

REGULAR MEETING
CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
April 25, 1972

The Regular Meeting of the Centerville Planning Commission was held on April 25, 1972 at 7:30 P.M. Present were Chairman Harold Wells, Bruce Baker, Robert Ackerman, John Davis, Gary Maxton, City Manager James Smith and Consulting Engineer Karl Lewis.

The minutes of the April 11, 1972 meeting were approved unanimously.

C-72-3 A Public Hearing was held on the request for Conditional use of 87.8 acres owned by Paul Lapp along A-B Road near Wilmington Pike. Mr. Abromowitz of the Woolpert Company presented the proposal. It contained 5.5 acres of park, 12.3 acres of streets, 75.6 acres of lots. They are permitted 165 lots but are proposing 136 lots. Mr. Maxton again objected to the lack of depth on lots along A-B Road. He further felt the lots should back up to A-B Road and have entrances from the interior of the Lapp property. Mr. Wells felt that by increasing depth that front yard turn-arounds could be included giving more safe exits and entrances onto A-B Road.

Dr. H. Kelso, 2212 A-B Road was opposed because the step down from the large lots located to the west was too abrupt. Mr. James Schwindeman, Mr. Loring Duff, Mr. R.C. Woodall, Dr. Owen Hughes and Dr. Meng were all opposed for the same reasons. Further Mr. Duff requested consideration of the proposed uses of adjacent land so that the whole region could be tied in together. Dr. Meng stated that he would agree to match lot sizes and number of lots on his land which abuts the proposed cul-de-sac running south from A-B Road. Thus, if only one or two large lots abut the cul-de-sac on the Lapp property, he would only propose one or two large lots on his property. Thus, a more gentle transition could be made. Mr. Davis felt, unlike Mr. Maxton, that lots backing up to A-B Road would be undesirable. Mr. Baker felt the arrangement lacked imagination and was "un-Centerville-like" lacking in cul-de-sacs and perhaps designed to give the developer a minimum area of streets to be developed. Mr. Abromowitz stated they would restudy the parts of the proposal which were objected to.

V-72-3 A Public Hearing was held on a request for a business sign for Elder Realty, Co. on their property at 125 W. Franklin Street. Mr. Robert Powers and Mr. J. Paterbaugh objected to business signs in residential districts. In general, the Planning Commission felt that a small post-type sign approximately 12 x 18 inches located just back of the street right of way would be acceptable. A new drawing and design will be submitted prior to a decision. This decision would be a first test of the use of residential office zoning and sign requirements.

James Presbaugh.

Z-72-3 The request for rezoning by James L. Schwindeman was discussed. Mr. Wells explained that apparently wrong information was given to Mr. Schwindeman, stating that the seldom used S-1 and S-2 districts could be requested rather than the R-1 which was advised. Mr. Schwindeman was requested to submit a proposal for Centerville S-2 zoning (30,000 sq. ft. lots) and a residential development plan if his R-1 request was turned down. Mr. Maxton moved to deny the request. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. Mr. Schwindeman further agreed to try to work out a suitable plan with all neighbors.

Richley Property--A proposal by Mr. Roderick Richley to subdivide his property in the center of a tract of land along A-B Road was discussed. In general the Planning Commission felt that "flag-shaped" subdivisions were a problem and in this case the development would not abut a public street. The Planning Commission agreed to go to the area at their convenience in the next week to study the proposal "on site".

An application was received from Igleburger, Henderson and Nowak, Architects representing Steak & Ale Restaurants, Inc. They are proposing a restaurant along State Route 48 south of the Hinkle House. The major objections by the Planning Commission were the overhang on the front of the building, the lighted sign in front and the parking in front. Mr. Henderson stated they would restudy the plan. Karl Lewis would study the proposed drainage before the next meeting and be prepared to make recommendations. The request was tabled until further information was available.

PO-72-3 Discussion was held on an ordinance to amend the zoning ordinance regarding multi-family use which is allowed in some existing E.C. zoning. Harold Wells objected to the fact that the ordinance was supposedly in order and had been received by the City Attorney, yet did not contain his signature. He felt that this was bad practice. The ordinance was set for Public Hearing on May 30, 1972 at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. Abromowitz of the Woolpert Company presented a preliminary plan for part of Revere Village. The plan was for single family housing. One strip of land along Spring Valley was not part of the proposal. The Planning Commission objected to the piecemeal submission of the area even though the small strip was stated to be owned by a subsidiary of the company owning the Revere Village property. The Planning Commission felt that no provision for widening Spring Valley by the subsidiary was available and that the subsidiary might claim at a later date that they could not widen Spring Valley due to the small size of their strip of land. The Planning Commission felt that the size of the Revere Village development could be taken into consideration when Spring Valley considerations were discussed. The developers will restudy the situation. Mr. Wells read proposals from the

Fire Department. They dealt mostly with street widths and street names. The Planning Commission saw no problems in general with the layout.

A request was received from a Mr. MacArthur for a variance to build a new garage along Von Dette Circle. The existing garage is now remodeled into part of the house. More complete drawings were requested by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Baker requested that the Planning Commission set policy on when a request to the Planning Commission is considered accepted for study. This is because of the 60 day limit. He felt that submission to the City Manager on a date not coinciding with a meeting of the Commission was unacceptable and that a proposal should only be considered "accepted" when received at a meeting of the commission and so stated in the official minutes of the Planning Commission.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.