

City of Springboro  
320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio 45066

Planning Commission Work Session  
Wednesday, January 10, 2007, 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the January 10, 2007 Work Session to order.

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Jim Chmiel, Barbara Gibson, Hans Landefeld, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk  
Absent: Becky Hartle

Staff: Chris Thompson, City Manager; Dan Boron, Planning Consultant; Raj Sharma, City Engineer; Elmer Dudas, Assistant City Engineer; Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary

II. Agenda Items

A. Final Development Plan, Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, preliminary review of office component

Background

This agenda item is a request submitted by Troy Messer, P.E., Kleingers & Associates, on behalf of Coffman Development Company, for a preliminary review of the majority of the office component of the Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use (PUD-MU). The Village Park PUD-MU is located on the southwest corner of North Main Street (SR 741) and Pennyroyal Road.

The area that is the subject of this request is approximately 22.63 acres of land on the west side of Gardner Road extending from Pennyroyal Road on the north to Anna Drive on the south. Approximately 9.34 acres of the proposed office area is located north of Village Park Boulevard; the remaining 13.29 acres is located to the south.

The office component of the Village Park PUD-MU was approved as part of the General Plan for the PUD in 2004.

Adjacent land uses to the proposed office area include: to the west, a city park and the residential component of the Village Park PUD-MU; to the north a low-density residential uses north of Pennyroyal Road in Clearcreek Township; office and retail uses proposed as part of the Village Park PUD-MU to the east; and to the south the Easton Farm.

As indicated in the submitted site plans, a total of 280,000 square foot of office space is proposed in a total of 17 office buildings ranging in size from 8,000 to 22,000 to 32,000 square feet. A total of 134,000 square feet of office is proposed in five buildings located on the north side of Village Park Boulevard; 146,000 square feet of office is proposed in ten buildings located on the south side of Village Park Boulevard.

Staff Review Comments:

1. A patternbook for the office component needs to be prepared outlining proposed building design, streetscape and other project design details—for example, lighting, landscaping, signage—for subsequent review of individual sites/buildings.
2. In what matter does the development propose to seek approval for individual areas of the office component of Village Park? Specific plans, in writing, need to be provided.
3. Are sidewalks proposed to be extended to connect to the park area to the west?
4. What plans does the developer have to provide a buffer between the proposed office development and the multi-family residential area to the west?
5. Staff reiterates its recommendation to the developer that the placement of the office building on lot 5 be moved to the north.
6. No part of a parking lot or circulation aisle to be closer than nine feet (9') to any established street right of way or property line. See Ordinance Section #1271.04 (c) (7). Some accommodation on the placement of the parking area relative to the city park can be discussed with the City.
7. Show parking spaces required and provided for each lot.
8. The exterior lighting to be provided as per City of Springboro Ordinance Section 1271.02.
9. Please indicate the building set back lines.
10. The parking spaces may be modified to ensure access to Fire Department Connections to be determined.

Chris Tinder of Coffman Development Company and Troy Messer of P.E., Kleingers & Associates were in attendance to answer any questions of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Tinder commented that the pattern book would be similar to that of the retail portion of the project in regard to such items such as lighting, architectural guidelines and materials. The pattern book will be provided prior to final approval. He asked that tonight's discussion be about the horizontal layout prior to any further discussion about the details. Individual buildings will be addressed in two or three specific sites for pattern book review. He explained that the project would be presented in pads with subsequent owners submitting their individual plans to Planning Commission. These plans would follow the development's pattern book.

Mr. Boron asked whether the plans phasing would come to Planning Commission by the number of parcels (five) proposed for the site or as individual buildings (seventeen as indicated in the plans).

Mr. Tinder answered that it would not be in 5 lots but as individual pads. Coffman Development does not expect to build most of the buildings.

Ms. Gibson asked whether condos would be sold as lots or pads, which are buildings within the lot.

Mr. Tinder answered that the condos would be sold as pads.

Mr. Boron asked how site plans would be presented, considering site development issues such as parking.

Mr. Tinder answered that Coffman would like to control how the parking is laid out. The owners would have control only over their own building sidewalks and landscaping.

Mr. Chmiel asked whether the requests for layouts are for a maximum footprint. He asked what would occur if an owner requested a change such as two larger buildings instead on four smaller ones.

Mr. Tinder answered that yes, no further square footage is possible. If more square footage were added than more parking would also need to be added. He explained that the size of the pads would dictate the size of the building to be placed there.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Tinder about the concept and whether once approved the plans would need to be changed.

Mr. Tinder answered that he will work with Mr. Boron to plan a layout of approved buildable lots with layouts and specific commitments for the developer as far as the parking lot, sidewalks and landscaping. The only variation will be in the elevations of the buildings and their specific landscaping once having met the requirements of the pattern book. More detailed requirements can be required of the builders if requested by Planning Commission.

Mr. Chmiel asked whether the Planning Commission could be given a firm set of variables for approval that would set boundaries for the project.

M. Landefeld asked about the plan to sell the buildings as condos with common parking areas and whether the lots would be subdivided.

Mr. Tinder answered that the lots would not be subdivided, but an association would manage the common area. Individual owners would pay a common area fee for this management.

Ms. Gibson asked why the project was divided into five lots.

Mr. Tinder explained that for General Plan approval the lots have to be divided into lots of a minimum of two acres and a maximum of 8 acres. These lots can be adjusted as needed.

Mr. Chmiel asked whether the common area maintenance would be shared by lot or by site.

Mr. Tinder answered that the entire site would share the maintenance, prorated by the owner's square footage. Until the project is complete this would be based on the maximum square footage that is proposed for the entire site.

Ms. Ridd expressed her disappointment in the proposal. Previous plans had showed walkways, common gathering areas and clustered buildings. These plans show only parking and buildings. She also asked Mr. Tinder about the amount of parking shown.

Mr. Tinder explained that the plans do not show the pedestrian detail yet. Pedestrian gathering places will be included. He explained that the parking is broken down per lot, with some over the limit and some under the limit and the total parking being 10% over the minimum required.

Mr. Landefeld indicated that he would like to see a trail between the residential and commercial developments with the least amount of crossings. A trail from Pennyroyal Road to the city parks would be appropriate.

Mr. Papakirk asked for clarification that the buildings would be the responsibility of the new owners. He asked about the responsibility of the parking and landscaping.

Mr. Tinder explained that Coffman Development would present the pattern book but will only overlook the projects. Coffman would be responsible for the layout of the parking but will not be responsible for installation of the parking lot.

Mr. Papakirk asked how the landscaping plans would be handled with the owners, in order to ensure uniformity and consistency.

Mr. Tinder explained that the landscaping would be addressed in the pattern book, with plans by Siebenthaler landscaping.

Ms. Ridd asked whether Coffman Development would approve the plans and whether Coffman Development would be responsible for maintenance.

Mr. Tinder answered yes that the plans would be approved per the pattern books.

Mr. Papakirk expressed his concern that different entities will be working on the landscaping and their ability to maintain a consistent quality.

Mr. Tinder asked whether Planning Commission would prefer a set landscape plan for each building.

Mr. Papakirk expressed a concern about that possibility with the buildings being built at different times and in different shapes. Some conformity and unity needs to be agreed upon.

Ms. Belpulsi asked if different plantings could be suggested to allow for different styles but maintain a consistent plan.

Mr. Papakirk answered that the pattern book has some suggestions, but does not address the design. He expressed his concern that a design be maintained.

Mr. Tinder responded that they are open to addressing the concern. In future contracts with building owners it will be stated that Siebenthalers must design the landscape plan.

Ms. Belpulsi expressed concern that with the uncertainty of the building plans, more consistency in the pattern book would be important. She requested that the pattern book be very specific.

Mr. Chmiel asked whether the plan could be laid out by a certain amount of material per foot.

Mr. Papakirk asked that a street tree plan be established that is set in stone with some flexibility around the buildings and in the parking areas.

Mr. Tinder referred to staff comment number three and explained that the walkways would be connected in multiple areas to the park property. A proposed trail system in the residential portion of the property would include a pond and benches with a sidewalk.

Ms. Thompson clarified that the staff has proposed a trade off of a trail on the park property to connect the residential and commercial property to the south and to Pennyroyal Road.

Mr. Landefeld agreed that it would be an asset to all users.

Mr. Tinder agreed that they would like to connect the sidewalks to the park to the west and to the trail system.

Mr. Tinder referred to staff comment number four and explained that they propose a landscape screenage to at a minimum to include a tree line.

Mr. Messer explained that there is a wide gap for screening at the multi-family area. Other areas may be more difficult due to utility easements, but will be addressed.

Ms. Gibson asked what the setback and the height would be for the three-story building. She expressed that she would like to see the setback be twice the height of the building. She approved of the plan to build the one story buildings nearer to the residential areas. She would like to see the larger concentration of office space closer to the park as opposed to up against the residential property. She recommended that the plans be flipped to allow the three story building in the south and the one story buildings to the north. This will also eliminate any problems with the setbacks. She agrees with the city staff's comment number five, that the building be moved closer to the north in order to eliminate the parking along Pennyroyal Road.

Mr. Tinder was not opposed to the idea, at this point no owners have been identified, only prospects, so this could be a possibility. The reason for the placement of the building is to present an attractive entry way off of Gardner Road. He appreciated the concern for the appeal along Pennyroyal Road but felt that there would be a significant amount of landscaping to accomplish the greenspace look. The parking spaces along Gardner road will be edged with denser shrubs to screen it more effectively. No user is in mind; prospects have expressed an interest in being near the Kettering Medical Center site.

Mr. Landefeld expressed a concern about the building owners developing portions of the parking lots and how it will work. He asked about the need for a staging area as construction progresses.

Mr. Tinder will discuss the phasing of the office park with Mr. Boron and construction will be controlled to avoid a scattered look.

Mr. Chmiel asked whether the lots would be sold separately or as pads and whether Coffman Development would retain ownership of the lot itself.

Mr. Tinder answered that that the lots would be sold as condos with the buyers owning the land under the building and certain square footage around it.

Ms. Gibson asked whether there would be an owner to the lot.

Mr. Tinder answered that the office association would be the owner of the lot.

Mr. Chmiel expressed concern that the project and parking lot construction phasing is hard to visualize due to question of the various building sizes and the uncertainty of when they would be built.

Ms. Gibson asked Mr. Tinder or Mr. Boron to present examples of this type of development to answer questions about how it will progress to completion and how it is run.

Mr. Boron answered that he can present smaller scale versions of this type of project.

Ms. Ridd asked Mr. Tinder to explain how he will accommodate prospects that may want to build outside of the planned phasing and whether builders would be willing to wait for a lot in the size that they need.

Mr. Tinder explained that some phasing is to be expected while the infrastructure is completed. Lots will only be available as construction progresses.

Ms. Ridd expressed concern that she didn't think it would be possible to make a user wait for a property, she expects that the project will need to be amended to accommodate the users as the project proceeds. With all of the buildings being varied in size and with different builders, it will make the project more difficult to accomplish smoothly.

Mr. Tinder agreed that it would be more difficult to complete because the site is not planned out entirely. The project will be broken up into sections to allow work to proceed as needed.

Mr. Chmiel expressed the need to work on the parking lot plan to make sure it is completed in unison with the buildings. He also asked about waste containers and their location, signage and whether signs would be grouped at an entryway and delivery access. He expressed his concern about truck traffic to service the buildings.

Mr. Tinder explained that that would be addressed in more detail in the future. He will explore possible solutions to the problem.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Tinder to review staff comments and present a more concrete plan. Planning Commission will allow some flexibility but she felt that more structure is needed.

Mr. Tinder answered that at this point he is asking Planning Commission to review the general layout of the project. He will review the project with attention to the layout of the buildings and the landscaping.

Ms. Gibson reiterated her preference that the larger building be moved farther away from the residential portion of the development.

Ms. Ridd reminded Mr. Tinder that the buildings must comply with the setbacks.

Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Tinder how Coffman Development would handle a builder who came in with a proposal for one large building with the same square footage instead of four small ones on the same lot. She also asked how Coffman would deal with the condition of the rest of the parking lot should one building be finished with limited finished parking spaces.

Mr. Tinder answered that a change in the number of buildings would not be approved.

Mr. Chmiel asked how drainage and sewer could be completed when only part of the parking lot would be completed.

Mr. Boron suggested that marketing a larger portion of the site with complete infrastructure might be easier than marketing just a single pad. He is concerned about the time frame for future buildings.

Mr. Tinder answered that they are working with a projection of completion within five-eight years. He explained that they couldn't put in the entire parking lot immediately.

Ms. Thompson explained that they are only asked for the parking lots to be completed as the lots are completed.

B. Final Development Plan, The Springs Planned Unit Development, The Villas condominiums, exterior elevations and lighting plans

Background

This agenda item is a follow-up review on the lighting plans and exterior building elevations proposed for The Villages condominiums proposed for The Springs Planned Unit Development (PUD). The Final Development Plan for The Villas condominiums was approved at the December 12, 2006 Planning Commission meeting with the condition of providing Planning Commission, at the developer's earliest opportunity, with color renditions of the proposed building elevations and lighting plans.

Staff Review Comments:

1. The Clearcreek Fire District offered a reminder to the developer about posting the access streets no parking to ensure emergency vehicle access.

Chris Tinder of Coffman Development Company and Troy Messer of P.E., Kleingers & Associates were in attendance to answer any questions of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Tinder responded to the staff comment concerning the sign posting and stated that the signage would be completed. The signs are not shown on the plans but could be added.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that the signs should be put on the plans to alleviate any confusion.

Mr. Tinder stated that he would add the signage to the plans and resubmit.

Ms. Thompson asked what the price point of the condominiums would be.

Mr. Tinder answered that they would be listed at \$250,000 to \$275,000 for 1800 to 2200 square feet.

C. Rezoning and General Plan Amendments, The Enclave Planned Unit Development-Business and Planned Unit Development-Residential, preliminary review of proposed expansion of retail development

Background

This agenda item is a request by John Chico, P.E., McDougal Marsh and Chico, representing Bob Abernathy, developer, for a preliminary review of proposed changes to both The Enclave Planned Unit Development-Residential (PUD-R) and The Enclave Planned Unit Development-

Business (PUD-B). Both PUDs are located on the southwest corner of East Central Avenue (SR 73) and Red Lion-Five Points Road.

The Enclave PUD-B was approved by City Council in 2002 for a 8.87-acre retail business development using B-2, Local Business District uses as a basis and with restrictions on the maximum size of individual buildings (6,000 square feet with 10,000 square feet with Planning Commission approval). The Enclave PUD-R was approved by City Council in 2001. Since that time three (3) individual sections or phases have been proposed. Sections 1 and 2, located on the south side of the PUD-R area, have been platted and are largely built-out. Together these two sections are approximately 13.34 acres in area. The requested change will not have an effect on these two areas.

Section 3, while approved in terms of General Plan, Final Development Plan and Record Plan, has not been developed. As approved, Section 3's 4.69 acres included 18 single-family residential lots, right-of-way dedication and open space dedication.

As indicated in the submitted plans, the applicants are proposing to expand the PUD-B by 4.69 acres by moving Section 3 from the PUD-R to the PUD-B area. The addition of 4.69 acres to the PUD-B would allow for two (2) additional retail lots to be platted totaling 2.1133 acres in area along with a landscape buffer between the expanded PUD-B and the remainder of the PUD-R.

The requested change would require a number of Planning Commission, City Council and administrative actions. Following Planning Commission review and acceptance of the concept of the addition to the PUD-B area, these actions would include, at a minimum, (1) the rezoning of Section 3's 4.69 acres from PUD-R to PUD-B; (2) the General Plans for both the PUD-B and PUD-R would need to be revised; and (3) the Final Development Plan and Record Plans for Section 3 of the PUD-R would need to be vacated.

Staff Review Comments:

1. Provide a public cul-de-sac with dedicated right-of-way per City of Springboro specifications.

Tom McDougal of McDougal, Marsh and Chico and Bob Abernathy, developer, were in attendance to answer any questions of the Planning Commission.

Mr. McDougal explained that the purpose of the requested change is to move the business zoning line. No change to the residential portion will be made at this time. A change in usage of the greenspace is still under consideration.

Mr. Abernathy explained that plans at one time called for greenspace to be given to the residents but was functionally not possible. Space would be added to the greenspace to create a limited common area.

Mr. Boron explained that the residential PUD would need to meet the minimum 25% open space requirement.

Mr. McDougal explained that the new PUD-R plans that remain would include 26.8% greenspace. The landscape buffer will remain in the ownership of the business portion of the development and they will be responsible for maintenance.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether this management would be one entity.

Mr. McDougal agreed the maintenance would be managed by one business park association. He added that the detention area is not included in the 26.8%.

Mr. Chmiel asked for clarification about what portion of the development has been platted and homes completed. The map was reviewed with Mr. McDougal.

Ms. Gibson asked about the current residents and the impact on their property.

Mr. Boron explained that a meeting had been held at the request of the City between the developer and the residential neighbors to clarify the changes and ask for their input.

Mr. Chmiel asked whether another access was being shown on the plans. He asked whether the business portion would be interconnected with the residential.

Mr. McDougal explained that there would be no direct access but an emergency access is planned. It will not be an open street.

Mr. Landefeld asked about the landscape proposal.

Mr. Abernathy responded that Envision works has a proposal, which will be presented at future meetings.

Mr. Boron explained that at this time the general plan is being presented only.

Ms. Gibson commented that the land had not been developed, why they were asking for more land and whether they had a vision planned.

Mr. Abernathy explained that they do not have concrete plans but are looking at local business office uses. The residential lots did not work in Section 3 of the residential PUD. The business project may not proceed for potentially 5 years.

Mr. McDougal explained that a design is ready should a buyer become available.

Ms. Gibson asked whether they would stay within the same guidelines as far as the types of businesses.

Mr. Abernathy stated that they are asking for nothing more as far as the zoning.

Mr. Papakirk clarified that nothing will change in rezoning except for the boundary line.

Mr. McDougal answered that yes, the planned usage will not change.

Mr. Boron explained the procedure; that the General Plan for the PUD-B would need to be amended along with a rezoning from PUD-R to PUD-B, that the Record Plan for Phase 3 of the PUD-R would need to be vacated. Phases 1 and 2 of the residential PUD would not need to be changed other than overall changes to the approved General Plan and Final Development Plan.

Ms. Gibson asked for clarification about the staff comment concerning a cul-de-sac at Haverstraw. The map was reviewed and staff will be consulted. She expressed that the landscape buffer that will be designed for that area should be substantial. She asked if the landscape plan could be included in the rezoning for approval.

Mr. Abernathy agreed to present a landscape plan and will meet with staff to discuss.

### III. Guest Comments

David Weinberg, 176 Haverstraw Place commented that the residents concern was the change in greenspace from the original plan shown to residents by representatives of the developer at a meeting in November and a second meeting on December 12th. Traffic was also a concern for residents.

Ms. Ridd explained that there would be a substantial buffer for the residents and commented that the Planning Commission would be vigilant about the landscaping. She asked that the amount of greenspace be made clear in the motion to approve the rezoning.

Ms. Belpulsi added that the Planning Commission would review the landscape plan.

Dave Arndt, 164 Haverstraw Place asked why the greenspace would be the responsibility of the homeowners and not the city.

Ms. Ridd explained that that is part of the original site plan and is between the developer and the homeowners association.

Mr. Boron explained that the number of homes has been reduced so the amount of greenspace needed to retain the 25% minimum has also decreased proportionally.

Greg Miller, 90 Waldwick Way claimed he was misinformed by Beazer Homes about the plans for the development and the size of his yard. He is concerned about the landscaping and the location of the mound.

Ms Belpulsi explained that those plans have yet to be presented and that Planning Commission will review them once presented.

Mr. Miller asked about plans for a gas station on the west end of the property and expressed his concern about that.

Mr. Sharma explained that plans for a gas station were part of the original plans for the PUD-B area and has been approved.

Ms. Belpulsi reassured Mr. Miller that Planning Commission would review the gas station plans in relation to the lighting and the placement of the pumps with regards to the effects on the neighboring property. She encouraged the property owners to follow the City's website and Planning Commission's agendas for items of concern to them.

David Kirschner, 25 Woodcliff Blvd expressed his concern about the traffic in the area. With the possibility of a childcare business being proposed for the site, he is concerned about the additional traffic generated by the location.

Ms. Thompson commented that the city has no control over possible lights on SR 73. The county would be responsible for establishing the need for a light.

Ms. Belpulsi thanked Mr. Kirschner for his comments and encouraged him to talk to county officials to express his concern. Planning Commission and City staff working with the city's traffic engineer will continue to work with the county and the township on traffic concerns.

Debbie Young, 65 Haverstraw Place asked about the emergency access.

Ms Belpulsi answered that the road will be for only emergency access and there is not plans for an entrance from the business portion to the residential portion. The emergency access will be grass and only available for use by emergency vehicles.

Mr. Boron explained that based on Planning Commission review earlier in the meeting, the plans would be formally considered at the January 31st Planning Commission meeting. He will notify Mr. Weinberg as the neighborhood representative before the meeting. Neighbors will be notified of any public hearings should those occur in the future.

#### IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Ms. Belpulsi poled the Planning Commission about the planned Council/Planning Commission retreat scheduled January 27, 2007 from 8:00 am to noon. The date was approved and the time for the Planning Commission session was confirmed to be from 10:00 am to noon in Council chambers.

Ms. Gibson asked staff to review the plans for the Coldwell Banker building on North Main Street and confirm that it was built according to the plans approved by the Planning Commission.

City Staff will follow up and report.

#### V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, January 10, 2007 Work Session at 8:48 P.M.

---

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chair

---

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

---

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary