

PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, July 26, 2016

Mr. Paul Clark called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Paul Clark, Amy Korenyi-Both, Robert Muzechuk and Bill Etson. Also present were City Planner Andrew Rodney, Municipal Attorney Scott Liberman, Planner Mark Yandrick, Councilmember John Palcher and Assistant Clerk of Council Julie Weaver.

Absent: Jim Durham and Kevin Von Handorf.

EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS

MOTION: Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to excuse Mr. Durham and Mr. Von Handorf. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No additions or corrections were noted for the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of June 28, 2016.

MOTION: Mr. Muzechuk made a motion to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of June 28, 2016, as distributed. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

OPENING STATEMENT

Mr. Clark read the Opening Statement concerning protocol for public hearings. He announced the Cornerstone Phase IV applications were going to be tabled later in the meeting. If anyone present was interested in them, there would be no discussion of those items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application P-2016-0028: Variances for Mike's Carwash, 6250 Far Hills Avenue

Mr. Etson made a motion to remove from the table the application for variances at Mike's Carwash at 6250 Far Hills Avenue. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Yandrick presented the staff report for the five variances requested by Mark Bredemeier of KBA, Inc. on behalf of Mike's Carwash in a B-2 zoning district. The requested variances included placing an accessory structure (kiosk) in the front yard along Fireside Drive, placing a wall sign on a non-frontage façade, having wall sign area of 146.6 square feet, permitting non-compliance with the average to minimum lighting ratio and permitting non-compliance with the minimum to maximum lighting ratio.

Mr. Yandrick gave general background using an aerial map and a diagram to show the layout of the business on the dual frontage lot. Mr. Yandrick shared that the placement of the vending kiosk in the front yard along Fireside Drive was due to the presence of underground utilities and stormwater pipes severely limiting the areas available for construction. He stated staff had minimal concern about the placement of the kiosk; exterior materials to be used were the main interest, since the the applicant had not designated construction materials for the kiosk in the submittal. Mr. Yandrick stated the Standards of Approval for a variance generally could be met and recommended approval, subject to the following one (1) condition:

1. The façade material of the kiosk shall match the materials of the principal building approved in the Major Site Plan.

Mr. Yandrick explained the request for a variance for a wall sign on a non-frontage facade. He noted this variance was closely related to the request for a variance for additional sign area. Schematics showed no wall sign facing Fireside Drive, where a wall sign would be permitted. The applicant felt the signage would be more effective on the south wall seen by northbound traffic on Far Hills Avenue. Staff recommended the approval of the variance, subject to the following condition:

1. The wall sign on the south side of the building shall be in-lieu-of any wall signage on the east side fronting Fireside Drive.

Mr. Yandrick presented the background for the variance request for additional sign area. Because the underground utilities put constraints on the placement of the building on the lot, the narrow side of the building was on the Far Hills frontage used for calculating allowable sign area. The building width facing Far Hills Avenue was 57 feet on a frontage more than 200 feet long. The formula limited sign area to 86.25 square feet, while the applicant requested 146 square feet. Additionally, the building canopy did not qualify for use in the formula. If the length of the canopy could be used, 137.25 square feet of sign area would be allowed. Staff felt this was a more typical sign area for a lot of comparable size. Since most of the Standards of Approval could be met, staff recommended approval, subject to the following two conditions:

1. The total wall sign area shall not exceed 137.25 square feet.
2. 50% or more of the total wall sign area shall be placed on the west side of the building.

The fourth variance requested to exceed the normal ratio of the average to minimum lighting levels. Mr. Yandrick stated the applicant had worked cooperatively with staff to reduce the lighting levels to be more in keeping with the neighborhood. The inability to place a light pole safely in the area of the drive lanes skewed the ratios because of low numbers for the minimum lighting in that area. Staff felt that the higher lighting levels were needed in other areas for the safety of workers and patrons and that the numbers were in harmony with the intent of most of the lighting standards. Staff recommended approval of the variance to exceed the ratio for average to minimum lighting levels, subject to the following one condition:

1. The approval shall be solely for the lighting plan submitted and stamped received July 15, 2016.

The request for the fifth variance was similar to the fourth, but considered the ratio for maximum to minimum lighting levels. Staff recommended approval of the maximum to minimum lighting variance, subject to the following one condition:

1. The approval shall be solely for the lighting plan submitted and stamped received July 15, 2016.

Discussion followed. When Mr. Clark questioned whether he should separate the votes on the individual variances, Mr. Rodney recommended five votes—one for the kiosk, two for signage and two for lighting. Mr. Clark verified where the kiosk lights would be directed and where they would add foot candles to the plan. Mr. Yandrick stated the kiosk would not add appreciable light. Upon question, he went over the traffic circulation on the lot. Mr. Etson expressed concern about bright light on the east side of the property bleeding over to the apartment homes across Fireside Drive. Mr. Yandrick clarified that the lighting would be shielded. Mr. Rodney stated that the difference in intensity of the permitted lighting and the requested lighting in the variance was not large. The higher wattage minimized the number of poles and spread light evenly. The revised lighting plan threw most of the light into the center of the lot and concentrated illumination in areas where people and cars were expected to circulate. In answer to the question from Mr. Etson, Mr. Rodney said shields would be required on all fixtures except the light at the kiosk. Light would not be allowed to shine toward the apartments.

Discussion turned to signs and sign area, Mr. Clark reminded everyone that the increase in permitted sign area would stay with the parcel for the long-term, and would not apply only to this business. He asked how the area of the two wall signs would be divided, if the sign for the south façade and the additional area were approved. He wanted to know if a sign the size of the original request would be put on the west façade and a smaller one on the south. Ms. Korenyi-Both asked how the proportions of signs with a reduced maximum area would look on the background “tower.”

When Mr. Clark opened the public hearing, Mr. Greg Ries, 100 Northeast Drive, Loveland, spoke on behalf of Mike’s Carwash. In response to an inquiry from Mr. Clark, he said Mike’s Carwash was agreeable to the conditions requested by staff. In answer to Ms. Korenyi-Both’s question, he stated the signs shown on the most recent submittal were done to scale with signs of equal size with a slightly smaller area, so the proportions of the walls and the signs would be as shown.

Mr. Muzechuk requested that Condition #2 for the variance for sign area clearly state the wall signs on the west and south had to be the same size so that a later tenant could not use the entire area for a sign on the Far Hills frontage.

Mr. Clark closed the public hearing.

MOTIONS: Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to approve the variance for an accessory structure (a vending kiosk) on the Fireside Drive frontage, subject to the condition recommended by staff, as shown above, requiring the materials to match the main building. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to approve the variance for the average to minimum lighting levels, subject to the condition shown above noting the approval was solely for the lighting plan submitted July 15, 2016. Mr. Muzechuk seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to approve the variance for the maximum to minimum lighting levels, subject to the condition recommended by staff noting the approval was solely for the lighting plan submitted on July 15, 2016. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1, with Mr. Clark voting no.

Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to approve the variance for sign area of 137.25 square feet, subject to the conditions recommended by staff, with Condition 2 modified to reflect that the wall signs on the south and west frontages shall be the same size. Mr. Muzechuk seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1, with Mr. Clark voting no.

Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to approve the variance for a wall sign on the south non-frontage façade, in lieu of a wall sign on the east facing Fireside Drive. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1, with Mr. Clark voting no.

Continuing the agenda, Mr. Rodney noted the applicant had requested the next four Cornerstone North items be tabled to the next meeting.

Applications P-2016-0029: Final Development Plan for Phase IV, Cornerstone North

Mr. Clark open the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Etson made a motion to table Application P-2016-0029 to the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on August 30, 2016. Mr. Muzechuk seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

Application P-2016-0030: Rezoning Cornerstone North Phase IV to R-PD, Residential-Planned Development

Mr. Clark opened the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Muzechuk made a motion to table Application P-2016-0030 to the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on August 30, 2016. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Application P-2016-0031: Record Plan for Cornerstone Phase IV

MOTION: Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to table Application P-2016-0031 to the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on August 30, 2016. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

Application P-2016-0032: Major Site Plan for the Cornerstone Park

MOTION: Ms. Korenyi-Both made a motion to table Application P-2016-0032 to the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on August 30, 2016. Mr. Muzechuk seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rodney shared the following under Communications:

He reminded Planning Commission of a Work Session on August 16, at 6:30 p.m., to review a proposal by Hallmark Campus Communities for a multi-family development on the property at Chardonnay Drive.

He thanked Amy Korenyi-Both for her service on the Centerville Place Study Group. (Mr. Durham, who was absent, also took part.) A report should be ready for Planning Commission comments in September.

Mr. Rodney asked about starting the meeting on August 30, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. due to the large number of agenda items expected. Because several members were absent, Mr. Clark suggested polling the members for a start time.

Mr. Clark also made several comments. He stated appreciation for the recognition given to Mr. Briggs at the Centerville Council Meeting and announced that City Council had granted the appeal of the decision of the Planning Commission denying the variance for additional height to accommodate a beacon at the Hilton Home2 Suites Hotel on Cornerstone North Boulevard.

Mr. Etson stated he would not be available for a work session on August 16, 2016.

The next regular meeting of Planning Commission was scheduled for August 30, 2016, with an expected start time of 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

Mr. Clark adjourned the meeting about 7:15 p.m.



Paul Clark, Chair