

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
Work Session  
Tuesday, June 14, 2016

Mr. Clark convened the meeting in the Law Library about 6:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Jim Briggs, Jim Durham, Robert Muzechuk, Amy Korenyi-Both, and Paul Clark. Also present: City Manager Greg Horn, City Planner Andrew Rodney, Planner Mark Yandrick, Municipal Attorney Scott Liberman, Intern Jenny Jessen and Assistant Clerk of Council Julie Weaver. Absent: Mr. Etson and Mr. Von Handorf.

Applicants: Robert Hall and George Oberer, Jr. representing Cornerstone Developers, Ltd.

Mr. Rodney stated that the purpose of the meeting was to familiarize Planning Commission with the basics of the applications for Phase IV of the Cornerstone North development. Late in the afternoon, Mr. Hall submitted three applications for the meeting on July 26, 2016—a Final Development Plan, a rezoning and a record plan covering approximately the northern half of the development. Mr. Rodney stated the format of the evening would be the presentation by the developers with questions from Planning Commission and then discussion by the members.

Mr. Hall used a PowerPoint presentation to explain the applications. He began by reviewing the existing zoning, which is mostly R-PD with a Neighborhood Residential overlay and B-PD with a Community Center overlay, before showing the zoning requested for the office campus, the multi-family residential areas, and the proposed park. The revised zoning included shifting several small blocks of acreage to accommodate updated plans. The northwest quadrant would be B-PD with a Community Center overlay; the north central was proposed to be B-PD with a Neighborhood Center overlay and the eastern portions would be R-PD with Neighborhood Residential overlays. The diagonal park acreage was shown as B-PD with a Community Center overlay. Mr. Hall noted the applicants would need some variances for items such as setbacks, especially in the office area, in order to blend the requirements of the zoning district, the overlays and the Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Hall discussed the Final Development Plan for Phase IV. A box culvert would bring Cornerstone North Boulevard across the creek where it would turn to the east. This street would be a public roadway until the crossing Sweet Arrow Lane, the new access from Brown Road for the apartments. Two smaller ingress/egress access points were anticipated along Brown Road. The Fortus Group proposed apartments in the north central section, and the developer showed a senior living center south of the owner-occupied housing to the northeast. Green space followed the creek from the northwest corner of the property to the southeast. A “flagpole” bufferyard extended southward from the owner-occupied housing on the northeast along the property line of the senior living center adjacent to I-675. Mr. Hall described a typical street section and gave general information on possible features for the park. No tennis, volley ball or basketball

courts were included. He pointed out walking paths, benches and water features such as rock ledges. He showed a diagram of a gazebo in the style and copper color used elsewhere in the development, before stating walkway bridges were still being studied.

Mr. Hall estimated the major site plans for the multi-family housing and the park might be submitted in time for the September Planning Commission meeting.

Questions followed from Planning Commission. Mr. Clark verified that no further curb cuts were expected for Wilmington Pike. Mr. Muzechuk asked about the acreage for the pond, the proximity of the hotel to the park and parking for those using the greenspace. When Mr. Horn asked about recreational amenities in the plans, Mr. Hall stated none were shown, only open space for lawn activities.

Mr. Oberer and Mr. Hall left at this time.

Concerns discussed by the Planning Commission and staff included the following:

1. Ownership and maintenance of the park and common areas
2. The “flagpole” strip attached to the owner occupied housing area along I-675
3. Office zoning for the northwest corner of the development
4. The lack of active recreational opportunities in the park (playground equipment, volleyball courts, tennis courts); the vagueness of information about the park
5. Neighborhood residential overlay zoning would allow additional density in exchange for better quality or more amenities, but tradeoffs were not specified
6. Sightlines from the park to the businesses
7. The need for a second access to the senior living center

Planning Commission felt the top priorities should be defining the regime for ownership and maintenance of the park and guaranteeing the office zoning in the northwest quadrant.

Mr. Clark adjourned the meeting about 7:35 p.m.

---

Paul Clark, Planning Commission Chair