

*approved 4/15/70*

## CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

The Regular Meeting of the Centerville Planning Commission was held on March 31, 1970. In attendance were Harold Wells, John Butler, Willis Creamer, Nevin Elliott, Marion Loemker, Elmer Tate, Bruce Baker, City Manager - John Griffin and City Engineer - Frank Williams.

The Minutes of the March 11, 1970 Meeting were approved.

1. Dr. Edw. R. Thomas owner of a large (126 acres) farm along East Franklin Street asked the Planning Commission to discuss some alternatives for his property.
  - a. The proposed Master Plan shows his land to be used for mostly residential home building with a strip of multi-family adjacent to the industrial zoning to the east. Dr. Thomas does not agree with this plan. He proposed industrial zoning for light industry with a buffer of apartments to the west.
  - b. John Butler proposed extending the line from the current industrial park, southward and eastward to a point at the north east corner of the existing plat in Washington Township on the southern border of the Thomas land.
  - c. Dr. Thomas, speaking for Mrs. Magsig who owns five acres at the N.E. corner of the property, proposed commercial zoning for her land.
  - d. Dr. Thomas stated that the City could then buy some land in the N.W. section of his farm, along East Franklin Street, for a city building.
  - e. Mr. Baker questioned the constantly used principle of using only apartments for buffering. This was then discussed in detail by the Commission. Nevin Elliott proposed office buildings as good buffers. The Commission felt that a school site and a city building could be good buffers in this particular case.
2. Reconsideration of a request by Bill Knapp of Michigan, Inc. concerning the driveway exit on Far Hills Avenue.
  - a. John Griffin presented several alternatives following his discussion of the problem with a traffic engineer. He proposed the following possible alternatives.
    1. Close the entrance onto Route 48.
    2. Move the driveway as far north as possible. (about 500')
    3. Add an acceleration lane.
    4. Add a turn control island.
  - b. John Griffin further explained that the entrance was a very severe problem from a traffic viewpoint because of topography, sight distance of 600', speed of traffic and volume of traffic.
  - c. Willis Creamer pointed out that Loop Road was right now potentially very dangerous. Vision was far too poor because the hill has a flat crest making vision almost impossible.

- d. The Planning Commission was in agreement that Loop Road should not be opened without a light, however no suitable solution was found to stop its being opened.
  - e. It was decided that some pressure could perhaps be created to get the light installed when the land was further developed along Loop Road.
  - f. Elmer Tate moved that the entrance be located within 20-25 feet of the north property line, have only one curb cut, have a suitable divider indicating in or out, have a direction island which would turn the exit traffic north bound only and be designed in a suitable manner to the Planning Commission. John Butler seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
3. The Application of Senate Builders, Inc. for a Conditional Use for a Residential Development Plan was discussed.
- a. The lots have been reduced in size because of the open park area in adjacent Black Oak Estates. The Planning Commission felt that the request violated the spirit of the ordinance regarding land reduction due to parks in the quarter section.
  - b. Further the Planning Commission felt that variable lot sizes belonged in the Residential Development Plan, Section 20 of the Ordinance, whereas reduced lot sizes, was a part of Section 14 of the Ordinance. Hence, the applicant was requesting variable lot sizes and reduced lot sizes in one request which might be a conflict with the ordinance.
  - c. The effect of the request was really a rezoning if the density of the plat is considered.
  - d. The Planning Commission generally felt the plan showed little originality or reasonable layout or design.
  - e. Willis Creamer moved to reject the proposal from Senate Builders. Bruce Baker seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
4. Consideration of Request C-2-70 for a Curb Cut by Main Auto Parts and Glass Company was made.
- a. Mr. Robert Kilmer, contractor for the project, presented the request.
  - b. The request was for an additional curb cut to be used in conjunction with the existing curb cut.
  - c. Since the lot is only 100 feet wide the Planning Commission questioned the need for two curb cuts entering onto the property.
  - d. John Butler moved that the request be turned down. Elmer Tate seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0. The Planning Commission further recommended that the applicant should submit a plan showing a curb cut (one) not less than 27 feet or more than 50 feet.
5. Mr. Wells announced that nothing would be done concerning an Historic Preservation District unless Centerville Citizens and the Centerville Historical Society show much more interest in the legislation.

6. Discussion was held on part of a proposed change in Ordinance 15-61. The letter and proposed changes recommended by City Engineer - Frank Williams were compared with Article 43 of the Montgomery County Ordinance. The changes were relating to Parking Spaces, Day Care Centers and Churches. During the discussions Mr. Baker reminded the Planning Commission that in making detailed changes in the ordinance as the Planning Commission was proposing would be made considerably easier with Professional Assistance. This assistance recommended by the Planning Commission to Council in December 1969, was stalled at Council by lack of funds.

At this Meeting changes in Section 19, Figure seven, were discussed. Parking spaces and contingent uses were reviewed.

7. There being no further business the Meeting was adjourned.

Bruce H. Baker  
Secretary