

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

Planning Commission Work Session  
Wednesday, January 9, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the Springboro Planning Commission Work Session to order at the temporary Springboro Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 425 South Pioneer Boulevard, Springboro, Ohio.

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Chairperson, Jim Chmiel, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld, 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. Preliminary Review of Final Development Plan  
Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, Office Component

Background

This agenda item is a request submitted by Greg Martin of Village Park Office Commons, LLC, property owners and developers, for 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.

This proposed project was last reviewed by the Planning Commission at the November 14, 2007 Work Session at which time the new developers of the office park were introduced and a general discussion of issues on the site took place. Comments submitted by staff for the November 14th Work Session were general in nature; since more detailed aspects of the proposal have been presented, a more detailed set of comments are provided by staff below.

The area that is the subject of this request is approximately 22.63 acres of land on the west side of the proposed 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 Village Park PUD-MU in 2004. Other office space, located on the southwest corner of Pennyroyal Road at North Main Street (SR 741) is not subject to this review/approval request.

Adjacent land uses to the proposed office area include: to the west, an undeveloped city park and the undeveloped 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 for a total of 15 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 (5) buildings located on the north side of Village Park Boulevard; 146,000 square feet of office is proposed in ten (10) buildings located on the south side of Village Park Boulevard.

Changes to the November Work Session submittal include indications of a six-part phasing plan for the office component of the Village Park PUD-MU and a draft version of a patternbook for the office component.

Staff comments below are organized to include those directed at the proposed patternbook and preliminary Final Development Plan.

Patternbook Staff Comments (references are to page number of 12/28/06 draft):

1. Pages 5-6. Office development landscaping. Are no shrubs are other vegetation proposed for common areas of office park such as site entrances, parking areas, etc.? Also please indicate proposed vegetation for the private access drives to the development.
2. Pages 5-6. Office development landscaping. Please indicate proposed landscaping density for use on the patternbook (e.g., specimens per acre, shade trees per parking space, ornamental trees per linear foot of roadway).
3. Pages 5-6. Office development landscaping. Please delete "or eliminated" from general note on landscaping and lighting locations.
4. Pages 5-6. Office development landscaping. Please add note indicating site plan suggested is for planning purposes only. Exact building locations and site development such as parking lot configurations subject to Planning Commission review through Final Development Plan review process.
5. Pages 5-6. Office development landscaping. Additional landscaping is recommended by staff for the following locations: (1) on eastern perimeter facing the city park and proposed residential area; (2) on the Pennyroyal Road frontage to screen the proposed parking area; (3) on the Gardner Road frontage overall and (4) where plans suggested gaps in the shade trees along Village Park Drive.
6. Page 7. Building/site landscaping. As with the proposed office development landscaping, please indicate the proposed density of vegetation proposed and specimen size (e.g., diameter breast height, gallons or feet high as applicable).
7. Page 8. Office development signage. Please provide page references for signage A and B.
8. Page 8. Office development signage. What are the developers plans for matching proposed signage for the office park with the overall Village Park PUD-MU development (e.g., signage at SR 741 and Anna Drive; SR 741 and Village Park Drive)? That signage package was approved under the retail patternbook in February 2006 but has not been constructed.
9. Page 9. Please indicate proposed building materials for dumpster surround.
10. Pages 10-11. Building/site signage. Please contact Dan Boron, Planning Consultant, for comments regarding proposed building/site signage for individual buildings in the office park.
11. Page 12. Typical elevation. Please indicate whether buildings are to match the proposed building indicated on this page or that the proposal is for scale and form match only.
12. Page 12. Typical elevation. Please indicate proposed exterior building materials. Also add note indicating, if applicable, that materials to be used on one-, two- and three-story buildings.

13. Page 13. Please indicate proposed exterior building materials. Also how will the three-story elevation design be included in patternbook?
14. Page 14. Lighting. As with the proposed landscaping plans, it would be helpful to determine how and where the lighting will be installed and the selected manufacturer/model. Will there be a hierarchy for the lighting for use on the overall development and individual buildings/sites?
15. Page 14. Lighting. Please add a note indicating all exterior lighting including canopy lighting to be high-pressure sodium. No exceptions.
16. Page 14. Lighting. Are not wall-mounted lighting fixtures proposed?
17. Page 15. Roofing and Brick. Please provide manufacturer and product name for proposed brick range of color. Also provide a note that indicates, "For matching purposes only."
18. Page 16. Trim and Siding. Can a color manufacture/name be provided to tie colors to such as the proposed roofing materials on page 15.

Preliminary Final Development Plan comments:

1. Please indicate plans for the proposed north-south pedestrian connection for the PUD-MU.
2. The right-of-ways are to be dedicated and public improvements constructed or bonded, including sidewalks, for all public streets (Gardner Road, Village Park Blvd., Anna Drive, SR 741, and Pennyroyal Road) within the Village Park development, as previously approved by planning commission, before any additional individual final development plans are to be approved by the planning commission.
3. Provide association documents to be reviewed by the City. Occupancy permits will not be issued until the documents have been approved by the City and then recorded.
4. Construct the Anna Drive extension to the south property line and record the record plan.
5. Provide the lot lines and acreage breakdown of each lot. Per the approved general plan, the minimum lot size is 2 acres and the maximum lot size is 8 acres.
6. Connect interior sidewalks to the public walks along Gardner Road and Village Park Boulevard.
7. Indicate where curbing is being used, if any, within the parking lots and islands.
8. Provide separate construction drawings for the sanitary sewer main and water main.
9. For each final development plan phase, provide the storm sewer, water main and sanitary sewer design, as well as the proposed grading for the parking lot with spot elevations.
10. Obtain private storm sewer easements for the offsite storm sewers west of the property.
11. Proposed 8" water mains to be looped.
12. Sanitary sewer to be at least 20' from the building face.
13. The proposed water main and sanitary sewer to be designed and built as per City specifications and standards. Also provide water main and sanitary sewer easements as per City's request.
14. Show the details for the type of curb, sidewalk-curb combinations and sidewalk.
15. The sanitary sewer laterals to be at least 15' from the manhole.
16. Show the breakdown of the office area, parking spaces and handicapped parking spaces for the north and south side of Village Park Drive.
17. Clearcreek Fire District Comment: Per phone conversation with Joshua Liles with Apex, we require one (1) additional fire hydrant near Northeast corner of building 4 and one (1) additional hydrant to be located between 40 and 75 feet of the fire department connection of building 11. Mr. Hoff apologized for any confusion regarding the submission requirements. Some details may have been omitted from the plans and updated plans will be submitted before the next Planning Commission meeting. The lighting and landscaping plans will be submitted at that time.

Greg Martin, Dick Lawton, Dan Fishbaugh and Tom Streiff of Village Park Office Commons LLC were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Greg Martin introduced the members of the Village Park Commons LLC team.

Mr. Lawton of Berns Landscaping explained his background and the concepts behind the landscaping plans and the intent to establish an interior feeling and maintain a village concept. He reviewed the plans for the various areas of the development and the types of landscaping to be used.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Papakirk commented that he likes the approach. He would like to see more trees along Gardner Road with the intention that Planning Commission ensure that the other side of the street be treated equally. He also commented that the trees per linear foot were to be used as a good guide. Taking into account visibility, he would like to see more trees in the islands. Mr. Papakirk felt that the standard for the trees at 2" was small. He felt that, as a standard 2-1/2" would be more appropriate.

Mr. Lawton responded that the choice between 2" and 2-1/2" trees was based not only on availability but on studies that showed that smaller trees are better and in a 40-60 year cycle, younger trees respond better. He added that his concept is to let the area develop uniquely not by continuous patterning.

Mr. Papakirk commented that it was not his intent to use the guideline to have the trees planted in a row or every so many feet, but as a total number of trees, which may be grouped. His concern was that both sides of Gardner Road look balanced.

Mr. Lawton asked if there was a plan for the other side of the street.

Mr. Boron explained that there was an overall plan but that landscape plan would need to be approved as the development continues.

Ms. Gibson asked if this plan should become the standard for both sides of the street.

Planning Commission agreed.

Mr. Chmiel asked Mr. Papakirk if his comments were directed to the north portion of the property or the entire development with regard to the trees being in a row and not clustered.

Mr. Papakirk explained that his comment was just addressing the number of trees as a standard.

Ms. Belpulsi summarized that Planning Commission would like to see the number of trees be increased based on the formula and that the dispersement would be up to the developer.

Mr. Papakirk suggested that a standard might be one shade tree and 10 shrubs per thirty-five feet or fifty feet. He added that the numbers are not as important as a good design.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that the Planning Commission seemed to desire more trees and ones with 2-1/2" "as a standard.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Papakirk if he was suggesting more trees in each grouping or more groupings with trees.

Mr. Papakirk answered that he would like to see more trees in each grouping and commented that the spacing of the trees is distant.

Ms. Ridd asked how Mr. Lawton envisions the landscaping around each building and whether he could increase the amount of landscaping in areas where there may be fewer trees seeing that each building would be landscaped differently.

Mr. Lawton commented that the buildings are beautiful and that the landscaping should reflect that.

Mr. Fishbaugh commented that the intent is to have the buildings visible and attractive from traffic.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that for the Planning Commission the pattern book is the City's and the developer's guideline to approve the development.

Ms. Ridd commented that the development has some spectacular entranceways that need to be included in the plan.

Mr. Landefeld asked Mr. Papakirk if he approved of the mix of trees.

Mr. Papakirk answered yes, but he would like to see more trees in the islands to break up the parking lots.

Mr. Lawton answered that the trees would block the lights.

Mr. Papakirk suggested ornamental trees with a canopy that may be seen through.

Mr. Lawson commented that ornamental trees might block the peripheral vision.

Ms Belpulsi asked Mr. Boron if he had any further comments.

Mr. Boron commented that the Planning Commission and applicant comments have made sense. He added that without limiting creativity that the pattern book needs standards for staff to evaluate.

Mr. Lawton asked that the terminology of caliper and American Nursery Standard be used for clarification.

Ms. Belpulsi concluded the discussion by saying that some embellishments and greeneries need to be added.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments concerning the signage.

Mr. Landefeld commented that his concern is that signage has been approved for an earlier section and that a standard look be merged between the two portions of the development.

Mr. Martin commented that the same brick would be used in the signage as in the building and stated that they would desire to avoid any contrast.

Mr. Fishbaugh commented that no specific make of brick had been chosen. The same font as previously approved would be used. Back lit metal letters with neon behind it had been approved, but due to the unreliability, raised limestone letters with up lighting would be used. This change has been approved by the developer.

Mr. Martin commented that their signage would match the brick of their buildings and not for example Max and Erma's and asked whether Planning Commission prefers that the signage match in color or design.

Mr. Landefeld answered that the conformity of the signage should include all residential and retail portions.

Ms. Thompson stated that now is the time to change the design.

Ms. Ridd added that as long as the font was the same there should be no problem.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments about the dumpster design.

Mr. Fishbaugh explained that the dumpster designs are being revised. The interior of the dumpster would be block with brick exterior. In speaking with Mr. Lawton the fencing was too long, so it is proposed that the fencing be removed from both ends with the brick stepped down on each end.

Mr. Lawton commented that landscaping would be added to soften the pattern.

Mr. Fishbaugh added that this would be indicated in the patternbook.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for comments or questions about the building signage.

Mr. Fishbaugh explained the proposed signage is a small sign in front of the buildings for multiple users with the flexibility for one larger sign on a building for one tenant in a single building.

Ms. Gibson asked that the signage be shown on the buildings with explanations for either/or single or multiple users.

Mr. Boron commented that the signage would be understated as opposed to retail signage and likely won't hit the Sign Code's cap. One concern though is the 2 or 3 story building signage. Staff will work with the developers.

Mr. Landefeld asked that the name and the addresses be on two faces of the building to make them easier to find.

Mr. Fishbaugh commented that the addresses would be placed over the doorways for consistency and to not conflict with the business names.

Mr. Landefeld asked that they be placed on the street side.

Ms. Ridd suggested that since the entrances are back from the street that the addresses be visible.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments about the elevations.

Mr. Landefeld asked that an example be provided for a three story building.

Mr. Fishbaugh explained that the development will be completed in phases. A tenant for a three story building may have definite requirements that would be proposed to Planning Commission at that time.

Ms. Belpulsi asked that the look be consistent with the rest of the development.

Ms. Gibson asked about the bricks, whether they are the same bricks or in the same family.

Mr. Fishbaugh explained that the intent was to propose a range, the bricks would be of the size and sample will be provided.

Mr. Boron asked that the material manufacturer information be provided in the patternbook.

Ms. Thompson asked about the colors provided in the proposed patternbook.

Mr. Fishbaugh answered that actual samples would be provided before the next meeting.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for comments or questions about the lighting.

Mr. Fishbaugh explained that they would confirm to City standards. No wall mounted lighting is proposed.

Ms. Ridd asked whether the police department would be okay with no building lighting as far as security.

Mr. Fishbaugh commented that the lighting would be provided in the canopies, in the recessed lighting.

Mr. Boron asked whether all three lamps proposed would be used.

Mr. Fishbaugh answered that the light on the left would not be used; the light on the right may not be used.

Mr. Boron commented that the lighting would need to comply with the airport regulations. He added that the canopy would need to comply with high-pressure sodium requirements of the City.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for any final questions or comments regarding the pattern book.

Mr. Boron commented that the patternbook may be completed concurrent with the phasing and that final development approval would be contingent upon approval of the patternbook.

Ms. Belpulsi asked the developers for any question or comments to staff regarding the final development staff comments.

Mr. Streiff commented that he will work with Mr. Sharma and Mr. Dudas to resolve the staff comments.

Mr. Papakirk asked about the curbing referred to in comment #7.

Mr. Martin explained that the curbing is shown on the revised plans and is not labeled on the original plans.

Mr. Streiff reviewed the curbing at the main entrances and islands.

Mr. Papakirk asked about the interior islands and added that he would prefer that they be curbed.

Mr. Streiff stated that the plan was not to curb those islands.

Ms. Belpulsi conferred with and agreed that the Planning Commission would recommend that the islands be curbed.

Mr. Boron commented that staff comment #5 is procedural and would be dealt once the general plan is approved and the phasing is proposed. The limitation of 2-8 acres would not work relative to the current proposal and would need to be revised in the general plan.

Mr. Martin agreed that staff comment #3 is standard as far as the association documents.

Mr. Martin asked about the pedestrian connection proposed in staff comment #1 and the intent of the connection.

Mr. Boron explained that the north south connection is PUD wide and is intended to connect the Easton Farm to any future development to the north. The trail could be placed in the City park area and the City would be willing to accept the trail. This walkway was in the original concept.

Ms. Thompson added that the trail is intended to connect Anna Drive with Pennyroyal Road. The City will work with the developer to complete the project.

Mr. Martin and Ms. Thompson reviewed current and proposed sidewalks and walkways in the project and connecting to adjacent properties.

Ms. Gibson explained that in the original plans there were to be an internal sidewalk system with sidewalks along the main streets in addition to a bike trail with a longer connection much further north and south.

Mr. Martin asked whether the intention was for a trail in addition to a City sidewalk or instead of one.

Ms. Thompson explained that the intention is for a trail to connect Austin Pike to Pennyroyal, Anna and S.R. 741 and internally. How this is accomplished is up to the Planning Commission. Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Landefeld whether these were two separate issues.

Mr. Landefeld responded they are two separate issues. A trail would accommodate bikes, which are generally not allowed on City sidewalks. Bikeways are by design wider and would be used by bikes traveling at a greater speed than pedestrians.

Ms. Thompson explained that long term plans for the City call for a dedicated bikeway from Austin Road into the City that does not interfere with pedestrian traffic. Ms. Thompson added that easements have been taken in South Tech to continue the trail.

Ms. Thompson added that the City would work with the developers to complete the bikeway.

Mr. Chmiel asked how Mr. Martin envisioned a break area for employees outside of the buildings. Mr. Martin explained that it would be driven by the building user.

Mr. Chmiel asked if he felt the lack of a gathering area would pose a challenge.

Ms. Gibson commented that she didn't foresee a problem.

Mr. Streiff asked if it was too early to turn in construction plans.

Ms. Thompson explained that plans could be approved contingent upon approval of the patternbook.

Ms. Gibson asked if there were any objections to the footprints.

There were none from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Martin explained that an approval would help with potential customers.

Mr. Boron and Mr. Streiff will work to complete the proposal and resolve any issues before the January 30th Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Boron explained that the next steps would be revising the general plan, approving the patternbook and final development plan and approving Phase I, the first five buildings.

### III. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments.

### IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Mr. Landefeld distributed articles concerning wind turbines, a mixed use development in Dublin and one on urban developments impact on seniors to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Boron commented that there is a wind farm in the process of approval at the state level. He will forward information to Planning Commission as it develops.

Mr. Landefeld offered to give a presentation on trails to Planning Commission at the January 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The Planning Commission members accepted his offer.

Mr. Boron reminded Planning Commission members that election of officers would need to be held at the January 30 regular meeting. He added that staff would have a proposal for the Planning Commission for changes to the parking regulations for restaurants with regard to sit down vs. drive thru restaurants.

Ms. Ridd pointed out that the Planning Commission meeting in November is scheduled for the night before Thanksgiving. Planning Commission will make a decision at that time whether the meeting would be rescheduled.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, January 9, 2008 Work Session at 8:46 P.M.

---

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chair

---

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

---

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary