

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Special Meeting - March 11, 1975

7:30 p. m.

Those present: Messrs Tate, Maxton, McCrabb & Gillingham and Mrs. Lake.

Absent: Messr. Baker

Also Present: John Levermann, Administrative Assistant; William Linklater, Assistant City Engineer.

Approval of January 28, 1975 Minutes deferred.

The Minutes of the February 25, 1975 meeting were approved.

Communications

There were no new communications received.

Mrs. Lake made reference to the communication from Church of Latter Day Saints and Mr. Maxton's comment regarding area information along with plans. Mrs. Lake said that she thought this had been established with Mr. Winterhalter that area maps were to be a requirement. Mr. Maxton confirmed that this is in our subdivision requirements. Mrs. Lake wants to emphasize that P.C. would appreciate receiving this information.

New Business

1. Application for Sign Variance by the Franchise Realty Interstate Corporation (McDonald's).
-

Mr. Levermann reviewed the application. According to the size of the building, the maximum sign size should be 66 sq. ft. This request is for 96 sq. ft. for a freestanding sign with no other identification signs. The applicant, at the last meeting, was unaware of the existence of a McDonald colonial style sign, and he has provided a drawing of this sign for P.C.'s information.

Mr. Gary Smith, representing the applicant, said that this sign is the same size except that it has the addition of the colonial border. The identification area is the same. It was established that this would increase the variance. There was a discussion as to whether the total sign is considered or whether the identification area only is considered. Mr. Maxton said that the total sign is considered when determining the square footage of the sign.

Mr. McCrabb asked the material of the trim and was told by Mr. Smith that he believes it to be plastic, non-maintainable.

Mr. Maxton said he would rather go along with the original sign. He does not think the trim will add that much and to keep the sign down, he prefers the original sign. Mr. Gillingham disagreed, saying that people don't generally consider McDonald's as being colonial and it would be nice to have a better looking building. He feels the colonial sign would add to the appearance of the overall lot.

- * Mr. Gillingham made the motion to approve the sign as presented with the white colonial trim (McDonald's 72-53 Colonial). This sign is approved with the stipulation that no other identification sign will be erected for this building. Seconded by Mr. McCrabb.

Mrs. Lake said she would like the size of the sign checked. She said she is agreeable to a certain amount of negotiation but does not want to end up with a billboard.

Mr. McCrabb asked which part of the building is the front. Mr. Smith said that the front faces '48. Mr. McCrabb asked if that or the wall with the door is the front of the building. Mr. Smith said they consider the front facing '48 - it all is a matter of interpretation, he said - they have chosen the shortest wall as the front.

Mr. Gillingham believed the McDonald sign to be smaller than the one (previously) approved for Cambridge Inn. A slide of the Cambridge Inn sign was shown for comparison. (The size of the McDonald building was established as 44' wide x 78.8' long.) After some discussion it was stated that the total area of the Cambridge Inn sign is 84 sq. ft.; 11.5' to the outside of the sign without including the 'lamps'; 47.5 sq. ft. per side. McDonald's proposed sign is 82.4 sq. ft.

- * Mr. Gillingham's motion approved 4-1, Mr. Maxton being the one negative vote.

Mr. Smith said he would provide a copy of the sign drawing.

2. Review of Site Plan for the Church of the Latter Day Saints

Mr. Levermann reviewed the request for preliminary site plan, saying it was located on East Whipp, just west of the Penn Central Railroad. He said that the TCC has been contacted regarding the proposed light rail system and the proposed site plan of this church and the TCC sees no conflict or problems from that viewpoint.

Mr. Linklater said there are several ordinance problems:

- 1- The parking is set back from a residential area less than 15' and the requirement is 25'.
- 2- Any property abutting residential area (and used for this purpose) requires screening 6' x 6', so screening would have to be added to conform.
- 3- The present 60' right-of-way on E. Whipp will be changed with our thoroughfare plan and this would require moving the sidewalk.
- 4- The building location would then have to be changed to meet requirements.

Mr. Maxton said that with so many problems and no representative here, there is nothing that can be done but make it subject to (certain) changes or reject it in total. Mr. Levermann said he thinks the applicant is looking for direction from Planning Commission. Mr. Tate suggested

marking up the plan or providing the applicant with a copy of the zoning ordinance.

Mrs. Lake said she would like Planning Commission to see the Council minutes regarding this subject. She said this has gone on for years. She said in essence the road is sub-standard at this time and will ultimately be widened.

Mr. McCrabb said that unless the city can say precisely what they want, they should not make this requirement. Mrs. Lake said that we do not know at what point in time Whipp Road will be widened and we could have developed dangerous situations. We could end up with three different road widths, she said.

Mr. McCrabb asked if the storm sewer is in. Mr. Linklater said there is none in front of this property, but it is in on down the street. Mr. Schab has informed the church of certain catch basins that should be installed, Mr. Linklater said.

Mr. Maxton asked Mr. Levermann to bring Planning Commission up to date on the background of this application - i.e. grade, setback, width, etc., of Whipp Road, what time limit are they talking about. Mr. Levermann said he suspects Whipp Road will be five lanes but this has not been determined as yet, this would be approximately two years away. Mr. Linklater said it will be an 86' right-of-way, 43' from centerline here and the proposed site plan shows the north side of the sidewalk located where the right of way line would be.

Mr. Maxton said the parking could probably be eliminated on one side, they are essentially 10' short; the sidewalk would have to be moved; screening would have to be all around, perhaps this could be tabled (we are not on a time schedule for preliminary plan), and we could review what has gone on at Council workshop on this. Mr. Gillingham would like to provide the applicant with a list of what has to be done.

- * Mr. Tate moved to reject the site plan for the Church of the Latter Day Saints as presented as it does not meet the zoning requirements. Seconded by Mr. Gillingham. Vote was unanimous to reject the plan.

Mr. Levermann said he would try to get the background desired. P. C. would like to know what Council discussed and why it was discussed by Council prior to the plan having been sent to Planning Commission.

Mr. McCrabb left his seat on the Planning Commission.

3. Approval of Final Plat Plan for Candlewyck South Subdivision

Mr. Levermann said there are 10 lots with S-2 zoning requirement and they are located south of Alex-Bell Road. They have 30,000 min. footage per lot and there is a 480' cul-de-sac (Mapleton Drive). Sidewalks are proposed everywhere except the south side of Mapleton Drive. Mr. Linklater said this plan is acceptable insofar as engineering is concerned, except for the sidewalk requirement.

Mr. Maxton asked if there were sidewalks on the adjacent property and Mr. McCrabb, representing Mid-American Building Corp., said there aren't any - if and when the Duff property is platted, there could be sidewalks there. There are no changes on this plan from the preliminary plan.

Mr. Maxton said that Planning Commission should get pertinent information to identify the property when they get the preliminary plan. When P. C. gets the record plan there should be a slide on the preliminary plan. Mrs. Lake asked for reference to minutes of the meeting when the preliminary plan was presented at the time of the record plan application.

Mr. Tate asked if VonDette is actually as it is shown on the plan. Mr. McCrabb said it is shown that way because it is dedicated but it doesn't actually go around. He added that the sewer and water is in.

Mr. Gillingham asked about the bond. Mr. Maxton said this would be set by Council.

- * Mr. Gillingham made the motion to approve the Final Plat Plan for Candlewyck South Subdivision as submitted with the waiver of the sidewalk on the south side of Mapleton Drive until such time as that property is developed. Seconded by Mr. Maxton Approved 4-0.

General

4. Mr. Maxton asked Mr. Linklater if the zoning ordinance is in readable form. Answer: The index has to be done. The amendments have all been inserted, but no one can provide information regarding what Section 29 is. It was discussed that it is possible that there is a numbering error and the ordinance erroneously went from Section 28 to Section 30.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p. m.

Next regular meeting scheduled March 25, 1975.

