

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

Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, November 10, 2010, 6:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the Springboro Planning Commission Work Session to order at the Springboro Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Chairperson, David Vomacka, Janie Ridd, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld, Becky Hartle
Absent: Chris Papakirk (Mr. Papakirk arrived at 6:55 P.M.)

Staff: Dan Boron, Planning Consultant; Elmer Dudas, City Engineer; Raj Sharma, Assistant City Engineer; Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary; Alan Schaeffer, City Attorney

II. Agenda Items

A. Final Development Plan, Lovely Farm PUD, Planned Unit Development, 330 East Central Avenue, addition to farm market building

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for Final Development Plan approval, the second-stage of the three-step Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval process, of a 3,108-square foot addition to Lovely Farm market located at 330 East Central Avenue (SR 73). The application was filed by Robin Lovely-Dowd, property and business owner. The existing market building is approximately (see comment #2 below) 6,768 square feet in area. The addition is located on the east side of the existing building

The property was rezoned to PUD effective March 1998.

Adjacent land uses to the north and east include the open space/agricultural and residential portions of the PUD. To the south the Fieldstone subdivision that is zoned R-2, Low Density Residential District and the Richards Run Business Park PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, to the southwest.

This item was on the October 13th Planning Commission Work Session agenda and at the conclusion of the review of this agenda item it was determined that formal review and approval could occur at the November 10th formal business Meeting. Based on the comments below, particularly item #1, staff recommends that this item be on the November 10th Work Session agenda so that the questions raised in the staff comments can be address prior to formal approval.

Staff Comments

1. The base mapping used is incorrect and needs to be based on correct as-built information particularly relative to existing parking areas, right-of-way and property lines. Please show existing property line between farm market and residential lot to the west. Drawing A1.0 needs to indicate areas of proposed pavement (parking and drives) as well as proposed building locations accurately.
2. All proposed parking and driveway areas to be constructed of asphalt or other non-gravel surface.
3. Based on the proposed addition eight (8) additional off-street parking spaces will need to be provided.
4. Please clarify the provision of water and sewer to proposed building addition.
5. Please indicate if any exterior building lighting is proposed. If so it will need to comply with Section 1271.02 (Exterior Lighting) of the Planning and Zoning Code.
6. Dedicate 60' of right of way along the north side of SR 73.
7. Dedicate 35' Public Access Easement along SR 73.
8. Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Robin Lovely-Dowd of Lovely's Farm Market was in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Ms. Lovely-Dowd stated that regarding staff comment #1, she has met with staff and worked out the corrections on the site plan. Staff comments #2 and #3 she has no problems with. Staff comment #4; there will be no additional water line. Staff comment #5 is okay.

Regarding staff comments # 6 and #7, Ms. Lovely-Dowd stated that she sees little impact on the traffic on St Rt 73. She is requesting that these items be deleted. Should she build an additional building, she will approve a right-of-way at that time.

Ms. Ridd asked whether that was for the road widening.

Ms. Gibson asked whether 35" was broad across the entire city.

Mr. Dudas answered that there are two of them, a 60' right-of-way for a future five lane expansion and a 35' public access easement for a total of 95'.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments of Planning Commission.

Mr. Vomacka asked whether staff could wait on staff comments #6 and #7.

Mr. Dudas answered that they could. The City is doing roadway construction there now to three lanes.

Ms. Ridd asked that it be noted in the motion that it is being waived for now but in the future when the City needs it then it will be revisited.

Ms. Lovely-Dowd stated that she agrees and understands that.

Mr. Vomacka asked that they pay attention to the requirements of staff comment #5, in particular, wall packs that tend to shine straight out.

Ms. Lovely-Dowd answered that her business is generally closed in the evening. There is a pole light there now that could be turned on if needed.

Mr. Vomacka understands that she does not have a history of it being a concern.

Ms. Lovely-Dowd answered that she will comply with the City.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for any further questions.

There were none.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that this item would be added to tonight's regular meeting agenda for formal action.

B. Preliminary Discussion, Major Revision to the Approved General Plan, The Springs PUD, Planned Unit Development

Background Information

This agenda item is based on an application filed by Fischer Development Company, seeking a revision to the approved General Plan for The Springs PUD, Planned Unit Development. As indicated in the submittal, the applicants are proposing to revise the General Plan for a portion of The Springs PUD, as indicated in the "property boundary" on the large-size map submitted by the applicant.

The property boundary includes an area where 19 single-family homes have been completed near the southeast corner of the property along with approximately 2,000 feet of the Springs Boulevard roadway, portions of five other local streets as well as infrastructure and development amenities. A partially complete clubhouse for the subdivision is also located in this area along with a partially constructed single-family home.

The property boundary excludes The Falls area of the PUD and its 145 apartment units located on the northwest corner of the property and the "continuing care area" that is proposed to be the site of St. Mary's Catholic Church.

While no action is ever anticipated at a Work Session, City staff is approaching this review as a Preliminary Discussion to allow the applicant to provide the Planning Commission with an outline of what is proposed as part of the General Plan Revision, to obtain feedback from Planning Commission and to discuss further actions. No formal action is requested at the November 10th formal business Meeting of Planning Commission. Given the nature of the submittal at this point in time City staff comments are general in nature; City staff reserves the opportunity to comment when the General Plan Revision application is complete.

For the purposes of background, The Springs PUD was originally established in January 2000 by Coffman Development as The Glennon Farm PUD through Springboro Ordinance O-00-10. The General Plan was approved in 2002 and revised in major fashion in 2005 through Springboro Resolution R-05-48. Another General Plan Revision, pending City Council approval at the time of

this writing, will change the "continuing care area" at the northwest corner of Springs Boulevard and Yankee Road to a church use.

Under the provisions of the City of Springboro Planned Unit Development Ordinance, Chapter 1272 of the Codified Ordinance, the proposed church constitutes a major change to the approved General Plan for the PUD. As such the proposed revision would require the approval of the Planning Commission and City Council.

Staff Comments

1. Staff recommends retaining the connection to the Sycamore Springs development by way of Sycamore Springs Drive not only for purposes of connectivity but due to the City's loop water main system always planned for that location and would like to retain the Woodstream Drive connection if possible. A second access area is recommended for the 196-unit "proposed condos" in "Proposed Area 1" per the provisions of the Planning and Zoning Code .
2. Please indicate the housing types (e.g., exterior elevations, building materials, etc.) proposed for the areas subject to the General Plan Revision.
3. Please indicate the boundaries and land area to remain as dedicated open space within the General Plan Revision area.
4. Verify that the existing sanitary sewer can handle the additional flows from the increased density.
5. A number of streets proposed in the plan are not in compliance with the provisions of the Planning and Zoning Code including the length of cul-de-sacs (600' maximum permitted), centerline radii (150' min) and the employment of "knuckles."
6. The design incorporates proposed lots that are not in compliance with the provisions of the Planning and Zoning Code including the incorporation of flag and flag-type lots, stacked lots and lots with no legal frontage.
7. Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Todd Huss, Jeff Hayes and Giles Patterson of Fischer Development Company also known as Grand Communities were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Huss reviewed the history, problems and issues of The Springs Development. The issues include; assembling properties from various entities into one acquisition, changing the plan to make it successful in today's economy, issues with the EPA and the Corps of Engineers and permitting, issues with the existing detention basins and systems and working with the existing homeowners to improve their situation.

Mr. Huss offered their solutions to the issues; the ability of Fischer Development to combine development, construction, management of HOAs and home sales. This plan will provide product diversity within the pods or areas and provide a good transition both internal and external to the site. The existing clubhouse will be demolished. The open spaces within the development will be revisited.

Mr. Huss stated that the most important thing was to provide something that is viable for the residents and turn this into a successful community.

Mr. Huss reviewed the plan. Recognizing the importance of protecting the investment of the existing homeowners, the product within the vicinity of these homes would be one that is compatible to the existing homes and would set the tone for the community. The next area continues the transition into the condominiums.

Mr. Huss explained that the community facility would be relocated to the center of the site; it allows it to be linked to some open space and make some pedestrian connections. He commented that in terms of product diversity their plan is to open up the development to a larger scope of potential buyers.

Mr. Huss explained that there would be an attached condominium product. The number of units in terms of the condominiums is roughly the same as the previous plan. There are eight to ten unit condominium buildings of two kinds, the Villa and the Gallery.

Mr. Huss reviewed connectivity and street connections.

Mr. Huss stated that any of the staff comments can be worked through and dealt with.

Mr. Patterson reported that he has met with the existing homeowners. Immediately upon closing, Mr. Hayes started on cleanup of the site. Letters were sent to the residents arranging a meeting, with all in attendance except one homeowner. Liaisons were established and information was provided to them.

Mr. Patterson provided examples of the different products that would be intended for the various areas within the development. He described the homes in area two as being 1200 to 2900 square feet ranches. Area three and four would be 1600 to 3800 square feet. He reviewed what style homes would be in which areas and provided elevations.

Mr. Patterson reviewed the condominiums, providing photographs and floor plans. He described the Villa condominiums as 8 units per slab with either single or double garages. The Gallery condominiums are 10 units with some of the units having single car garages and some using off street parking. All units have individual exterior entries. He explained that the condominiums are stylized by theme such as the Tuscany which has an Italian feel. The condominiums are 950 to 1800 square feet.

Ms. Hartle asked the age of the buyers that they are attracting.

Mr. Patterson answered that they get a lot of first time buyers, downsizers, and second homeowners.

Ms. Ridd asked how the density of the proposed homes compares to the condominiums that were previously approved. She also asked about the overall density.

Mr. Hayes answered that there were 192 units in the 2005 plan and 196 units are proposed.

Mr. Boron explained that in 2002, 752 units were approved including the Falls apartments. In 2005, the plans were reduced to 720 units of which the Falls is 305 units. The proposed plan is for 825 units.

Mr. Hayes commented that for their portion of the development the units went from 452 to 520.

Mr. Boron commented that the areas presented are different from the areas presented in the overall plan. Staff has intentionally not looked at the density specifically at this point. The project site is expected to have 105 new units.

Ms. Ridd commented that she would want a quality product and would not want on street parking.

Mr. Patterson stated that the parking would be off street; he could appreciate Ms. Ridd's comment but some buyers want that product.

Mr. Patterson invited the Planning Commission to visit their other developments.

Ms. Belpulsi asked about the exterior materials for the condos.

Mr. Patterson answered that they focus on materials that require little maintenance such as brick or vinyl.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that Planning Commission prefers Hardiplank; vinyl is not a preferred material. This applies to the condos and the homes.

Mr. Schaeffer asked about the percentage of vinyl on the buildings.

Mr. Patterson answered that the vinyl is typically on the second floor.

Ms. Belpulsi invited the applicants to stay after the regular Planning Commission meeting to continue the discussion.

The applicants agreed.

Ms. Belpulsi suspended the Planning Commission Work Session at 6:55 P.M in order to convene the regular Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Belpulsi reconvened the Planning Commission Work Session at 8:02 P.M. (Ms. Ridd was absent for the remainder of the discussion.)

Ms. Belpulsi asked that the discussion be continued, focusing on the types of housing and the materials that would be used.

Ms. Gibson commented that the original product and market that was targeted may or may not be viable, but that target market had some pluses in that it had the probability of not sending more students into the school system. She sees this product as more of an extension of what is in Settlers Walk, with product diversity that may bring students into the school system. She stated that she is not sure that she is comfortable at this point changing the focus. She would have to think about changing the target and possibly changing the density.

Ms. Gibson asked about the open space.

Mr. Boron answered that it was a staff question and would be part of the discussion. Mr. Boron explained that the definition of open space is dedicated space that is held in common or held by the City.

Mr. Huss stated that he expects the open space to be at, equivalent or more than the previous plan.

Ms. Belpulsi asked what the minimum open space would be in a PUD.

Mr. Boron answered that it was 25%.

Ms. Gibson commented that she liked that they moved the community center to the center of the development.

Mr. Patterson commented that the market that was targeted was too narrow to support a project of this size.

Mr. Landefeld stated that it is important to him that all the stub streets are continued inside this development. He commented that he would prefer a plan where the green space is massed as much as possible. He appreciated the walkways and bikeways. As far as materials, he is in favor of brick and wood trim; he does not like vinyl materials.

Mr. Schaeffer commented that the detention will dictate where some of the green space is.

Mr. Vomacka agreed that Sycamore Springs should continue through the neighborhood. He asked how they would access the flag lots.

Mr. Huss explained that there would be private drives. They would be owned and maintained by the property owners.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he does not like the flag lots. He added that that kind of access to property leads to problems.

Mr. Vomacka commented that they may attract some young professionals but Settlers Walk is attracting young families with kids. This is in the smaller, less expensive home which is consistent with what they are proposing. This could mean a whole new school. He is more concerned with the lack of recreation amenities other than the passive part. He commented that there is a need for soccer and baseball fields. He commented that the lots in Settlers Walk are eighty feet and they are proposed fifty feet. They would be changing the nature of the community. He commented that they need to maintain the connectivity.

Ms. Hartle stated that she has a problem with the small lot sizes; it is too much on too little land.

Mr. Papakirk commented that he agrees with Mr. Vomacka about the lot sizes along the perimeter of the property and the quality of the open space. There is a nice landscaping feature along the detention area.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he is thrilled that they are coming in to develop this property and pleased that they are working with the existing homeowners. He stated that he knows there will be compromises; everyone will put their preferences out on the table and that they will work it out from that point.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she has a concern about the density of the condo area. It looks like it's going to be another apartment complex. The style is nice but she is concerned that they are too small; too dense.

Mr. Patterson asked that they look at the product, it will change their mind.

Mr. Huss commented that this plan masses the space in certain areas, the buildings in the previous plan were arranged in quads; this type of plan provides more green in between.

Ms. Gibson commented that the density has not changed.

Mr. Schaeffer commented that the plan calls for two story buildings on a smaller area.

Mr. Patterson explained that there are two of the smallest units without the garages per building and are meant for someone coming right out of college as an apartment alternative to allow them to buy their first home. They are the most popular unit. There are twice as many of the large units.

Ms. Hartle stated that she doesn't have a problem with the small condos.

Mr. Huss commented that they have not yet begun to think about what the community facility would look like. They have pools in about half of their communities, they know how to plan, build and size it.

Mr. Patterson commented that they have a 40% referral/repurchase rate which is something that they pride themselves on.

Mr. Vomacka suggested that they put together a list of communities for the Planning Commission to look and forward that to Mr. Boron.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether the applicant had any further questions for Planning Commission.

Mr. Boron asked Mr. Schaeffer whether he had any feedback.

Mr. Schaeffer commented that Ms. Thompson and staff have had several meetings with the applicants. From staff's perspective, there is an excitement that someone is looking at this site and is looking at the whole piece. Fischer is new to Springboro, and after due diligence on staff's part, reputable. Finishing the last piece in this part of the City in a comprehensive fashion is an exciting opportunity for the City, especially in this environment.

Mr. Boron commented that there are areas where their hands are tied and they need to plan around. Other things are open for discussion. There are road connections that are for future discussion. Other things are not open to discussion. Because of the way this plan was built and dedicated, they will just have to plan around. Existing areas which if they were not there this would be laid out completely differently. This is a site with a linear open space, connections into a road system that staff wants. Staff is willing to work with the applicant and Planning Commission to find something that will meet everyone's goals.

Ms. Belpulsi asked what is cast in concrete.

Mr. Boron listed. The road system; the Sycamore Springs connection has things with it over and above the idea of a stub street going into there, it ties into a subdivision as the main street, there is non-roadway infrastructure there. The open space and system of detention and retention is cast in stone, it defines how the roadway is going to be laid out. The 2000 linear feet of roadway on Springs Boulevard that ends at the proposed clubhouse is the infrastructure around which the site is going to be developed. The stub streets need to be addressed. There are 102 platted lots on Woodstream and Clearsprings, 20 of which are built.

Mr. Schaeffer agreed that these are the limitations. The detention ponds are not changing but they are also open space. The applicant has some ideas that staff is willing to listen to. The project is over designed for the wet areas. Three ponds are not required for detention.

Mr. Landefeld asked about the phasing of the project.

Mr. Huss answered that the plan is to develop 15 to 20 lots at a time. The utilities will determine what they do first and in what order. They need to look at how to efficiently develop the detention over time. The reason why product diversity is important is the ability to fairly quickly offer different product types at one time.

Mr. Schaeffer asked whether they would open up the different sections to product right away.

Mr. Huss answered that that would be the plan. They would have to think through what the timing would be.

Mr. Hayes commented that this is a ten year or more development.

Ms. Belpulsi asked that the applicant work with staff and return to work session.

Mr. Huss stated that they will meet with Mr. Boron.

Mr. Schaeffer asked to clarify the connectivity issue. The plan shows a connection to the property line but Fischer is not proposing that they are going to take it out. It is not their property and theirs to do. It may never happen; this area is still in a state of flux.

Mr. Boron stated that there will still be connections to the adjoining development in the area, both existing and proposed; there will be one or two to Settlers Walk, one or two to Sycamore Springs, three to Yankee Road and one to the north. The connectivity is in keeping with the provisions of the Mobility Master Plan.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that they are looking forward to working with the applicant to move this along.

III. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

There were no Planning Commission or Staff comments.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, November 10, 2010 Planning Commission Work Session at 8:36 P.M.

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chairperson

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary