

MINUTES
VILLAGE OF SUNBURY
VIRTUAL PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
February 22, 2021

Mayor Tommy Hatfield called the virtual Sunbury Planning and Zoning meeting to order at 6:32 p.m., on February 22, 2021.

The meeting was started with a moment of silent prayer and the pledge of allegiance.

Members present: Tommy Hatfield, John Lieurance, Joe Gochenour, Greg Elliott and Rick Ryba.

Joe St. John was absent.

Also present – Dave Parkinson, Allen Rothermel and Steve Pyles

Major Subdivision Plan – Final Plat – Miller’s Cove

Advanced Civil Design has prepared, on behalf of Romanelli & Hughes, the final plat subdivision plan for the development of 36 single family patio homes located on a vacant lot located on North Miller Drive

Mayor Hatfield introduced this item. Jay Bohman spoke upon behalf of the applicant noting Engineer Parkinson had provided a memo on the plat and offered to answer any questions in that regard.

Mayor Hatfield then asked Engineer Parkinson to offer any comments. Mr. Parkinson stated that the plan conforms to the zoning code and subdivision regulations, as well as the Preliminary Plat previously approved and the construction drawings submitted. Based upon reviews they take no exception with approval.

Mayor Hatfield asks the Commission for other comments or questions, there were none.

Mr. Ryba made a motion to approve and recommend the Final Plat, second by Mr. Elliott. The motion passed with five ayes.

Major Site Plan and Building – Sunbury Development LLC – Newman Roofing Building

Terrain Evolution and Bogenrife Architecture LLC have prepared, on behalf of Sunbury Development, a major site plan and building for Newman Roofing located at the current western terminus of Kintner Parkway

Mayor Hatfield initiated the discussions with Mr. Newman presenting his project. Mr. Newman noted that the building had changed from the initial rezoning request because he was uncertain of what he wanted to build, In his view is he is proposing a nicer building.

Mr. Parkinson noted he provides guidance and observation to the Commission. Mr. Parkinson went through his report highlighting some of the more substantial observations. He provided a background of the rezoning for the project and noted the southern half of the property is not zoned; the northern half is zoned PID. He provided some context of where Mr. Newman proposes to build his new building. He is proposing a 23,000-sf building and a 4,300 sf separate garage, he takes no exception to those changes from the conceptual plan. Mr. Parkinson did note some items from the review for discussion:

He wanted to confirm that building height does not exceed 35 feet, based upon scaling the plans it does not exceed this height. The applicant confirmed this observation.

Building materials may need some discussion. In the rezoning text the materials specified for non-roadway facing elevations is steel. The architectural drawings indicate that the non-roadway facing elevations on the warehouse area will be constructed of cement smooth block and split face block, which is not in conformance with the approved development text. The entire office area will be constructed of natural materials, which exceeds the development text that was approved.

Additionally, the warehouse portion of the building is one story and our code for architectural requirements in a commercial/industrial district state that the roof must be pitched construction and they are proposing a low slope/flat roof.

The final item is related to the garage, which is in the back of the property, does face a street. The development text specifies natural materials for road facing elevations. Mr. Newman replied that he would not be opposed to complying with the text by adding natural materials to that elevation.

Under the architecture portion of the code, Mr. Parkinson noted that it says, “should have similar theme”, and there is a variety of themes on the building based upon materials.

Mr, Parkinson also noted that under their general notes part of the report, including plans for Kintner Parkway and right of way dedication need to be part of the submission.

Mr. Parkinson concluded offering to take questions and moving on to discussion by the Commission.

Shawn Walker, representing the applicant, spoke to the design of the warehouse portion of the project stating the cement block will be painted and the block was added to give the building a better appearance than steel and to make it a better building in terms of function, durability, and fire resistance.

The discussion continued with Shawn Bogenrife sharing his screen to illustrate the different materials of construction.

There was also a discussion of low slope/flat roofs and how it contributes to the usable volume of the building. Mayor Hatfield asked about how the building would look with a code compliant pitched roof on the warehouse portion. Mr. Bogenrife responded that it would depend upon the required pitch. Discussion of roof slope continued, including the structural impact of a change in slope and changes in structure type with the inclusion of wood trusses.

Mayor Hatfield asked for additional Commission comments. Mr. Elliott asked about the proposed garage and asked if it would make sense to have the garage match the warehouse area. Mr. Bogenrife responded that using the natural materials would work better. Mr. Newman stated that the board and batten would function better than cement block because of the narrow space between the garage doors.

Mr. Elliott asked to confirm that there is some slope to the roof. The applicant responded there is, but it is low sloped.

Mayor Hatfield observed that if a sloped roof was added to the warehouse to be compliant with the code it would diminish the architecture of the proposed building. Further discussion of the value of a low slope to usable space continued along with the structural implications of adding a different roof pitch.

Mr. Walker offered that the design purpose was to budget costs to the front of the building that is visible to create a good prototype for the planned industrial district.

Mr. Newman asked to clarify where the sloped roof is in the code or in his development text. Mr. Parkinson stated it is in the architectural section of the code.

Mr. Ryba stated that the low slope portion of the roof will not be visible from the street based upon the front elevation.

Mr. Elliott stated he was not opposed to the design because of the front elevation quality.

Mayor Hatfield stated he was cognizant of the budget discussion from the applicant and the investment in the quality of the front elevation.

Mr. Newman discussed the height impact upon adding a pitched roof to the warehouse and stated it would likely exceed the maximum height allowed.

Mayor Hatfield discussed if a variance would be needed.

Discussion of the definition of one story followed. The code does not define stories in terms of height.

Mr. Gochenour offered that in his opinion the building is designed well and attractive.

Mr. Elliott concurred stating he supports the design and if a variance was needed, he would support that item.

There was a discussion on the idea of a variance and impact upon the applicant's timing to construct.

Mr. Newman summarized the three issues related to the application, which were roof slope, materials on the garage, which the applicant has agreed to change to natural, and the use of smooth and split face CMU instead of metal on non-road facing elevations.

Mr. Gochenour asked about the dumpster enclosures. Mr. Walker responded chain link with slats to obscure visibility and last longer.

Mayor Hatfield discussed what items would need a variance and the need to get input from the Law Director.

The applicant discussed their design and submission logistics.

Mayor Hatfield asked Mr. Pyles about lead times for a variance. He stated 20 days. He then noted there is a section in the Planned Industrial Code that allows a modification of the approved development plan and shared that language with the Commission. He discussed divergences in planned district as a possible way to deal with the low slope roof as part of a modification, as well as the materials being addressed by the modification.

Mr. Walker added that the flat roof in the plan is shielded by a parapet if that helps with the acceptance of the building.

There was further discussion about the modification language in the code and if it would allow the site and building plan to move forward.

The development text was displayed, and potential modifications to the text were discussed. The applicant requested the Commission consider modifying the development text after discussion.

Regarding materials – the following modification was discussed:

Modification #1: An addition in allowable materials to allow for non-road facing elevations to be finished in split face and smooth CMU, versus 25-gauge steel siding through the elimination of the reference that exclusively identified steel as the acceptable material and referencing the existing Sunbury Zoning Code.

Regarding the low slope roof – the following modification and divergence was discussed:

Modification #2: A change to allow for a low-slope roof on the Warehouse Indoor Storage Portion of the main building. A parapet shall shield the roof on the elevation facing the roadway.

Mr. Gochenour had a question regarding the east elevation showing a parapet, would that be eliminated? The applicant responded it would.

Mayor Hatfield made a motion to submit requested modifications to the zoning text for Council review and approval. Second by Mr. Elliott. Upon vote there were five ayes and the motion passed.

A motion to approve the site plan and building with the following five conditions was made by Mayor Hatfield, second by Mr. Ryba. Upon a vote of the motion, there were five ayes.

1. Final Legal Approval
2. Final Engineering Approval
3. Council approval of two requested modifications to the proposed development plan per S81.15.13.5 (f)
4. Submission and approval of a public roadway plan with appropriate right-of-way dedication
5. Submission and approval of appropriate lot split

No visitors were present to speak to the Commission.

Motion to approve Minutes of the January 22, 2021 Meeting

Motion to approve by Mr. Gochenour, second by Mr. Elliott. Minutes were approved with five ayes.

Zoning Report

Mr. Pyles briefly shared the zoning report and offered to take questions.

New Business

There was no new business.

Next Meeting Date – March 22, 2021

Motion to Adjourn

Motion by Mayor Hatfield, second by Mr. Ryba. Five ayes, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.