone fence installed, and that Dr. Ackley was very willing to cooperate.

Mr. Myers asked Dr. Ackley how many people he would anticipate would use the driveway to enter his business in a day.

Dr. Ackley answered possibly twenty - based on approximately 70 presently at the Kettering location with the three partners.

Mr. Myers asked Dr. Ackley if this would be for small animals only.

Dr. Ackley answered yes.

Mrs. Lake asked where the present driveway to his residence is on the drawing. She also asked if there is anything that makes this zoning imperative at this time rather than at a later date, possibly at a different location.

Dr. Ackley answered that the only thing that is imperative is that if he doesn't put it in now, someone else will. He also pointed out that he now owns this property and to put it elsewhere would mean purchasing more property. He pointed out the present driveway on the drawing. (N. of the corner)

Mrs. Lake feels the zoning a little premature. She likes the drawing but feels this should be residential. We do have a prime residential area with a major intersection rather than asking for the exception first she would like to see a residential plan presented with an exception for the corner.

Mr. Maxton stated that the corner is now high traffic. Area back is residential. Feels that to consider residential plan is fool-hardy. He feels that we have to come up with some kind of business that would blend in with the residential area. He feels it is a good answer to that corner to have the animal hospital there.

Mrs. Lake questioned the timing, and the feasibility of putting it further down.

Mr. Maxton doesn't think it is fair to ask Dr. Ackley to change the whole area. We will have to treat other possible requests individually. He feels the proposal Dr. Ackley presents would be very good.

Mr. Myers suggested that the concern here is the access to the driveway on the busy corner itself. Asked if it would be possible to use present residential drive and have the access to the O-S from that driveway, which would move the professional driveway from the corner.

Mr. Wells stated that Site Development questions are being raised and we should hold this off until the next meeting to answer some of these questions.

Mr. Maxton does not feel that it is fair to Dr. Ackley because we don't do this to others. He thinks our comments to Dr. Ackley should be representative of other proposed developments.

Mr. Tate stated that he can see where there will be a great amount of traffic but does not feel that it will actually add to the present traffic and generally has no objections. He feels the proposed building is very good.

Mrs. Lake would like the option to approve site plans and delay a decision until they are submitted.

Mr. Wells suggested that the main concern is to keep traffic congestion away from the corner.

Mr. Maxton moved to approve the proposed zone change. Seconded by Mr. Myers.

Mrs. Lake requested a rough site plan in two weeks.

The motion was approved unanimously.

It was suggested that it might be advisable if the site plan were taken to Council before their public hearing, and stressed that it is important to make it clear to Council that this will not change the area.

Mrs. Lake stated that it is not her intent to make this a business corner.

Mr. Wells stated that the public doesn't know what is being planned so this should be made clear at Council presentation.

Unfinished Business

Review changes to Record Plan 2 and 3, Pelbrook Farms.

Mr. Winterhalter showed plan to be modified to 105' or 115'<sup>lot widths</sup> in order to put larger homes than on the 110 ft. lots. This is the area on the SW corner of Alex-Bell and Wilmington.

Mr. Tate stated that if this will give the developer a chance to put variation and enhance the development it is a good change.

Mrs. Lake moved to accept the plan. Seconded by Mr. Tate. Vote was unanimous.

Review construction drawings and record plan for Southbrook Manor #4.

Mr. Winterhalter made several comments regarding this plan which puts single residence homes on Marshall with sidewalks. Stated that these plans match the prevailing standards. He recommended we accept the plan.

Mr. Myers moved to approve the plan as presented. Seconded by Mr. Maxton  
Vote was unanimously approved.

Review Master Plan and Section 1 for Walnut Walk (Black Oak Estates 6).

Mr. Winterhalter showed the plans for this section. ~~this section~~

Mr. Archdeacon made several comments and explained the proposal showing Ambridge Rd. extension. Additional road to come in from Clyo and would have cul-de-sac with maximum wooded area. Three access roads on Clyo. He showed proposed park area. Pointed out the walkways and explained the plans are to create open space and cluster the houses with ~~walkways~~ walkways in open areas. They are asking for consideration of many variances. It is a different type plan for this area but has been done in other sections with great success. There would not be sidewalks in front (in the dedicated streets) but in the rear. Right-of-way proposed to be 40'. Homes will fit the topography.

Mr. Wells stated that we need fundamental recommendation on Ambridge extension and reviewed items covered at last meeting regarding the connection of Ambridge Road.

Mr. Schab asked that the chair recognize those present in the audience.

Betty Mantis, 7276 VonDette Circle, is strongly in favor of opening this for better flow of traffic. Those on VonDette and Mapleton Dr. have taken most of the traffic to date. Yesterday she contacted approx. 40 people who signed a petition (on file) to open the streets so they do not have to bear the traffic for the Black Oak residents forever as well as having had the traffic, etc., of construction. Others who built homes there should be willing to share the load of some of the traffic. She did not have time after learning of this meeting to cover more than two streets but she feels that the response from 40 should mean something since approx. 20 are trying to block it. Mentioned past assurance by Council that they would not be required to bear traffic from Black Oak forever.

Clark McLaughlin, VonDette & Mapleton, stated that he has spent over \$400 in the last 6 months to repair his lawn from people who cut across. There is only this one outlet and he feels that someone else should bear some of this traffic now.

Mr. R. C. Herman, 7605 Rolling Oaks Dr. presented a signed petition with 8 signatures (on file) from people urging they quickly open more access roads. They do not like the increase in traffic, both construction and private vehicles.

R. McSherry stated that they have been fighting this for three years. He sees no reason why we should run this road through. It is not going to hurt the developer. The houses will sell better if it is not put through. Ambridge was not built to carry that much traffic. There is going to be mayhem on Bigger Road. He feels there is no reason for this street to go through. He also stated that Planning Commission should represent the people and that he represents the people and this is the way they want it.

Mrs. Mantis, VonDette Circle, stated that those she represents are also the people and that the Planning Commission also represents them. She cannot understand the selfishness of others. People should share this traffic.

Mr. Wells stated that we have heard both sides and represent both sides and appreciate both sides of this situation. He closed the public hearing.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that they are involved in this complete Black Oak Development and planned to have several outlets. They want to help alleviate construction traffic that has occurred in the past.

Mr. Wells stated that one of the problems of this is that there is only one Northern exit and entrance to area and that is VonDette Circle. There are two Southern, one on the West and no Eastern entrance and exit. This has presented construction traffic problems and

this has finally developed to the point that some of the problems are over. He also stated that previous Swim Club opposition is really not valid as it is too far away to be involved in road traffic. VonDette has had all the traffic, but sees no alternative but to continuation of Ambridge Road. Stated that he does not like the stub going toward Alex-Bell.

Mr. Myers stated he does not like stub, either.

Mrs. Lake stated that her concern is with the 40 driveway. She likes the plan but is not convinced it will work. The parking is a problem, when there is a party or company, there just isn't enough space.

Mr. Winterhalter stated that with both 40' or 50' right-of-way, 24' roadways apply.

Mrs. Lake is concerned with more and more cars. Also asked about the Fire Chief's response to 24' right-of-way. Believes we need sidewalks on Ambridge.

Mr. Wells would prefer Ambridge to be standard 28', not 24'. If Ambridge is extended he would like to see sidewalks. He asked Mr. Archdeacon to define walkways and sidewalks.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that walkways will be hard surface (asphalt or concrete) approx. 5' wide. They feel that with the walkways, sidewalks are not needed.

Mr. Myers asked what the reason was for requiring the stub up to Alex-Bell Rd.

Mr. Wells stated that it was so we would not leave the land 'land locked'.

Mrs. Lake asked if the stub could be left out, and an easement for roadway left in.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that they could eliminate the stub but would have to change the curve of the street somewhat.

Mr. Schab stated that he has heard complaints from a lot of people. At this time it is about 50-50 for and against putting Ambridge through. As an Engineer he feels it is necessary for Ambridge to run through. The distance from Clyo to easternmost boundry of the tract is considerable. (approx. 2000'). We would rarely leave 2000' without an access. To slow down traffic on Ambridge, 24' could be considered but it could be narrowed down from Clyo.

Mr. Smith stated that 24' is not wide enough to accommodate parking but people would park there. Enforcing it is impractical. Regarding the stub, he would not like to see escrow on this stub. Alex-Bell Rd. contours and elevations are going to change and that corner that causes the problem will probably be eliminated so that stub will not be the danger that it appears to be now.

Mr. Wells questioned whether Alex-Bell and Wilmington will be signalled.

Mr. Smith stated that there is no question in his mind that the corner will be eliminated and it will be reconstructed and he thinks the stub will be needed and the Greenbriar section across will probably be signalled also. That hook where the stub is should not be left there to slow down traffic as it would create a collision problem.

Mr. Winterhalter stated that Ambridge is not a thoroughfare, but an abbreviated 'collector' street, designed to collect traffic to a thoroughfare. He feels we should consider waiver of 28' for Ambridge. He feels that the road should be keyed to Clyo. He would like to approve the plan all but the walkways at this time. The sidewalks may be necessary for school bus children. Possibly the walkways could be extended in width for the school bus children.

Mr. Wells would like a motion to eliminate the stub and let the subject of the sidewalk and walkway be left to a future meeting and the extension of Ambridge Road be 28'.

Mr. Tate likes the idea of the walkways and would like these possibly flaired at the end to facilitate children waiting for busses.

Mrs. Lake would like the Fire Department report.

Mr. Wells read statement from Fire Department.

Mrs. Lake proposes that we get another master plan to cover the exclusions as suggested.

Mr. Wells requested a modified plan be presented in two weeks by M. Archdeacon.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that this preliminary plan was presented two weeks ago. It is now construction time and they would like to get this completed.

Mrs. Lake stated that she doesn't want to see this going to Council with all these exceptions.

Mr. Wells identified exceptions: Right-of-way widths, eliminate stub, Fire Dept. concern on right-of-way widths and bulbs for parking. The pathway (walkway) systems not OK'd.



Mr. Archdeacon stated that if they don't have walkways and are forced to sidewalks they will have to redo the entire system. He proposed 24' right-of-way with parking bays. This is currently in existence in Springfield and they have not experienced a lot of violations. These bays are considered 'party parking' - one-half car per unit. This will be something different in street design, open space, setback and walkways. It is all an integral part. If we are going to have 28' streets the parking bays are not necessary and this would have to be redrawn.

Mrs. Lake stated that she would like City Planner to go over these things before it is presented to Council.

Mr. Myers stated that he would rather see this approved by Planning Commission now as we have been going over this for three years and it is construction season. He would like to see 28' streets.

Mrs. Lake asked if we are going to exclude the 40 right-of-ways. We must have this final before it is presented to Council.

Mr. Maxton stated that if we make these restrictions, and it is clear what we want, the plan should be revised before going to Council.

Mr. Wells stated that Council must realize we cannot see everything, we are trying to work with the developers and this just means more deals. Some changes may have to be made and approvals given with restrictions.

Mrs. Lake stated that we cannot ask these people to continue to wait, they have waited long enough and it is construction season. The city would like to consider bikeways and walkways and this developer has been very considerate. If 6' walkways are necessary they should let this be known earlier in the stages.

Mr. Wells suggested we review the master plan, and eliminate the stub at the North. Master plan shows 50' right-of-way and does not show parking bays or street widths.

Mr. Smith believes it would be well to leave the easement there for the stub. Straighten Ambridge Road and provide easement retaining Bikeway (walkway) as is.

Mr. Jim Singer, Ambridge Road, stated that whether Ambridge Road is extended or not is an issue to be determined by the board. He thinks the people on VonDette and Mapleton are mis-guided if they think their traffic will stop with another access. He asked if a traffic analysis of the area was made, he feels it should have been.

Mr. Maxton made the motion to accept the Master Plan as stated. Seconded by Mr. Myers. Vote was unanimously passed.

Mr. Archdeacon showed a drawing for the area on which they would like preliminary approval. Thirty units on seventy acres. They are to be single family units with two exceptions and each of these are 3 attached units. Each of these attached units will have a two-car garage and a driveway to put two additional cars and each unit will own the lot in front and in back, just as the single family units. There are 24' streets with parking bays. If 28' streets are required they will eliminate the bays.

Mrs. Wells brought up the question of school busses.

Mr. Archdeacon said there has been some land purchased at the south end of the tract for a future school. (Children in this vicinity now attend Village South).

Mrs. Lake said we do not want another area where the streets go from one width to another, and doesn't feel the bays will be enough parking.

Mr. Winterhalter asked the area covered by this preliminary plan. Mr. Archdeacon clarified this on the drawing and also pointed out that the bays will provide parallel parking.

Mrs. Lake questioned the amount of Bays and availability to the houses they are designed to serve on the North cul-de-sac depicted.

Mr. Archdeacon is willing to add one on this cul-de-sac if deemed necessary. The area at the parking bays are 32' wide.

Mr. Wells stated that he goes along with the concept of short streets.

Mr. Myers asked if this could be policed by the association.

Mr. Tate stated that if this requires policing by anyone at all he is not in favor of it.

Mr. Maxton asked if we should have Ambridge 24' or 28' and asked for comment regarding this of the City Engineer.

Mr. Schab recommends 28'.

Mrs. Lake would like the proposed 24' with parking bays to include sidewalks to the houses.

Mr. Archdeacon pointed out that driveways are close by.

Mrs. Lake commented that one would still have to walk in the street to get from the car to the driveway.

Mr. Smith commented that sidewalks should be there for the children and not just for the people going from the cars to the houses. The walkways would

not suffice as the stream in the rear is the most attractive thing in the area for children.

Mr. Wells proposed that we approve Sec. 6 in concept but ask the developer to bring a revised plan regarding the sidewalks on Ambridge Rd. from parking bays to the units to be served.

Mr. Winterhalter recommended 6' walkways rather than 5'. He stated that the one section of walkway on the north side of the stream will be part of the proposed public bikeway system and it is requested that at least this portion be 6' wide.

Mr. Wells reviewed the proposals presented here, those being: 24' width, reconsider the parking, & reconsider the access from the parking bays to the nearest houses on this preliminary plan.

Mr. Myers suggested this should be flexible at this time as this is a novel approach.

Mr. Wells asked Mr. Archdeacon if he needed a vote from the board tonight.

Mr. Archdeacon said that he would certainly like to. He said if 6' walkways are required they will have to restudy their entire walkway system.

Mr. Wells stated that the board likes the concept and will take no action at this time to await a preliminary plan revised.

Mr. Archdeacon asked if the real 'hang-up' was the sidewalks from parking bays. Mr. Wells answered affirmative. Mr. Archdeacon proposed sidewalks from the parking bays to the nearest driveway. He also stated that they want a variance on the setback. The houses will be built closer to the street to allow the park plan. The preliminary plan shows the general area the houses will be located on and they do not want to have to get individual variances on setback.

Mr. Wells made the motion to accept preliminary Black Oak Section 1 subject to the condition of sidewalks and parking bays with 3' wide sidewalks at least to the nearest driveway, and accept the variation of setbacks and accept 24' pavement and 5' walkways with the portion which will be public-type bikeway to be 6' wide. Seconded by Mr. Myers. Motion was unanimously approved.

The developers will be back in two weeks, at the next meeting, with the preliminary plans revised.

#### Review Record Plan for Southpoint, Section 7 (Washington Twp.)

Mr. Winterhalter reviewed the plans and stated that the Twp. has only gone over lot sizes. Our major concern is with the sidewalks and street widths.

Mr. Schab asked if what we want is sidewalks on both sides. Plan presented shows no sidewalks.

Mr. Wells asked what has gone through regarding their being on one side.

Mr. Schab stated that if we approve this we should consider 28' back-to-back, which was OK'd by Twp.

Mr. Winterhalter stated that the <sup>local</sup> streets shown are 27' back-to-back. He wants Yankee Road to be widened, not just ~~bermed~~ as the developer plans.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Wells if he was recommending that we have sidewalks along Yankee and none in the section.

Mr. Wells stated that we want sidewalks along the right-of-way on Yankee and improvements of the right-of-way.

Mr. Val Lapsin, Judge Engineering, representing the developer, stated that the placement of the sidewalks tend to destroy the appearance of the neighborhood, and sited Penbrook Trail & McEwen as examples. He also stated that the homes are placed on large lots and the pedestrian traffic is minimal. They feel that sidewalks are not necessary and detract from the neighborhood. They are not in the other developments. He pointed out that neighborhoods in the adjacent areas do not have sidewalks. He feels that Planning Commission should not insist on sidewalks after a plan has been approved. If the sidewalks are wanted to lead into the park or school (if they lead somewhere), they could put them in later. Also pointed out that the berm was not proposed by the developer, it was required by the county engineer, he feels the previous comment unfair to the developer. This is the same as required elsewhere in the county. If there is any change needed they can be put in later by assessment. They feel that the sidewalk and road should remain the same as this was what was required by the county.

Mr. Wells stated that we are fighting with decisions that were made in the past. He feels we should have sidewalk on Yankee. Getting a plat at the nearly-completed stage of development is difficult.

It was mentioned that the school board recommends sidewalks.

Mr. Schab does not believe striping (as suggested by someone) is the answer because it is a hazard.

Mr. Myers stated that if we are going to live with yesterdays mistakes there is no sense in revising our ordinances - and we are revising them.

Mr. Wells suggested we waive sidewalk requirement on internal section and require them on east side of Yankee.

Mr. Maxton moved to approve Southpoint Section 7 subject to widening of Yankee to Centerville thoroughfare standards and sidewalks on both sides of all streets. Seconded by Mr. Myers. Vote was unanimous to approve.

V-74-3, freestanding sign variance for Goldman's Dept. Store.

Mr. Winterhalter contacted applicant and advised him of the fact that freestanding signs are not allowed in B-2 districts. A text change would be the only possible action, and Mr. Winterhalter does not recommend this.

Mr. Myers moved to deny the public hearing for this sign. Seconded by Mrs. Lake. Vote was unanimous to deny the hearing.

V-74-5 for accessory building setback (carport) variance requested by Zengle Builders for the southwest corner of Route 725 and Cedarleaf Drive.

Public Hearing was set for 7:30 May 28, 1974

V-74-4 for an extension of an accessory use requested by Mr. Don Williams

Public Hearing was set for 8:00 May 28, 1974.

Review Record Plan for Meadows Professional Center (Washington Twp.)

Mr. Winterhalter reviewed plan and recommended it be accepted with the exception that the widening of Garnet Rd. be required. Sidewalks were waived in the plat by the Twp.

Mrs. DeCamp stated that Garnet Drive was dedicated years ago and does not require widening.

Mrs. Hal DeCamp stated that the county advises Garnet Dr. did not need to be 60' right-of-way street.

Mrs. Lake made the motion to approve the record plan of Meadows Professional Center with the total width of 13 1/2' from centerline of the right-of-way of Garnet Dr. to the west. Seconded by Mr. Maxton. Approved unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 pm

Next meeting: April 30, 1974.

Approved as corrected.

