

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

Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, April 8, 2009, 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, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld
Absent: Jim Chmiel, Becky Hartle

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

II. Agenda Items

A. Revision to Approved Signage Package, The Falls Apartments, The Springs Planned Unit Development

Background

This agenda item is in request filed on behalf of The Falls at Settlers Walk, Phase II, for a signage package for a portion of The Falls apartment complex located north of the intersection of Springs Boulevard and Yankee Road. The Falls apartment complex is located within The Springs Planned Unit Development (PUD). The Falls was approved, as part of the General Plan for the overall PUD, for 305 dwelling units. To date approximately one-half of the complex has been built. The area comprising Phase II of The Falls is indicated in the enclosed aerial photograph on page 3 (as show in yellow). As indicated in the supporting documentation, The Phase II area is in receivership and the receiver is managing the leasing of the Phase II area of The Falls distinctly from the leasing office in Phase I.

The applicant is proposing an extensive package of signs—banners, leasing signs, construction signs and directional signs—for this portion of the PUD. While the signs themselves may or may not be approvable through the Building and Zoning Department's enforcement of the Sign Code, the signage is being proposed in a PUD that was approved by Planning Commission. Staff's concern is that this package represents a significant departure from the spirit of the original plan for the apartment complex, a development that was conceived as a single piece under unified design—building appearance including signage—and management.

The following are general comments on the proposed signs as they relate to the Sign Code:

- Leasing Sign. Sketch 1. Is the sign proposed to be permanently installed at this location or temporary? One sign permitted per code.

- Leasing Banner. Sketch 2a. A maximum of one (1) 35-square foot banner is permitted for a one-month period four times annually per code. The banner needs to be security fixed to a structure through a permit from the Building and Zoning Department.
- Directional Sign. Sketch 3. Permitted per code.
- Construction Sign Sketch 4. Does not meet the definition of a construction sign (is another lease sign and only one is permitted)
- Yankee Street Banner. Sketch 2b. Sign is well over maximum allowable area, one banner permitted. See Leasing Banner comments above.

Mr. Boron indicated the applicants were unable to attend the Planning Commission Work Session. Mr. Boron explained that staff's concern is the amount of signage and that if the property is further subdivided the signage situation would become more complicated.

Ms. Belpulsi indicated that Ms. Ridd would abstain from any vote on this discussion.

The Planning Commission asked that an overall map be provided to give Planning Commission a better handle of what has been and could be developed on the property to maintain control over the density.

Mr. Boron stated that staff would be happy to do so.

Planning Commission concluded that the signage should be consistent within the development and management cooperation issues between the owners and within the development were discussed.

B. Land Use Master Plan

C. Planning and Zoning Code Amendments

Mr. Boron reported that the Land Use Master Plan was adopted by City Council, Thursday, April 2, 2009. He reviewed the plan recommendations and explained that the City has been divided into sixteen policy areas grouped by location, use, age of construction and character. Within each policy area current and preferred land uses and conditions were summarized.

Mr. Boron commented that some of the recommendations that have come out of the plan were density recommendations, annexation policies, implementation policies, the need for a long range open space and park plan, and connectivity policies.

Mr. Boron explained that the next step in the process is to update the Planning and Zoning Codes to reflect the change in the Land Use Master Plan, the scope of which is to be determined by Planning Commission, staff and Council. Updates would include changes to the zoning maps and text changes to update the codes and simplify and clarify the language.

Mr. Boron reviewed the recommendations of the Master Plan in regard to its effect on various policy areas and the current and preferred zoning in those areas and the need for zoning variances. He also reviewed the density recommendations for some areas.

Ms. Gibson asked whether the Master Plan defines density as gross or net.

Mr. Boron answered that it defines density as gross. He added that there are other areas that need to be more clearly defined.

Ms. Gibson asked whether an open or urban zoning could be applied to the Historic District.

Mr. Boron answered that yes, the new code would be a form based code in order to address those issues. Other issues are addressed by the ARB.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether an overlay district could be applied on top of the form based code.

Mr. Boron answered yes. He also addressed the issue of adjacent zoning districts that need to comply with the overall intended uses of the districts. He added that there are many grandfathered uses.

Ms. Gibson asked whether no visibility of drive thrus was limited to SR 73 or should it be applied also to SR 741.

Mr. Boron answered that it should be applied to both.

Mr. Papakirk added that the language was specific for SR 73 due to the commercial nature of the area while SR 741 was seen more of an office area and it was left for the input of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Ridd asked whether it should be required on one and not the other.

Mr. Boron added that Planning Commission has the control through site plan review to require screening and the Master Plan is just a guideline.

Ms. Gibson reviewed some inaccuracies in the details of the policy areas of the Master Plan and will discuss them with Mr. Boron.

Ms. Belpulsi concluded by asked Mr. Boron what the next step would be; whether it is to make the zoning compatible with the Master Plan.

Mr. Boron added that there is also a request to review the sign code. Staff will work to initiate updates to the zoning codes for presentation to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether green initiatives could be incorporated into the codes.

Mr. Boron answered that yes, they could be incorporated.

Mr. Landefeld asked whether staff would be writing the updates and suggested that for clarity one author be used.

Mr. Boron suggested that a catalog of uses; the use of a GIS to clarify any current and proposed uses would be helpful in such ways as explaining bringing township zoning in line with City zoning.

D. Bicycle Advisory Committee

Background

Mr. Boron reported that the most recent City newsletter included an article on the bicycle advisory committee and some interest has been expressed by citizens wanting to be on the committee. He added that Ms. Thompson suggested at the April 2nd Council meeting that this committee be a

subcommittee of the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission seek people who are interested in working on the subcommittee and receive the input from that subcommittee.

Mr. Landefeld suggested that input be obtained from the schools.

Ms. Belpulsi suggested that the structure of the committee be well defined.

Mr. Boron commented that at the April 29th Planning Commission meeting the subcommittee call for volunteers will be discussed again; ways to design the committee and select members were discussed.

III. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Mr. Boron presented a landscape plan for the Menrisky building on SR 741 and requested preliminary input from the Planning Commission. The plan was reviewed and discussed.

Mr. Boron reported that the landscape plan should be on the agenda for the April 29th meeting.

Mr. Papakirk reported that the State of Virginia has officially banned cul-de-sacs. The use of cul-de-sacs was discussed.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, April 8, 2009 Work Session at 8:12 P.M.

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chair

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary