

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

Planning Commission Work Session  
Wednesday, March 9, 2011, 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, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld  
Absent: Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk, Becky Hartle

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

II. Agenda Items

**A. Site Plan Review, southwest corner West Tech Drive and Industry Lane, office/manufacturing facility**

This agenda item is based on an application, filed by Bill Hibner, Oberer-Thompson Company, agent for the property owner, to construct an office/manufacturing facility on a (approximately) 4.0 acre parcel located southwest of the intersection of West Tech Drive and Industry Lane. The proposed site is situated between the Dayton Squash Center and Crucible Materials on the south side of West Tech Drive. The property has direct frontage onto West Tech Drive.

As suggested in the submitted materials, the applicant proposes to build in the long-range a 40,000-square foot office, manufacturing and warehouse facility. At this time the applicant proposes to build as part of a first phase of their project 16,000 square feet of space on the south side of the property in Tenant spaces A and B.

The subject property is presently zoned ADD-1, Austin Development District-1. As a reminder since Planning Commission has not seen a Site Plan Review case in the ADD-1 District since 2007, the ADD-1 District was established to comply with the recommendations of the multi-jurisdictional *Austin Center Land Use and Development Plan* that is intended to guide the long-range development of the land adjacent to the Austin Road interchange of I-75. As part of the review process, review and approval by the Austin Center Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) is required. Staff will be available to explain the LUAC process further at the April 11th Work Session.

Adjacent uses include the Dayton Squash Center to the east; a stormwater drainage channel owned by the City of Springboro to the south; a manufacturing facility, Crucible Materials, to the west; and SourceLink to the north on the north side of West Tech Drive.

All properties abutting the property are zoned ADD-1.

## Staff Comments

1. Plain CMU is not permitted as a building material per Section 1264.20(f)(2)(C) of the Planning and Zoning Code. All other exterior building materials are permitted (EFIS as a secondary building material) under the provisions of Section 1264.20 of the Planning and Zoning Code.
2. Please provide a color rendition of the proposed building elevations at the March 9th Work Session.
3. A 35-foot strip along the West Tech Road frontage to be provided as provided in Section 1264.20(f)(4)(B). This area to be reserved for right-of-way plantings (see comment #3 below), access drive and signage. No parking is permitted in this area. Please adjust site plan accordingly.
4. Applicant to comply with landscaping requirements for portion of property abutting right-of-way, adjoining property, building foundations and parking lot interiors in keeping with Section 1264.20(f)(4) of the Planning and Zoning Code following Work Session discussion regarding building placement and site parking/circulation.
5. Lighting plan in keeping with the provisions of Section 1271.02 of the Planning and Zoning Code to be provided following Work Session discussion regarding building placement and site parking/circulation.
6. Applicant to coordinate with Dan Fitzpatrick, Zoning Inspector, at (937) 748-6845 or [danf@cityofspringboro.com](mailto:danf@cityofspringboro.com) following Work Session discussion, regarding compliance with Sign Code regulations.
7. An additional three parking spaces to be provided to satisfy minimum parking requirements for the proposed Tenant A and B spaces.
8. Review by Austin Center Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) is required per the requirements of the Austin Center Land Use and Development Plan. City Staff will coordinate with the applicant on this requirement.
9. Plans for tenant spaces C-E are provided for planning purposes only; plans for this portion of the building/site to be provided at a later date.
10. Springboro Engineering Department has no comments at this time.
11. Clearcreek Fire District has no comments regarding the short-range plan however an additional drive and curb cut on the front lot during the second phase of construction, near tenant space E. The dead end lot, as proposed, would be difficult for our apparatus to maneuver out of if they had to pull in for an emergency.

## Discussion

Stephanie Rumford and Jim Rumford, Rumford Industrial Group, Bill Hibner, Oberer-Thompson Company, and Jim Hawthorne, Architect, were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked the applicants whether they had any questions regarding the staff comments.

Mr. Hibner reviewed the plans for the Planning Commission. He commented that the drive requested by the Clearcreek Fire District could be worked into the plan for the future.

Ms. Gibson asked whether what area under the plan was for office and what was for production. She wanted to know how many people would be in the back.

Mr. Hibner answered that the area in the back was for production and distribution.

Mr. Rumford explained that there would be one or two people in the distribution area. He explained that the company brings product in and ships it out.

The elevations were reviewed.

Ms. Gibson asked what materials they would be using.

Mr. Hibner explained that they have been using a custom cast stone.

Ms. Gibson asked about the location of the additional parking spaces requested by staff.

Ms. Rumford answered that they would go out back.

Mr. Hibner asked because the building would be phased, how the common wall between units two and three could be treated.

It was agreed that it would be painted to match the other elevations and landscaped.

Mr. Boron asked whether the applicant had any questions about the staff comment regarding the thirty five foot setback.

Mr. Boron will review this item with the applicant.

Mr. Boron commented that the plans would be reviewed by the Austin Center Land Use Advisory Committee. This would be done before the final approval of the application at the April 27th Planning Commission meeting.

## **B. 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.

This agenda item was discussed at length at the November 10, 2010, December 15, 2010, January 12, 2011 and February 9, 2011 Planning Commission Work Sessions as well as the February 23, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting at which time this agenda item was tabled.

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. A General Plan Revision approved in 2010 Planning Commission and City Council 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 recommends the Planning Commission consider this application in three broad categories based on the discussion that has taken place at the previous four Planning Commission Work Sessions and the nature of the General Plan change:

- Is the proposed change in the number residential housing units acceptable? The Springs PUD in 2005 was approved for 720 residential dwelling units including 415 dwelling units for Fischer Development's "project area" consisting of a combination of single-family detached and condominium dwelling units. At the November 10th Work Session Fischer proposed an additional 105 dwelling units in a combination of single-family detached and condominiums; at the December 15th Work Session that number was reduced to 77 additional dwelling units in combination; at the January 12th Work Session that number was reduced to 74 dwelling units in combination. At the February 9th Work Session the number was reduced to 65 and now the number is 61 dwelling units in combination. This increase is, in part, achieved by providing "stacked" condominiums on the north side of the Fischer project area and reducing the overall size of the condominium site from the 2005 development and proposing single-family residential lots on the remainder. These single-family dwelling units abut single-family residential area in Settlers Walk.
- Is the proposed exterior materials scheme proposed by Fischer Development acceptable? Fischer Development revised "Housing Details and Architectural Guidelines" folder following the February 9th Work Session (please see your February 23rd Planning Commission Meeting materials).
- Are the proposed changes to the layout of the subdivision—street layout, distribution of open space, common spaces and other improvements—acceptable? Based on the four Work Sessions and communications between meetings the applicant has made significant progress on the overall layout of the revised General Plan. A total of 8 comments remain in this category as indicated below.

### **Staff Comments**

The following comments are directed to the "Housing Details and Architectural Guidelines" included in the Fischer Development submittal using the proposals for Area 4 as an example:

1. It is recommended that the applicant express the percentages of masonry to vinyl in terms of minimums; averages are not an enforceable standard within the City of Springboro.
2. Please provide masonry-to-vinyl percentages for side and rear elevations on a subarea by subarea basis.

3. Please provide a vinyl sample for proposed use within the project area or subareas.

The following comments are related to the remainder of the submittal:

1. Remove material included in Tab 1. Is this information relevant to the current proposal?
2. Staff concurs that the access point's construction be triggered by the construction of the 100th dwelling within the Area 1.
3. Are sidewalks to be provided throughout the condo portion of the development as indicated in Tab 9?
4. Vacation of right of way details at the round-a-bout and entryway to Area 1 to be provided at a later date.
5. Which vegetation areas on the "Community Features Plan" will be retained?
6. Revised HOA documents to be reviewed by the City prior to recording. Likewise City to review proposed conservation easement language and "Housing Details and Architectural Guidelines."
7. Revisions to the approved details and plans provided by Coffman Development for specific elements or areas of The Springs PUD, for example, specific designs and layouts for the proposed clubhouse, landscaping of individual lots, common areas and boulevard, to be determined as part of the Final Development Plan stage of the PUD approval process.
8. The Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

### **Discussion**

Todd Huss, Jeff Hayes and Bob Hawksley of Fischer Development Company were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Huss commented that there were two items from the last meeting that Planning Commission may have had concerns with; the front elevations in Area Two and the overall density. In Area Two, the concern was the percentage of vinyl. They have eliminated the two elevations at the lowest percentage and will also eliminate the next two elevations. This will result in the elimination of the lowest four elevations in terms of percentage of vinyl and result in a minimum masonry to vinyl percentage of 25%.

Mr. Vomacka asked for clarification about the percentages.

Mr. Huss explained that the minimum percentage of masonry to vinyl would be 25%; they have removed any reference to averages. The minimum percentages are 25% on Area Two, 15% in Area Three and 100% in Area Four.

Ms. Gibson asked about Hardiplank being included in the masonry percentages. It carries with it the need for maintenance which stone and brick does not and the look is different. They could do a house entirely in Hardiplank in Area Four by their definition of masonry. She would prefer not to see it included in masonry.

Mr. Huss commented that it is a question of definition. Industry standards state that this is how Hardiplank is defined.

Mr. Hawksley stated that there are no elevations with all Hardiplank.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether Hardiplank could be removed from the masonry definition.

Mr. Huss commented that it would change the minimum; add an entire new set of data to what is already a cumbersome set of data.

Mr. Vomacka stated that in Area Four, they need 100% masonry which does not include Hardiplank and in Area Three Planning Commission agreed to 50% masonry which does not include Hardiplank.

Mr. Vomacka commented on the number of elevations and asked that the number be cut back.

Mr. Huss commented that it is a key component of what they bring to the table as a builder; the diversity of housing and elevations. He asked why more architectural diversity is not a positive thing.

Ms. Gibson commented that the elevations do not need to be 100% masonry. If the existing homes have 90% stone and brick with 10% lap siding and Hardiplank, then their percentage can come down to that. She is concerned about allowing the Hardiplank to be included as masonry.

Ms. Gibson commented on the number of elevations and number of lots in Area Four. She commented that Fischer Homes can reduce the number of elevations and still have diversity.

Mr. Hawksley asked what percentage they would be comfortable with. He commented that some siding is needed to support the structure.

Ms. Gibson stated that she would be fine with 85-90% brick and stone.

Mr. Huss commented on the density. He stated that they had asked for an increase of 105 units and have reduced that to 61. He added that that is only part of the recipe that makes up the plan. They have increased the amount of open space and made it centrally located so it will serve the community better. The plan includes an overall increase in lot size on average in width and depth. He agreed that there is a nominal increase in density but stated that it is a result of an improvement and reconfiguring of the plan to make it more efficient. He stated that they have put their focus on the housing. At this time they are not proposing any specific changes in density to the plan.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she would like to see it less dense; cut down to 50 houses if possible. She asked if it would be possible in Area Four for them to have houses built that are similar in size to the existing houses. She asked if they could designate several lots for ranches.

Mr. Huss stated that they have designated lots for ranches.

Certain lots were indicated that could to be designated as part of 4B instead of 4C.

Mr. Landefeld commented that there a lots on the west side of Area 2 that abut the conservation easement and he did not see how they could meet the setback requirements there and maintain the vegetation in the easement and still fit a house there. If they need to cut density, that may be a place to start.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he does not have a strong concern about the overall density. He added that most of the increase in density is from the condos which are multi story on a smaller portion of land. He is inclined to think that it is appropriate for that kind of condo development and that Springboro needs more development of condos. He would like to see a reduction in density on

the west property line on the lots that back up to Stanton Drive. He would like to see couple of the lots taken out of there and the ground spread over the remaining lots so they are a little bit larger.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that in her absence Ms. Ridd had forwarded her comments which as she stated at the last meeting, she would not be in favor of increasing the density, and she would like it to be the same as when it was first approved.

Ms. Gibson stated that she would welcome any further reduction in density; she agreed with Ms. Belpulsi that she would feel more comfortable with it if they could get it down closer to 50.

Mr. Landefeld commented that he could like to see the cul-de-sac shortened. He added that he thought the 50 lot target was reasonable.

Ms. Belpulsi asked to next address the preservation easement. She commented that they have been many e-mails from the residents expressing their concern. She asked Ms. Thompson to talk about the difference between a preservation easement and common space.

Ms. Thompson explained that the twenty feet along Stanton Drive does exist; it has not been removed. The issue becomes how to best protect the existing and new homeowners from the twenty feet becoming a problem. Common area means that everyone that lives in The Springs that pays in to the homeowner's association will be able to use the twenty feet of common space behind these homes. For maintenance purposes, it will be responsibility of the homeowner's association. A breakdown of the association can occur and it is the feeling of Planning Commission and staff that if there is preservation or conservation easement then the trees and flora can be protected by the covenants and restriction which the City reviews. If a tree is removed or destroyed, then the covenants and restrictions can demand that the tree be replaced. The land is owned by the homeowner of the lot; that way the burden comes to the homeowner's restrictions of The Springs. The current property lines will not change; the current residents of Stanton Drive will not be permitted to use the new common area. What the area is called will determine the maintenance and restrictions on the land. The preference by members of Planning Commission is what will protect that twenty feet the best.

Ms. Gibson asked about the issue of common space and setbacks. If you have a house with twenty foot common space and a ten foot setback then the distance between houses is thirty feet. If it is a twenty foot easement with a twenty five foot setback then the houses can be within twenty five feet because the easement is within their property.

Ms. Thompson agreed that that would be the setback and added that the setbacks were under the review of the Planning Commission because this is a PUD.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that the City would not be responsible for taking care of the common area or the easement. This has to be written into the covenants of the homeowner's association. Planning Commission is trying to get as much protection as possible down the road. She stated that she feels that the conservation easement offers the homeowners more protection. If the residents feel that strongly that they would prefer a common area in lieu of an easement, she would go along with that.

Mr. Hawksley commented that if someone bought that house then they would not want someone else to enter from the community and do whatever on the property, they want it to be private and that is the preservation easement concept.

Mr. Huss commented that they have done it both ways and by far this is the better solution for all parties.

Mr. Huss commented that they have increased the depths of the lots due to the changes in the setbacks.

Ms. Gibson commented that in order to make the prospective for the people on Stanton Drive and the possible setback and reduction of backyard that the setback be changed from twenty five feet to thirty feet. These also may be two story homes instead on single story homes.

Mr. Boron commented that there is a thirty foot setback on the properties of The Manor, Section five which abuts The Springs.

The current and proposed easements and common areas of The Springs were reviewed.

Mr. Boron asked whether there was a consensus about the forty foot common area along The Sycamore Springs properties.

Planning Commission agreed that the forty foot common area remain there.

Ms. Belpulsi recapped the items that Planning Commission would like the applicant to review; the density, getting it as close to 50 as possible and looking at decreasing the density of the lots abutting Stanton Drive, changing the setbacks so that the rear setbacks for the lots that back up to Stanton Drive will be thirty feet with the conservation easement, designating several lots for ranch style homes only and recalculating the percentages of Hardiplank and masonry.

Mr. Hawksley stated that he will review the elevations and the calculations.

Mr. Huss commented that he will also make adjustments to the covenants to reflect Mr. Vomacka's comments from the last meeting.

Mr. Boron commented the City is not party to the covenants, they can only make suggestions. The covenants are between the current and prospective owners in The Springs, the applicants and the homeowner's association at a later date. The City Attorney is reviewing the covenants as proposed.

Mr. Boron asked Planning Commission whether they were ready for the applicant to present for approval of a formal recommendation to Council.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that they were.

Mr. Boron commented that March 30th is the next formal Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that Council is only meeting one night in April, on April 7th. They will be having two meetings in one night due to charter requirements. She spoke with Council regarding the issue. If there is a recommendation to Council, citizens will be able to speak to the issue at the end of the first meeting and the resolution for the approval of the General Plan will be on the agenda for a vote at the second meeting.

### III. Guest Comments

Ms. Belpulsi thanked the residents for their e-mail comments and stated that they all have been read and that they are being taken into consideration. She commented that it was not possible or appropriate for Planning Commission to comment directly to each resident in order to remain objective. This portion of the agenda is the appropriate time for discussion between the residents and Planning Commission.

Robert Reichman, 515 Sycamore Springs Drive, asked about the south side of the development and whether the forty foot buffer will be maintained.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that that is what the goal would be.

Mr. Reichman stated that he thought the buffer was for water mitigation in the area. He had the original documentation from the Army Corps of Engineers and the Ohio EPA. He explained that they built drains and a dam in the area. Before then the area sometimes flooded and he does not want them to be disturbed.

Mike Hingsbergen, 48 Stanton Drive, asked for clarification about the ownership of the forty foot buffer.

Ms. Gibson commented that because of its configuration it can easily blend in with the open space and be common space for the HOA.

Mr. Hingsbergen commented that they will give them common space on that side but not on his side.

Ms. Gibson explained that it is not as accessible and does not tie in to other open space. She commented that the preservation easement the way it is laid out will give him better protection.

Mr. Hingsbergen commented that the common space was a property buffer to prevent the neighbor from cutting down the trees. If the trees are cut down, it is easier for him to sue the HOA than sue his neighbor. He looks at it as a point of privacy. When he bought his lot, he was told there was a common space there and that his neighbor's property line would be twenty feet away.

Ms. Gibson explained that with a common space the area could be cleared, a lawn put in with a tree every forty feet and it could be used by the neighbors. The preservation easement keeps the scrub as it remains and with the thirty foot setback, it moves the house back to the same area that it was in the original plan.

Mr. Hingsbergen stated that he will think about that and speak with his neighbors. He thanked Planning Commission for the different vibe of tonight's meeting, that he is hearing good things and that Planning Commission is considering the residents.

Myron Rheume, 148 Winding Creek Drive, and Ron Woeste, 178 Winding Creek Drive, thanked Planning Commission for the different tone of tonight's meeting. Mr. Rheume thanked Mr. Boron for his work with the residents.

Mr. Rheume commented that the basic premise was that the vitality of The Springs as an empty nester community did not exist. He stated that they have done an excellent job addressing the masonry issue in Area Four. He asked that Planning Commission point out the specific lots that were addressed in the meeting for ranch homes.

Mr. Rheume asked that Ms. Letsche's lot at 445 Clearsprings Drive be considered part of Area Four.

Mr. Vomacka commented that the exteriors visible from her property will be identical to Area Four. The only difference is the back side which is away from her line of sight.

Mr. Rheaume asked Mr. Huss about adding more ranches.

Mr. Huss answered that it was not possible; they needed to make the transition sooner.

Mr. Woeste asked whether it was possible to extend the line for continuity to make a neighborhood that is more of a single story empty nester complete neighborhood.

Mr. Huss answered that they have drawn the line where they believe it makes sense. It also coincides with what is currently developed and platted now.

Mr. Woeste asked that the pitched roofs from the original 2005 plan be used so that they have similar architectural styles, since that was the intent of the plan.

Mr. Huss answered that they cannot commit to that. It is not part of what Fischer does. They are doing it as part of the Main Streetscape. They must draw the line.

Mr. Rheaume asked to discuss the density. If they took the lot widths to 70 and 80 feet they could lose 17 lots in Area Three and 13 lots in Area Two for a reduction from 61 lots over the previous plan to 31 lots.

Mr. Rheaume commented on the units without garages in the condo area and asked that dimensional shingles be considered.

Mr. Huss explained that there are two units in each Gallery building without garages. This allows the diversity of price point within the community. There would be 24 units without garages.

Mr. Rheaume expressed their concern about the condos becoming an investor community and how to protect it.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that that would have to be part of their homeowner's association covenants.

Mr. Woeste asked that the 6/12 minimum roof pitch and the overhangs on the backs of the houses be continued to match the existing homes.

Kevin Bowman, 225 Sycamore Springs Drive, asked whether the intent was for Sycamore Springs Drive to run all the way through.

Ms. Belpulsi answered yes.

Mr. Bowman commented that his community is a lot of young families. Once people become aware that there is a way through it will be different. He asked that it not run through.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that the road was always meant to go through.

Greg Kaskey, 75 Stanton Drive, commented that one of the components that Planning Commission should review and consider is the traffic pattern and how it affects the collective streets. He asked whether a traffic study had been done by Fischer.

Mr. Boron answered that they looked at a left turn lane or signal at Springs Boulevard and Yankee Road and a traffic study was done as part of a proposal for a church to be developed at the northwest corner of Yankee Road and Springs Boulevard. The church will move forward in 2011. There have been two traffic studies completed. A signal will be warranted after completion of construction of the 200th unit within The Springs development which includes the apartments. The developer will pay a portion of it.

Mr. Kaskey commented that the street pattern was not what had been proposed under the 2005 PUD and expressed his concern that Stanton would be turned into a thoroughfare. He asked whether a traffic study had been done for the impact of the 61 additional units on Stanton Drive and East Manor Drive.

Mr. Boron answered that there had not been a study on that specific question.

Mr. Kaskey asked that before a decision is made that it is considered because this is a dramatic modification. Stanton Drive is going to be a thoroughfare. He asked about the common space and whether the homeowners would be restricted from putting things in there such as fences.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that it would be in the language of the easement.

Dennis Dorko, 65 Clearsprings Drive, commented that he is the closest lot to the new development and reviewed the easement with the Planning Commission members.

#### IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

There were no Planning Commission and Staff Comments.

#### V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, March 9, 2011 Planning Commission Work Session at 8:07 P.M.

---

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chairperson

---

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

---

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary