CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Chairman Paul Clark, Mr. Jim Briggs, Ms. Korenyi-Both, Mr. Jim Durham, Mr. Bill Etson and Mr. Jeffrey Gammell. Also present: City Manager Greg Horn, City Planner Steve Feverston, Municipal Attorney Scott Liberman, Assistant City Engineer John Sliemers and Assistant Clerk of Council Julie Weaver.
Absent: Mrs. JoAnne Rau.

EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS

Mrs. Rau had notified staff of her absence. Mr. Durham made a motion to excuse Mrs. Rau. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed with 6 ayes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no additions or corrections for the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of June 25, 2013.

MOTION: Mr. Briggs moved for approval of the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of May 28, 2013, as distributed. Mrs. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0-1. Mr. Gammell abstained because he was absent from the June meeting.

Before proceeding with the meeting, Mr. Clark called for a moment of silence in remembrance of Jim Brunner, a long-time member of the Planning Commission, who died recently.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application P-2013-0032: Rezoning .571 Acres From WT- B-2 to City of Centerville B-2 Applicant, Pat Gilligan, Dunkin Donuts, 9010 Dayton-Lebanon Pike.

Mr. Feverston introduced the application by Mr. Gilligan for rezoning of this property pending the finalization of annexation from Washington Township. He located the property on an aerial map at the southeast corner of Spring Valley Road and SR 48. He pointed out that the B-2 zoning is similar to its zoning in Washington Township and similar to surrounding businesses. The Planning Department advised the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the rezoning of 9010 Dayton-Lebanon Pike to the B-2 zoning classification to Council.

Mr. Pat Gilligan, the owner and applicant, stated that he was under contract to build a Dunkin' Donuts restaurant on the site and that the intended zoning would support that use.

Mr. Clark opened the public hearing. When no one else came forward he closed it.

MOTION: Mr. Gammell made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning to City Council. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

Application P-2013-0033 P-2013-0033: Variances for Dunkin' Donuts – Applicant, Pat Gilligan, 9010 Dayton-Lebanon Pike.

Using an aerial view of the property, Mr. Feverston explained the three variances for a Dunkin' Donuts at the southeast corner of Spring Valley Road and SR 48, the site recently occupied by Cricket. He stated that the first two variances cover the same area; one is for a reduction in the required parking and paving setback and the other is for a reduction in the bufferyard. Both variances are for the east property line and request a width of approximately five feet, rather than the required ten feet, in one particular section to allow for drive-through traffic, fire equipment and delivery trucks to maneuver around the building. Mr. Feverston stated that staff worked with the applicant to minimize the encroachment as much as possible and recommended approval of the variance subject to the following condition:

1. A plan, drawing or perspective image illustrating the appearance of the proposed retaining wall along the east property line shall be submitted to and approved by the City Planner. Such plans, drawings, or perspectives should indicate a material type reflective of the building architecture.

The third variance requested a drive-up window on the E. Spring Valley Road frontage. Normally, the drive-up window is limited to the side or rear yard of a property. Because of the alley to the east, the building has three frontages. Placing the drive-through window on the south face or east face would not allow enough stacking room for cars, thus putting the queue of waiting vehicles onto northbound SR 48. The drive-up window on the north face was the best solution and was reasonable in this case. Staff recommended approval, subject to the following condition:

1. A modified landscape plan shall be submitted and approved by the City Planner showing enhanced landscaping along the Spring Valley Road frontage to mitigate the visual impact of the drive-up window.

Mr. Durham asked if "enhanced landscaping" meant that the landscape plan would include trees. When Mr. Feverston answered in the affirmative, Mr. Durham asked to include trees in the condition.

Mr. Clark opened the public hearing and invited Mr. Pat Gilligan, Gilligan Oil Company, owner and applicant, to the podium. He stated that Mr. Feverston had been thorough and had worked with the team to minimize the variances. He introduced Ms. Kara Burkhardt and Mr. Jeff Pearson, before he stated that the material for the wall had not been selected. However, he showed the general color palette and stated the 2' wall on the east property line might be a modular block in a natural tone.

Mr. Clark closed the public hearing when no one came forward to speak.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the variances for parking and paving setbacks and bufferyard on the east property line, subject to the condition recommended by the City Planner, as shown above. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion for approval of the variance to allow the drive-up window on the Spring Valley Road frontage, subject to the condition recommended by the City Planner, as shown above, with the notation that the enhanced landscaping is to "include trees." Mr. Gammell seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

Application P-2013-0035: Variances for the Shops of North Village, 6230 Far Hills Avenue – Applicant, Jeff Zimmer.

Because of the proximity of his home to the site, Mr. Briggs recused himself and left the dais at this time.

Mr. Feverston gave the background on the six variances requested for the one acre site of the KFC restaurant at 6230 Far Hills Avenue, for the construction of the Shops of North Village with restaurant or retail uses. The current building will be demolished. Needed variances included parking and paving setbacks and bufferyards for the north and east property lines, a 27' setback to the building from North Village Drive, a 6.25' width for an interior landscape bed, a drive-through window on the north frontage, and a trash collection corral in the Fireside Drive frontage. In general, the three frontages of the property create physical hardship. Mr. Feverston described the current conditions and projected photos as he discussed the requested variances. He gave a general overview of each of the variances using a map.

For Variances 1 and 2, he said the proposed parking and paving setbacks and bufferyards on the south and east were significant improvements from the conditions for the previous occupant. In the past, there were legal non-conformities on the property. He felt the retaining wall should remain. Staff recommended approval of variances 1 and 2, subject to two conditions:

1. The concrete screening wall along the east property line shall remain to screen commercial uses on the subject property from nearby residential uses to the east. The existing landscaping on the wall shall be removed and replaced subject to the approval of the City Planner.

2. Concrete curb buttressing at the base of the rock wall adjacent to Fireside Drive shall be repaired or replaced to its original condition subject to the approval of the City Engineer.

He recommended denial of the request for encroachment of a portion of the one parking space into the 10' parking/paving setback and bufferyard width along the north property line.

Mr. Clark opened the public hearing, and Ms. Kara Burkhardt, Burkhardt Engineering, 2331 Far Hills Avenue, Dayton, came forward to voice concerns about the requirement to keep the landscaped retaining wall along the east boundary of the property. She felt removing the old plantings would destroy the integrity of the wall, that it would be difficult to blend the wall into the dumpster corral design and that the material of the wall would not fit the feel of the architecture of the new building. She stated the Planning Commission members at the work

session did not give the impression that keeping the wall was important. She noted that none of the other properties along Fireside Drive was required to have a wall. Also, replacing the wall was not in the budget.

Ms. Burdkardt discussed the request for approval of the encroachment of the parking space. She asked for approve of the triangular area of the encroachment, about 3.5' x 5' in area, a minimal variance. She respectfully asked for approval of the variances, as requested. She noted that Mr. Zimmer, the owner, was in attendance.

Mr. Clark opened the public hearing for the parking and paving setbacks and the bufferyards, but no one came forward to speak.

The Planning Commission discussed the issue of the landscaped wall. Mr. Gammell stated that mounding was not practical as an alternative buffer due to the narrow width of the space. Mr. Feverston said that, because North Village Drive is a collector street for the Village South neighborhood and the Villager Apartments, he felt there should be a means to shield headlights. Mr. Clark reminded the group of some of the opinions expressed at the work session. Mr. Durham, who was not at the work session, suggested deferring to staff's recommendation for a permanent, easily maintainable buffer. He stated that the setback variance on the north side was only necessary because the developer wanted to put three store fronts on a lot that had held one business. The requested northern setback would be an unfair advantage to the owner of this lot. Ms. Korenyi-Both said the material of the wall was not aesthetically pleasing.

Tom Smith of 8300 Yankee Street, representing the developer, reiterated that the old 1960's wall did not fit architecturally with the style of the proposed building and stated that it would be more expensive to replace it than to landscape the space nicely. He felt the structure of the wall would not survive removal of the current plantings. In response to Mr. Durham's comment about the three businesses being too big for the lot, Mr. Smith stated that this plan was no larger for the size of the lot than the Dunkin' Donuts building for its site.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the parking and paving setbacks and bufferyards requested in Variances 1 and 2 for the east property line, subject to the staff conditions shown previously. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion for approval of the parking and paving setbacks and buffer yard variances for the north property line. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-2, with Mr. Gammell and Mr. Durham voting no.

In reference to the variance for a 27' building setback from N. Village Drive, Mr. Feverston noted that staff recommended approval as requested.

When Mr. Clark opened the public hearing, no one came forward to speak.

Discussion by the Planning Commission members followed. Mr. Durham felt that the applicant should not be allowed to build closer to N. Village Drive; it was an unfair advantage to let a commercial developer build in the setback. Mr. Gammell pointed out the challenge of the three frontages and the non-conformities that had existed. For the building setback from N. Village,

the applicant was requesting 27 feet instead of the required 35 feet. The 50 foot setback from Far Hills Avenue was being honored.

MOTION: Mr. Gammell made a motion to approve the 27' building setback from N. Village Drive, as requested. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 4-1 vote. Mr. Durham voted no.

Mr. Feverston moved to Variance 4, the 6.5' width of the optional landscape area. The code requirements of the UDO for landscaping had been met elsewhere. He recommended approval of the variance, without conditions.

Mr. Clark opened and closed the public hearing for Variance 4, the 6.25' landscape bed.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the variance for the 6.25' landscape bed in the rear parking lot, as requested. Mr. Etson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

For Variance 5, Mr. Feverston felt the request for the drive-up window on the north frontage was reasonable and the best option available, because of the stacking requirement for the number of cars in a drive-through lane. Staff recommended approval, with the following condition:

1. An enhanced landscape treatment shall be provided along the edge of the drive-thru window pavement area to mitigate its visual impact from the North Village Drive public right-of-way subject to the approval of the City Planner.

Mr. Clark opened and closed the public hearing for Variance 5, the variance for a drive-up window on the N. Village Drive frontage.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the variance for the drive-up window on the north face of the building, subject to the condition of the City Planner and including the notation that the enhanced landscaping is to "include trees." Mr. Gammell seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 ayes.

For Variance 6, in reference to the dumpster on a frontage, Mr. Feverston stated the variance was reasonable. Multiple frontages create hardship for placement of the dumpster corral. The situation is similar to that faced by McDonald's with its new building to the south on Far Hills.

Mr. Clark opened and closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved for approval of the variance for the dumpster location in the Fireside Drive frontage on southeast corner of the property. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Liberman explained to Mr. Zimmer and Ms. Burkhardt that they could appeal the decision of the Planning Commission by filing an Appeal Application concerning the retention of the landscape wall with the Clerk of Council within 15 days.

Mr. Briggs returned to the dais at this time, but Mr. Gammell recused himself for the discussion of the Voss Chevrolet sign variance and public hearing and left the room.

Application P-2013-0038: Variance for Signs on Side Elevations of a Business – Applicant, Voss Chevrolet, Inc., for Voss Used Cars, 99 Loop Road.

Mr. Feverston gave the staff report for the application for wall signs on three elevations of the Voss Used Cars building that is being constructed on the south side of Loop Road. The applicant requests to divide the area that would have been allowed for wall signage on the frontage into three parts with a wall identification sign on the front and a wall sign and a Chevrolet logo on the east and west faces. He showed an aerial view of the property, the sign mock ups and the building elevations with the proposed three identification signs and two logos. He noted that other businesses on Loop Road have been allowed to divide the sign area generated by the building frontage in a similar way. He recommended approval of the application with the following two conditions:

1. The number of wall signs shall be limited to the three identification signs and the two trademark chevron signs as requested by this variance.

2. The sign area for all wall signs shall not exceed the maximum sign area permitted by the UDO for the front building wall.

Mr. Clark opened and closed the public hearing. Mr. Deeds was present representing the applicant, but did not make a statement.

Mr. Clark and Mr. Durham agreed on the need to amend the sign ordinance to deal with this situation so that businesses on Loop Road would not have to go through the variance process.

MOTION: Mr. Durham moved for approval of Application P- 2013-0038, the sign variance for wall signs on three faces at Voss Used Cars on Loop Road, subject to the two conditions recommended by the City Planner. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Gammell returned to the dais.

Application P-2013-0029: Major Site Plan for Centerville Mill Climate Storage, Compark Road – Applicant, Dan Wilson.

Mr. Feverston presented the staff report for the major site plan for a recently re-platted area on Compark Drive that adjoins Centerville Climate Storage at 86 Compark Road, in an area zoned I-1. Mr. Dan Wilson, the owner, submitted a Major Site Plan for the expansion of the number of storage units. Mr. Feverston showed an aerial view of the site, photos of the current conditions, pictures of the type of buildings to be constructed and images of the proposed layout. He noted that the two new buildings would be built with metal panels, flat roofs and metal overhead doors, although the current buildings are concrete block with pitched roofs. He stated that the re-plat obligated the construction of a cul-de-sac at the terminus of Compark Road and that the Washington Township Fire Department was satisfied with access to the area. He said that some engineering issues with regard to stormwater remain unresolved. He asked the Planning

Commission specifically to include its approval or denial of the metal panels and the flat roof in the motion. The Planning Department recommended approval, subject to the following 16 conditions.

1. The site plan shall be modified to include the existing Centerville Mill site demonstrating proper access through the site subject to approval by the City Engineer.

2. A final grading and stormwater drainage plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department showing drainage calculations and incorporating erosion control during construction in accordance with Article 9.35 of the Unified Development Ordinance. The plans shall detail the emergency overflow for its detention facilities. The plans shall also be designed in a manner to accommodate the acceptance of off-site stormwater, particularly in the southeast corner of the site.

3. The applicant shall coordinate storm sewer construction work to be performed in the Compark Road right-of-way with the on-site stormwater drainage system subject to approval by the City Engineer.

4. The developer's engineer shall be required to inspect all drainage facilities under construction and certify their compliance with approved plans, and, in addition, the City may inspect all drainage facilities while under construction.

5. Full depth curb shall be provided around the perimeter of the parking area and of driveways subject to approval by the City Engineer.

6. Driveway aprons shall be constructed to Centerville standards subject to approval by the City Engineer.

7. A final landscaping plan shall be subject to approval by the City Planner.

8. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted by the developer for all landscape, screening, or bufferyard improvements required by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) subject to approval by the City Planner in accordance with Article 9.25 C of the UDO.

9. A hard surface roadway capable of providing emergency vehicle access and support at all times for emergency purposes shall be provided during construction.

10. The Planning Commission shall approve the architectural design of the proposed building to assure the materials, shape, massing and architectural features create a unified design on the premises and is visually compatible with the surrounding buildings. Specifically, the Planning Commission must approve the flat roof, metal panel walls and the omission of the building's architectural base and cap.

11. A final exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the City Planner.

12. The area proposed to be a staging and materials storage area for the construction of the

development of this site shall be restored to a grass lawn after construction is complete subject to approval by the City Planner. Any additional use of this area shall require an amendment to this Major Site Plan for the Planning Commission's consideration.

13. A plan detailing the placement of all outdoor storage for the entire property shall be submitted on or before October 21, 2013, subject to approval by the City Planner.

14. The applicant shall contact the City Engineer's office at least 24 hours prior to any earth disturbing activity.

15. Per Article 9.31(C) (1) of the UDO, a Street Cut Permit shall be acquired for any new, expanded, or altered roadway right-of-way access point.

16. No sign depicted shall be approved as a part of this application.

Mr. Clark opened and closed the public hearing. No one was present representing the applicant.

MOTION: Following a brief discussion, Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the metal panels, flat roof, and architectural details of the buildings as submitted and to approve the Major Site Plan, subject to the sixteen conditions recommended by the Planning Department. He also stated that Condition 14 was to be amended to include "during regular business hours and at least 24 hours prior to any earth disturbing activity." Mr. Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

Application P-2013-0030: Major Site Plan for a Shelter House at Iron Horse Park – Applicant, Robert Feldmann, Centerville Washington Park District.

Mr. Feverston reported on the Major Site Plan for the installation of a 1,990 sq. ft. structure with restrooms, storage and a picnic shelter house at 6161 Millshire Drive in Iron Horse Park in the Red Coach neighborhood. Sanitary and water service would be provided via existing public utilities and stormwater would be contained on-site. Using an aerial photo Mr. Feverston showed the existing driveway access and parking lot that will serve the proposed shelter. Lighting for the driveway access and parking lot would be added. Noting that the brick and split-face block shelter house would be situated between the playground and the ball diamond, he located the property on a map and showed pictures of the terrain.

The Planning Department recommended approval, subject to one condition:

1. A final grading and stormwater drainage plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department showing drainage calculations and incorporating erosion control during construction in accordance with Article 9.35 of the Unified Development Ordinance.

Mr. Clark opened the public hearing and invited Mr. Robert Feldmann, Development Manager of the Centerville-Washington Park District, 221 N. Main Street, to the podium. Mr. Feldmann stated that this was a slightly smaller version of the Park District's standard shelter house that has been built in several area parks. Less storage was included in this plan.

MOTION: Mr. Gammell made a motion to approve the Major Site Plan, subject to the one condition recommended by the Planning Department. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with six ayes.

Application P-2013-0031: Major Site Plan for a Barbershop – Applicant, Tim Minton, 162 W. Franklin.

Mr. Feverston had recommended tabling the next item of business, the Major Site Plan for a barbershop at 162 W. Franklin Street.

When Mr. Durham asked if the applicant was agreeable to the item being tabled, Mr. Minton asked for approval conditioned on the findings of an additional survey, because he wished to move forward as soon as possible. As he discussed the matter, Mr. Minton stated that his last survey was in 2006. He requested approval conditioned on the survey being completed and his right of way issues being resolved.

Mr. Feverston explained that a discrepancy between the survey and the County Auditor's database created a property line issue that would make a decision difficult until a new survey was completed. If the auditor's map for Weidener Street was correct, a parking and paving setback variance would be needed. Mr. Minton stated that he would have additional area to the west if the Auditor's Map was correct.

Mr. Liberman noted that it would be safer to table the application. If any variances would be needed, the major site plan could not be approved before the variances.

Mr. Feverston stated that additional conditions would be required even if the survey is correct, but he had not prepared the conditions at this time. He mentioned possible conditions for parking space acquisition and stormwater management.

Mr. Liberman said without the determinations about the right-of-way lines, the stormwater management requirements, the needed parking leases, the application should be considered to be incomplete.

Mr. Durham moved to table the Major Site Plan for 162 W. Franklin Street to the Planning Commission meeting on August 27, 2013 or within sixty days. Mr. Gammell seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Horn asked that the Planning Department provide Mr. Minton a list of the deficient items, based on the assumption that the property lines on his survey are correct, by Friday, August 2.

Application P-2013-0034: Major Site Plan, Dunkin' Donuts – Applicant, Pat Gilligan, 9010 Dayton Lebanon Pike.

Mr. Feverston described the current conditions on the property at the southeast corner of SR 48 and E. Spring Valley Road. He noted that the current building and canopy will be removed prior to the new construction. He showed the plan for access and egress, the drive-through lane, the walkways, the dumpster location, and the landscaping plan. At their desks, the Planning

Commission members received handouts of the latest rendition of the site plan showing the two colors of brick, the EFIS cap, the bricked cooler area in the rear and the corporate logo sign panels on the front and over the drive-through. Mr. Feverston felt that the material of the sign panels should be more unified with the rest of the building materials. He also pointed out that the parapets concealed the mechanicals for a distance of 80-110 feet. Mr. Feverston noted that earlier in the evening the Planning Commission had approved the variances requested for bufferyards, parking and paving setbacks and the drive-up window on the north frontage. The Planning Department recommended approval of this Major Site Plan, subject to ten conditions.

When Mr. Clark invited the applicant to the podium, Mr. Pat Gilligan, the owner of Gilligan Oil Company, stated that he had come to have a conversation with the Planning Commission about the plan, but that he also had to balance their requirements with corporate requirements from Dunkin' Donuts. He described the varying color palette of the panels with the signs as monoliths and stated that they were key branding elements.

Discussion topics included the height of the parapet needed to keep the mechanicals out of the line of sight from the public rights-of-way, the traffic movement at the ingress and egress points, the brick around the cooler area, the need for the large logo panels over the drive-up window and the entrance, and the use of the hardie plank materials shown for those same logo sign panels. In agreement with the City Planner, the Planning Commission requested the use of other materials for the panels more in keeping with used elsewhere on the site, possibly EFIS. Mr. Gilligan said he thought they could use their color palette on EFIS to the satisfaction of the corporate requirements. The members asked Mr. Gilligan to increase the height of the parapet/fence hiding the mechanicals to screen them from the line of sight from the public rights of way and to increase the height of the brick wrap around the outside rear cooler to match the level of the next belt in the brick of the main building.

Mr. Clark closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the Major Site Plan for Dunkin' Donuts at 9010 Dayton-Lebanon Pike, subject to the conditions recommended by the Planning Department modified to read as follows:

1. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted and a cost estimate be determined by the developer for all landscape, screening, or bufferyard improvememts required by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) in accordance with Article 9.25 of the UDO.

2. The project engineer shall certify adequate sight distance on the landscape plans subject to approval by the City Engineer.

3. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted and a cost estimate be determined by the developer for all on-site public improvements required by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) in accordance with Article 9.17 of the UDO.

4. The Planning Commission approved the architectural design of the proposed building to assure that the materials, shape, massing and architectural features create a unified design

on the premises and are visually compatible with the surrounding buildings. Specifically, the Planning Commission approved the flat roof and the use of EFIS instead of fiber cement board above the drive-through window and at the main entrance.

5. Fire hydrants shall be located in accordance with the fire code subject to approval by the Washington Township Fire Department.

6. A hard surface roadway capable of providing emergency vehicle access and support at all times for emergency purposes shall be provided during construction.

7. Per Article 9.31(C) (1) of the UDO, a Street Cut Permit shall be acquired for any new, expanded, or altered roadway right-of-way access point.

8. A final grading and stormwater drainage plan shall be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department showing drainage calculations and incorporating erosion control during construction in accordance with Article 9.35 of the Unified Development Ordinance.

9. No sign depicted shall be approved as a part of this application.

10. Mechanicals on the roof shall not be visible form the public right-of-way on surrounding streets, subject to the approval of the City Planner.

11. The brick on the three walls over the rear cooler shall be extended upward to match the belt course of the rest of the building.

Mr. Gammell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with six ayes.

Application P-2013-0036: Major Site Plan for the Shops at North Village – Applicant, Jeff Zimmer, 6230 Far Hills Avenue.

Mr. Briggs recused himself and left the room before Mr. Feverston presented the staff report for the Major Site Plan for the revitalization of the KFC site at 6230 Far Hills Avenue. Mr. Feverston went over the applicant's proposal to demolish the current structure and build three storefronts under a single roof for three restaurants/retail uses. The plan included 48 parking spaces and 8 drive-through stacking spaces. He described the ingress and egress, the landscaping, the down-directed lighting, the parking configuration, and the four sided architecture designed for the site. Variances needed for the site were approved earlier at this same meeting, with conditions. He noted that, based on the UDO's requirement for minimum openings, the Planning Commission specifically needed to approve the absence of an entry on the north façade. Mr. Feverston recommended approval of the Major Site Plan subject to 16 conditions.

In response to the conditions, Ms. Kara Burkhardt, Burkhardt Engineering, took exception with two of them. Condition 1 required the handicap parking spaces to be nine feet wide. She stated her belief that handicap spaces at 8' were sufficient, because of the hatched area between the two spots. She also stated that Condition 6 concerning a drainage study should not apply because the plan did not disturb more than an acre of land. Mr. Feverston concurred with these comments.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve the Major Site Plan for the Shops of North Village, specifically approving the lack of an entry on the north façade, deleting Condition 1, deleting Condition 6 and being subject to the remaining conditions recommended by the Planning Department. The conditions were therefore amended to read as follows:

1. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted and a cost estimate be determined by the developer for all landscape, screening, or buffer yard improvements required by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) subject to approval by the City Planner in accordance with Article 9.25 C of the UDO.

2. The project engineer shall certify adequate sight distance on the landscape plans subject to approval by the City Engineer.

3. A performance bond or other construction guarantee shall be posted and a cost estimate be determined by the developer for all on-site public improvements required by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) in accordance with Article 9.17 of the UDO.

4. Per Article 9.31(C) (1) of the UDO, a Street Cut Permit shall be acquired for any new, expanded, or altered roadway right-of-way access point.

5. Fire hydrants shall be located in accordance with the fire code subject to approval by the Washington Township Fire Department.

6. A hard surface roadway capable of providing emergency vehicle access and support at all times for emergency purposes shall be provided during construction.

7. An alternative paving system shall be established for emergency vehicle access at the Far Hills Avenue frontage road. Such a pavement shall be of a material that is not concrete to differentiate the standard driveway access pavement from the emergency access paved area. Such material may be grass pavers, cobblestones, or other similar contrasting material. Such alternative paving system shall be capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus weighing 75,000 pounds.

8. A handicap curb ramp shall be provided at the northwest corner of the site subject to approval by the City Engineer.

9. New tree planting shall occur outside water and sanitary sewer easements.

10. No sign depicted shall be approved as a part of this application.

Mr. Gammell seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

COMMUNICATIONS

Because of the lateness of the hour, no communications were shared.

The next meeting of the Centerville Planning Commission was scheduled for Tuesday, August 26, 2013 at 7:30 in the Council Chambers. Mr. Etson stated that he did not expect to be present for said meeting.

There being no further business, Mr. Clark adjourned the meeting

Paul Clark

Paul Clark, Planning Commission Chair