

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

June 25, 1974 7:30 p.m.

Those Present: Messrs Gillingham, McCrabb, Maxton, Baker, Myers, Tate and Mrs. Lake. Also Present: R. Winterhalter, City Planner and K. Schab, City Engineer.

The Minutes of the June 11, 1974 meeting were corrected and approved.
Moved by Mr. Myers, Seconded by Mr. McCrabb.

Communications & Reports

Mr. Gillingham gave a status report on the meeting held regarding the planning of the 35 acres purchased by the City of Centerville. (Copy available)

Mr. Winterhalter presented the thoroughfare plan to the P.C. members. He also mentioned the revised code regarding the recording of purchases of less than five acres. This will be on the agenda at next months meeting.

Mr. Winterhalter suggested an appointment be set up regarding the possible review of the subdivision regulation with the Dayton Homebuilders Association. Mr. Maxton feels that this should be handled at a regular meeting time, however if more time is necessary perhaps a workshop meeting could be set up. A member of the Dayton Homebuilders Assoc. was in attendance and it was agreed to have an open workshop on Tuesday, July 16, 1974 to meet with the association. This will be the subject from 7:30 - 8:30.

Public Hearings - Z-74-7 (Rezoning map - proposed changes)

Mr. Maxton announced the procedure for public hearings and explained that action may or may not be taken and if action is taken and anyone does not agree, they can appeal to Council. He explained the procedure for appeals.

Mr. Winterhalter presented a map showing the proposed zoning changes and explained each. (Copy available) He explained that there are two ways zoning changes are proposed. 1) initiation by property owners, lessee, etc. and 2) initiation by the City. This proposed zoning change was initiated by the City. Two years ago a revised zoning ordinance text change was proposed and this goes hand-in-hand to reflect changes in conditions.

P.C. Mtg.
June 25, 1974

-2-

Mrs. Lake asked for an explanation regarding the zoning terminology. Mr. Winterhalter said that the descriptions used are for the existing text.

Those in favor - Numbers 1 thru 7 - None.

Proposed changes Nos. 1 thru 7 - None.

No. 8 -

Mr. Rodney Miller, 320 S. Village Drive stated that his concern is that, if there is a change, what types of safe guards will there be for adjacent property owners as well as himself. He is in favor of the change to residential but feels it should be tied down regarding buffer strip and drainage. If this change is approved, he would like to see these things taken into consideration.

Nos. 9 thru 12 - None.

No. 13 -

Mr. Dale Schaffer, 50 Bristol Dr. is in favor of having residential in this area behind his house. This change also has the unanimous approval of the Civic Association of Concept West.

Nos. 14 and 15 - None.

Those opposed -

No. 1 -

Mr. Richard Packard, Attorney, representing property owners stated that this has been described as a 2 acre tract and it is 6 acres. He said that the B-2 has been intended to be B-2 since 1971. Land here has not been developed and cannot be until I-675 is put in. The zoning has already been made without reference to Whipp road, and the Highway department has changed their plans several times. They feel the proposal is to delete approximately 6 acres and the resulting access to the area would be approximately 100 feet. This 100' access would be the only one. They feel that this will be unmanageable from a traffic point of view. This land has not been developed and will not be developed at this time as they are awaiting I-675. They are unaware of changing conditions which would necessitate zoning changes.

Mr. Maxton asked if Feed Wire has been extended. Mr. Bob Archdeacon, ~~Ralph Woolpert Co.,~~ said that they have worked with the City and the developers to get the connection between Feed Wire and Whipp during the establishment of the rezoning of this area and the surrounding areas. He said there was a proposal after this rezoning change, by TCC to extend Whipp down to Feed Wire. When it was proposed it was not viewed favorably by the City of Centerville. Mr. Schab said that the owner on the north ~~did not want Feed Wire to be extended through his property.~~ Mr. Archdeacon said that ~~it is his intent~~ through the development.

Mr. Baker said that the access being limited is the problem. Mr. Myers asked what the use of the access would be. Answer: (Archdeacon) to the B-2. Mr. Tate asked what they will do if the change is not made. Mr. Archdeacon answered that they would have access off Whipp. With the change they would have only one access and this is not desirable. The utilities are not available in this area until the Sugar Creek plant is open.

Nos. 2 & 3 -

Mr. Paul Rodenbeck, representing the R & R Development Co. in Cincinnati said he is a Planner and asked if Clyo Road is still part of the Master Plan, and if there is a change in the businesses to the north. Mr. Winterhalter said that remains the same. We want to eliminate the ~~speculative zoning~~. Mr. Rodenbeck stated that this property is at what they feel is a proper distance from the ~~planned interchange~~. South of the interchange and Clyo Road should be business, this was planned and they feel their planning was well substantiated at that time and remains the same. This area should stay business. He objects to the change.

Mr. Maxton stated that whether we consider these changes for the good or not for the good of the City, this zoning was made prior to the zoning of some of the other areas and it is the intention of the Planner to look at the land that has not been developed and look at our overall plan realizing that when some of this zoning was made we possibly did not have some of the zones (i. e. Residential, Business or O-S) and this is why we are looking at this tonight. It is not that we did not feel that the previous zoning was wrong, we just have to tie it all into the overall plan.

It was stated that the people who are principals in the area to be served by the Sugar Creek plant would have followed through with their plans if the utilities had been available.

P. C. Mtg.
June 25, 1974

-4-

No. 4 -

Mr. Joe Druenburg, Attorney for Alfred Albaugh, owner of the property in question for 22 years: Business zoning was initiated approximately ten years ago, Mr. Druenburg said. He said this intersection is an appropriate business corner, and the need and appropriateness is substantiated by the business that is there. He agrees that we must consider changes. Mr. Albaugh has a continuing interest in the development of this property, the only reason this has not been developed is that there are no utilities available. He said we should not penalize property owner because he could not have developed this, we should consider the situation of the owners. The purchase of this property was as a land investment by Mr. Albaugh. His position in staying there has been to develop it as business. Mr. Druenburg said that Mr. Albaugh had talked with the present City Planner one to one and a half years ago and was told that his whole 26 acres might be appropriate for business. Mr. Druenburg said there is an obligation by the City to the property owners.

No. 5 - None.

No. 6 & 7 -

Mr. Ralph Woodley, 1453 Carriage Trace referred to the fact that his 'mini-mall' has been approved for use and is on the agenda tonight. He said that they do have activity, utilities, a going concern and are representing to their (condominium) buyers that there will be a 'mini-mall' in this location. They feel that there is a lack of need for office service in this location and said that some offices in the area do not now have tenants. He said this should be allowed to continue as accepted. They feel that as their development progresses and they approach Bigger Road, a lot of the area will be taken by I-675. He said that they would like to suggest that until I-675 is settled this rezoning action be deferred.

Mr. McCrabb asked what will happen to the EC in the new text. Mr. Winterhalter said that it would be eliminated. If the zoning stays EC it will be given a different classification on the revised text and map and will be changed to whatever is the closest to its current use, by being

Mr. McCrabb asked if the EC change has been approved. Answer: (Mr. Winterhalter)
Yes.

No. 8 -

Mr. Maurice Leen, Attorney, representing J. S. Davis Co., owner of property north of Loop and to the south to the proposed I-675. He said this had been rezoned in 1967. As a result of past hearings, Mr. Leen said, certain commitments were made both by the City and by the property owners, a 100' buffer was agreed upon between the residences and business, and at that time it apparently was felt that this was adequate. Mr. Leen feels that the P. C. or Council must have reasonable grounds for a change. He doesn't see a change in the area that would indicate a change of zoning. There would be access for the residences and there would also be access to the businesses. He said they have been advised by engineers that access from Loop^{Rd.} is possible. They have developed along Loop Road, he said, and have not developed the lower section but this is primarily due to the owners desire to cause the least disruption to the residents of the tract. He said they are currently considering some options but have nothing definite. He said J. S. Davis has carried out their conditions and there has been no change and any rezoning would be unreasonable and in their opinion illegal and apparently all these documents are on file regarding these past agreements.

Mr. Gillingham asked Mr. Leen if he said it was conditional to the zoning that 100' buffer strip be provided. Answer: yes, where it abuts residences, not the church or other non-resident property.

Nos. 9 & 10 -

Mr. David Tipton, 9768 Arie Adne Trail, representing M. Lagadrost, who owns property in the center of this area, spoke. He said the B-2 was rezoned recently by the City. He said the EC permits offices and other uses. He is concerned with how much office would be permitted. They would like business zoning rather than O-S.

Mr. David Anderson, 6114-d Fireside Dr. is a developer. He said the developments that take place take approximately 6-10 years before they materialize. He sited several developments that took 6-8 years, saying that money, zoning, utilities, etc. are all factors. He said as a builder, he also knows what is involved to occupy the buildings. He said the P. C. is dealing with a legal question and one of the hallmarks of the legal profession is consistency and that is so people can go out and rely on its consistency. He asked how anything can be planned if changes are being made every two-three years. He said that when this land was originally rezoned an agreement was signed by the builder, with the City of Centerville that they would build and they would have EC zoning. He said they are currently working on development plans which will take well over 5 years to complete, after construction has started.

Mr. Anderson said they had showed office as well as commercial - not just office. They wanted to be allowed all the uses permitted in E-C. He further stated that a large residential project does need other types of development to support it. He said churches, banks, Doctors are needed as well as offices. He questions whether the growth pattern in this area would warrant this much O-S. He added that the area is approximately 27 acres, not 7.5 acres.

Mr. Maxton asked Mr. Winterhalter what the possible uses are in O-S zoning. Answer: some of the many uses are banks, institutions, hospitals, nursing homes, veterinarians, radio-TV, drugs, some retail such as gift shops (a conditional use). This is from 79-73 passed November 1973 and is a most extensive office-type district.

Mr. Maxton asked about the 7.5 acres versus 27 acres. Mr. Winterhalter said that this proposal was in application form only and it is possible an error was made. He assured Mr. Maxton that whatever the correct acreage is, will be presented to Council per the documents.

No. 11

No. 11 -

Mr. William Rogers, Attorney for the Black Oak Development Company mentioned the tract by the Weller Farm on Clyo and said that in their usual effort to cooperate with the City they worked out a satisfactory arrangement where they 'voluntarily' restricted their residence area to doubles and awaited the B-2 to B-1 - he said the deed of record contains the B-1 covenants (until 1981). He said it is 2.75 acres rather than 2.2 acres. He said there cannot be anything other than B-1 there based on deed requirements of the City of Centerville. He said that the Planner's standards for his actions do not apply, that there has been no change in conditions - Black Oak is a large development and this area should be best for B-1 - this is a plan that encompasses the entire area. Mr. Rogers claims that ~~he~~ doesn't know where (the Planner) wants the business as he tries to pull it away from one corner and put it to ^{another} corner. "We are doing quite well, he said, on our marketing problems, ~~without the Planner's help~~. When we make a deal we try to live up to it and we want the City to live up to it. We don't want this to be anything other than B-1.

Mr. Baker said that in order to expedite this (earlier) the P. C. did go to B-2. He asked Mr. Rogers if he would object to B-1. Answer: No.

Mr. Myers said that sarcasm has no place in a business meeting and he would not like to hear any further sarcasm. Mr. Maxton concurred.

No. 12 - None

No. 13 -

Mr. Robert Corwin, Attorney representing Carl J. Linksweller, said that the R-2 classification is pretty high in view of the development that has already occurred. 1) The geology of the property is difficult, the stone is close to the surface, etc. and residential would be difficult to develop. He said there is a more intensified traffic pattern and that this could be multiple families or business. The R-2 is too high a use to fit this property in view of the developments that have already occurred. He would like this to be E.C. or O-S so that his client could develop this in this manner, he owns approx. 4.6 acres.

Mr. Bob Archdeacon spoke on behalf of Dr. Zimmerman, a property owner in this area. He said that in 1961 the current zoning ordinance was adopted and this was part of the E.C. use. The reasoning at that time was to provide a transition from the residential to the business at '48' and Spring Valley. In 1969, he said, they filed with the BZA an extension which coincides with the extension of Virginia Ave. This was granted and is the current zoning. This is very rocky below approx. 1'. Since 1969 there has been nothing to lessen the desirability of E.C. zoning in this area. We see no reason, he said, for the change from E.C. to Residential. He said they show 25.2 acres to be considered in this section, of which 20 acres belong to Mr. Zimmerman. He requests that the P.C. deny this request. Mr. Zimmerman purchased this as E.C. and if it goes to residential he stands to suffer a financial loss.

Mr. Maxton read a portion of a letter received from the property owner regarding the Chevy Chase development being a deterrent rather than an attraction for residential.

Nos. 14 & 15 - None.

Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Gillingham asked if a vote would be taken tonight. Mr. Maxton said that he would like to defer the voting to enable the members to have time to review the individual proposals.

Mr. McCrabb asked who originates rezoning requests. Mr. Maxton said that some are requested by Council, some staff. Mr. Winterhalter said that the only bodies who would be able to do this would be P.C. or Council. Whatever P.C. finds would be then requested by them.

Mr. McCrabb asked if this Z-74-7 would be voted as a single item. Mr. Maxton said this could be voted on in total, changed, added to, portions deleted or whatever is desired. The P.C. has this prerogative. Mr. Baker recommended that the P.C. vote the entire proposal down as in no

recommended that the P. C. vote the entire proposal down as in no single case do we have adequate information to determine these changes and in many cases the acreage is incorrect.

Mr. Myers said that he doesn't feel the P. C. is ready to vote but does not feel it should be voted down. He would like the opportunity to visit the individual sites to get a better 'feel' for it. He feels that the elimination of E. C. will probably be an improvement. Any changes made by the P. C., he said, are done for the good of the City and we are all 'the City'.

Mrs. Lake said that she was not prepared to vote. She wants more information and precise acreage and she has difficulty in looking at this along with the text changes. She would like area maps of the individual areas.

Mr. Tate said that he has taken part in some of the areas as mentioned. Many of these commitments were forced by the City and we should live up to our commitments. He feels there should be a lot more study. He feels the citizens and property owners should make themselves familiar with just what is permitted in the O-S zoning.

Mr. Maxton said that this can be discussed at a work session, at the next meeting, or at the last meeting in July. Mr. Tate proposed the work session.

Mr. Packard (opposed to #1) said that they would like to have the opportunity to make another presentation based on the results of the work session.

Mr. Anderson (opposed to #9-10) said that in the best interests of the City, perhaps those concerned should attend the work session along with the P. C. members.

Mr. Maxton stated that all work sessions are open to the public.

Mr. McCrabb felt an apology was due the citizens for this having been brought to the public at this time. Mr. McCrabb moved to have a work session to discuss the proposed zoning changes at the July 16 meeting. 7:30-8:30 will be for the session with the Dayton Homebuilders Association (as previously set) and 8:30-9:30 will be the time allotted for these proposed changes. Seconded by Mr. Maxton. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Maxton said that these changes were initiated by the City, which by right and design they are entitled to do. We do not feel that these will all be to everyone's liking. He feels that some changes are needed and that these proposed changes are a starting point and this is why we had this public hearing tonight.

New Business set for 8:00 July

Public Hearing set for 8:00 July 30, 1974 on 27" variance for garage expansion,
V-74-6, by Mr. & Mrs. Stubblefield.

Record Plan review - Thomas Paine Settlement

Mr. Bob Archdeacon presented a drawing of the plans, and briefly reviewed same.

Mr. Schab stated that the parking is the same as proposed in the first section with parking spaces off the street. The walkway has been widened. Some bonding, etc., will have to be worked out when it is presented to Council. Mr. Schab recommended that this record plan be approved as shown.

Mr. Myers moved to accept the record plan for the Thomas Paine Settlement, #2. Seconded by Mr. Gillingham. Unanimously approved.

Mrs. Lake asked why the narrower streets were accepted. Mr. Schab answered that it was because the 'Bays' and Courts will provide the parking, not the streets.

Record Plan review - Walnut Walk (formerly called Black Oak Estates Six), Section I.

Mr. Archdeacon reviewed the plan, showing the grading, parking bays, bike-way, other proposed walkways in the area. Lots 28-29-30 will be 'open lots', Homeowners Assoc. will be responsible for the maintenance of same.

Mr. Schab was asked about the durability of the walkways. He stated that they were 5' walkways, asphalt with gravel base and should last as long as black top roads - approx. 10 - 12 years.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that a hauling road was to be provided for construction - they have established an alignment and a grade for Ambridge Road and propose a gravel base for construction traffic.

Mr. Myers asked if there wasn't an agreement to provide a walkway from each of the parking bays to the driveways. Mr. Archdeacon said there was, but that this map was not large enough to show this. The detail drawings show that these walkways will be extended to the nearest entrance walk or driveway.

Mrs. Lake asked about parking on Ambridge for lots 7-8-9. Mr. Archdeacon stated that the parking bays are 'party parking' and there are two across the street from lots 7-8-9. There is also parking for two cars in each driveway and double garages for parking.

Mr. McCrabb asked about storm sewers. Mr. Archdeacon said that there will be catch basins and ^{will be} piped to the storm sewer.

Mr. McCrabb asked if there will be curbs. Mr. Schab answered yes. Mr. McCrabb asked if the sidewalk would be concrete. Mr. Schab answered that it would be 3'4" concrete.

Mr. Maxton asked if the bikeway would be maintained by the Homeowners Assoc. Mr. Archdeacon answered that it would be maintained by the association outside of the park and the bikeway within the park will be maintained by the park board.

Mr. McCrabb asked if the parking bays would be dedicated. Answer: (Archdeacon) yes. Mr. McCrabb asked about a 50' right-of-way and asked about the maintenance of the dedicated portions in front of each property. Mr. Schab said that most people want to maintain this and that this would only amount to approx. 2' more than the normal. Of course, if the property owners did not maintain this, it would be the responsibility of the City. The Homeowners Association will only maintain the green open spaces as stated previously.

Mr. Myers asked for clarification of the meaning of the numbers in the building spaces on the drawing. Mr. Archdeacon answered that these are the approximate ground elevation of the proposed house.

Mrs. Lake asked about the Fire Department turn-around radius on the cul-de-sacs. Mr. Archdeacon explained that the proposed distance was layed out in a parking lot and the largest fire truck was used to determine if it was wide enough to turn around. The original size was not sufficient, it was widened and these are the dimensions that are shown on this drawing.

Mrs. Lake suggested a standard size for cul-de-sacs be established. Mr. Schab said that would mean a 60 foot right-of-way. Mr. Archdeacon said that busses and fire trucks are the only ones concerned with the turn-around. Cars can turn around in the normal 38'. Busses do not go down the cul-de-sacs and fire trucks go rarely and are not concerned with this. They have the right-of-way and in an emergency could go over lawns or in driveways. Mr. Winterhalter suggested that we could see if there is a need for a change. Sometimes it is desirable to go to 40-41' and sometimes the fire department is satisfied with 38'. It depends on the radius. Mr. Archdeacon said that we should not necessarily standardize, then each cul-de-sac would look the same. Mrs. Lake felt that standardized cul-de-sac sizes might be desirable to the developers, but if it is not, and they prefer the flexibility, it is alright to consider each case as it comes up.

P. C. Mtg.
June 25, 1974

-11-

Mr. McCrabb asked Mr. Archdeacon to trace on the map where the storm sewer is. Mr. Archdeacon showed the ravine at the North (this will be piped under the roadway). The next ravine is also piped. The cul-de-sac has a catch basin and it should be a double catch basin. Mr. McCrabb asked what type of drainage they anticipate. Mr. Schab said this would be 18" and 24" tiles and should take care of all of it.

Mr. Winterhalter said that this does not need to be considered at this time, but mentioned that this plat comes under the new tree regulations. The tree procedure will have to be established - at what point are the trees to be brought in. Will this be on a lot-by-lot, plat-by-plat basis or will the entire plat be done at one time.

Mr. Archdeacon said that this was originally submitted as Black Oak Estates Six, Section I, and they would like it to become officially Walnut Walk, Section I. He stated that the open spaces are for the use of the residents of the 92 acres.

Mr. McCrabb made the motion to approve the record plan with the change to Walnut Walk with the contingency that it must conform to the tree ordinance. Seconded by Mr. Maxton. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Archdeacon stated that he understood the condition in the motion, but that they are not sure just how they can comply with the tree ordinance and he wishes to so state. Also, in light of recent publicity, the park maintenance is a concern of the developer and he would like to see that it will be properly maintained. (Reference was made to a recent newspaper article regarding the maintenance of the Elizabeth Hoy park.)

Mr. Maxton asked if the Hoy park was not intended to be a nature park. Mr. Schab said that a gentleman from Aullwood Farm suggested that this should be part nature park - cat tails, creek, etc., lends itself well to this. Part of the park is playground and has swings, etc. Unfortunately the nature area is adjacent to property owners and they objected to it.
the nature area.

Mrs. Lake asked if some of the park in Walnut Walk would be nature area. Answer: yes. There are quite a few trees and considerable low land area. We just want to make sure, he said, that the City will maintain this area.

Mr. Maxton said that the P. C. would do all possible to see that the parks are maintained but this is the responsibility of the Park Department.

Mr. Gillingham asked that this be defined as to the Washington Twp. Park or the City parks. Mr. Winterhalter said this would fall under the City parks.

Final Development Plan - Ole Spanish Village

Mr. Winterhalter showed the plan and briefly reviewed it on the map. He recommended that this be approved. Mr. Schab made several comments: Dedication of Fireside Drive had to be done and the exit is going on a public street. Drainage was a question and it has been agreed to put a new tile in and have half of the drainage diverted to Rt. '48'.

Mr. Gillingham stated that with regard to the drainage, he feels they are doing the best that can be done under the circumstances. The City must sometime face up to the fact that the drainage has been overloaded, it was installed years ago and is no longer adequate, this is a City-wide problem. It is past time that Centerville have a better drainage system, however this should not be a deterrent in this case. Mr. Gillingham asked what ordinance Centerville has to keep the signs from totally detracting from the architecture.

Mr. Gillingham asked what ordinance Centerville has to keep the signs from totally detracting from the architecture. Mr. Winterhalter said that the sign size is determined by the building frontage. This property has a lot of building frontage, due to the fact that it is on a corner. Mr. Gillingham mentioned his concern with the architecture of the signs and Mr. Winterhalter stated that we have no control over this. He read from the design standard ordinance, Section 32, Pp. C. He said that each sign will require a sign permit, and if the Building Inspector (who is conscious of good architecture) feels it is undesirable he could bring it to the attention of the P. C.

Mr. Baker asked if the P. C. could review the architecture. Mr. Winterhalter said to review the architecture of all signs would be quite time-consuming, the P. C. can review the architecture of the buildings. Signs are to conform to the building but beyond that there is no ordinance.

Mr. McCrabb asked why the plans show a chain link fence at the top of a split rail fence. Mr. John Wyland, Developer, said the reason is because the adjacent property owners were concerned about paper and debris blowing onto their property. This chain link fence is an agreement with them. The other property owners view shrubbery and split rail fence. The chain link is on the developers side.

Mrs. Lake commented on the minimum width access and said that this can be a detriment to shopping in a given shopping area.

Mr. McCrabb made the motion to approve the final development plan for Ole Spanish Village. Seconded by Mr. Tate. Approved unanimously.

Final Development Plan review - Carriage Trace Trading Center

Mr. Archdeacon briefly reviewed the plans, stating that this is basically what had been presented before. The mounding is in the front. He pointed out the green areas and the court with a reflecting pond in the center.

Mr. Archdeacon then showed a drawing of the sign, which will be the same basic style as the one at the Carriage Trace (condominium) entrance. They are requesting approval so they can go to Council with a complete package.

Mr. Maxton asked for Mr. Winterhalter's comments. He said that the Fire Department had recommended that three spaces deep in the parking area surrounding the building be eliminated to allow a fire lane. Mr. Winterhalter feels that two would be adequate to eliminate, as this would still provide adequate parking compared to the buildings and too much traffic near the buildings would be undesirable. He said that ^{setback} two variations are required for the site, 12' for the building and the 17' for the sign.

Mr. Archdeacon said that the mounds were made to screen the area and the sign had to be placed in front of them to be seen, or the mounds would have to be re-positioned. Mr. Myers said perhaps they could make the mounds half as long and put the sign in back. Mr. Maxton did not agree with this. If we are going to allow the topography to vary the sign our ordinance would be ineffective, anyone could build a mound

Reference was made to the signs at the condominiums and Mr. Winterhalter thought those were temporary signs, he will look into that.

Mr. Archdeacon pointed out that the sign being proposed was not an excessive sign in itself, the planter surrounding it is not actually a part of the sign. The developer said the sign would actually require a 7' variance, not a 17'.

The possibility of moving the sign caused Mr. Winterhalter to comment that a traffic hazard can be created if this is too close to the right-of-way.

Mrs. Lake moved to table this until the July 9th meeting. This will allow time for staff to furnish information regarding whether or not the first two signs were permanent or temporary at the entrance to Carriage Trace Blvd., and a revised landscape plan regarding height and caliber of trees. Mr. Maxton suggested that perhaps the trees should be described by diameter rather than height. Mr. McCrabb agreed, stating that he is concerned with too-small trees being planted. Mr. McCrabb seconded the motion to table this plan. Approved unanimously.

P. C. Mtg.
June 25, 1974

-14-

Site Plan - Centerville Station Shopping Center

Mr. Ferguson requested that this be tabled

Fire Station Site - Recording of lot

Mr. Wilson, Springmont Co. mentioned that the Twp. was unable to record their purchase of a fire station lot due to the aforementioned ruling not to record purchases of less than five acres. He said the initial approach to purchase of this land came in 1973. They (the seller) and the purchasers were unaware of this ruling until the Twp. went to record the purchase, and the purchaser would like to get it recorded. (it is assumed they need a title to apply for federal financing.)

Mr. Maxton said that we are not trying to be difficult, but we cannot accept items such as this at the last minute. This will be on the agenda for the July 9 meeting.

Items set for public hearing for July 30, 1974 meeting:

Centerville liquor license repeal, 8:30 P.M.
Swimming pool set back variance, Mr. Humphries, 9:00 P.M.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Next meeting to be held July 9, 1974.

A special work session to be held July 16, 1974.

