

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session Meeting
Tuesday, December 15, 2020

TIME: 6:30 p.m.

PLACE: J. V. Stone Council Chambers

ATTENDANCE:

Present: Paul Clark, Kevin Von Handorf, Jim Durham (via phone), Bill Etson (via phone), Amy Korenyi-Both, Robert Muzechuk, and Donald Stewart. Also present: City Planner Mark Yandrick, Assistant City Planner Joey O'Brien, Municipal Attorney Scott Liberman, Development Director Michael Norton-Smith, and Assistant Clerk of Council Donna Fiori.

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

**City of Centerville
Variance Applications and Planning Commission's Role
Municipal Attorney, Scott Liberman**

Mr. Liberman made a presentation which detailed legal analysis, practical application, Ohio case law variance explanation, and planning commission's role. Mr. Liberman asserted Planning Commission's role is to review the evidence and decide. He highlighted the following:

- Variance application is a property owner's request to be relieved from complying with UDO
- Variance must be considered within City's seven (7) factors set forth in UDO
- Planning Commission's role is to be independent decision-maker and review application, materials, and testimony at hearing to reach a result
- Planning Commission's decision creates legal rights and responsibilities and creates a legal ground to appeal to City Council

Mr. Yandrick provided commission members a variance handout created to provide applicants. Changes to variance handout and times when UDO changes could be warranted were discussed. Commission members discussed and inquired about the appeals process; Mr. Liberman explained the process and that City Council is to apply the same standards of the UDO as Planning Commission.

Mr. Yandrick reviewed his memo regarding the variance process and five action items which included the following:

1. Benchmark Centerville's variances approval rate compared to other cities
2. Eliminate staff recommendation for variance cases
3. Educate Planning Commission on its quasi-judicial role with variances
4. Outline the process better for applicants
5. Evaluate the Unified Development Ordinance Process.

Mr. Yandrick addressed Planning Commission questions related to the memo.

Recess

At 7:18 p.m., the Commission recessed to move into the Regular Meeting.

Following the Regular Meeting, the Commission reconvened in Work Session at 7:26 p.m.

**Dogwood Commons, Cornerstone North (Phase IV)
Major Site Plan (P-2019-0024) and FDP (P-2016-0052) Amendment Proposal
Ross Sanford, Treplus Communities**

Mr. Yandrick introduced Mr. Ross Sanford of Treplus Communities. Mr. Sanford informed commission the Treplus Communities project (Dogwood Commons) is in danger of being cancelled due to challenges being presented because of COVID-19. The project had been approved with wood siding for the façade, but prices significantly increased due to manufacturing issues and increased raw material/wood costs due to the pandemic. Mr. Sanford stated they would like to propose an amendment to the FDP and Major Site Plan to allow the use of a vinyl product that looks like horizontal wood siding and board and batten siding. Mr. Sanford presented slides of the various elevations demonstrating the proposed vinyl. Mr. Sanford requested feedback from the commission.

Mr. Yandrick gave a presentation providing a brief review of the property and development plan indicating a change in the primary façade material would require an amendment to both the FDP and Major Site Plan and cannot be done at staff level. Mr. Yandrick pointed out the Phase 5 development was treated as a single-family development which has different architectural standards from the UDO than multi-family. Mr. Yandrick acknowledged this is a unique situation but needs to be balanced with the Cornerstone Development by seeking other options or alternatives that can achieve the desired results.

Mr. Durham inquired of Mr. Liberman how this process would need to be handled. Mr. Liberman concurred with Mr. Yandrick to remain consistent this could not be done at a staff level. Mr. Durham also confirmed with Mr. Liberman that the Planning Commission would be recommending or denying recommendation to City Council on the FDP amendment for which they make the final decision. Mr. Liberman confirmed this would be the case for an FDP, but the major site plan would be decided at the Planning Commission level.

Discussion occurred related to other material options, end units, the volume of area that would be replaced with vinyl, and joints.

Commission members concurred on a general aversion to vinyl and most members recognized based on the unique situation that the applicant should work with staff to make modifications for the least vinyl looking appearance. Mr. Sanford stated he would leave the vinyl samples for Mr. Etson to view at his convenience.

Mr. Clark adjourned the work session at 8:12 p.m.



Paul Clark, Chair