

City of Springboro
320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio 45066
Planning Commission Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2022

I. Call to Order

Chair Becky Iverson called the Springboro Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. at the Springboro Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio.

Present: Becky Iverson, Chair; Chris Pearson, Vice Chair, Mark Davis, Robert Dimmitt, Mike Thompson. Absent, Steve Harding and John Sillies

Staff Present: Dan Boron, City Planner; Elmer Dudas, Development Director, Chad Dixon, City Engineer; Ann Burns, Planning Commission Secretary.

Mr. Thompson motioned to excuse Mr. Harding and Mr. Sillies. Mr. Davis seconded the motion.

Vote: Iverson, yes; Dimmitt, yes; Thompson, yes; Pearson, yes; Davis, Yes (5-0)

II. Approval of Minutes

A. February 9, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

Ms. Iverson asked for corrections or additions to the minutes. There were none

Mr. Davis motioned to approve the February 9, 2022 Planning Commission minutes. . Mr. Pearson seconded the motion.

Vote: Iverson, yes; Dimmitt, yes; Pearson, yes; Davis, Yes; Thompson, Abstain. (4-0)

II. Agenda Items

A. Preliminary Review, Minor Revision to Approved General Plan, The Falls PUD, Planned Unit Development, revision to apartment component

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for preliminary review of a minor revision to an approved general plan for a portion of the apartment component of The Falls PUD, Planned Unit Development. The application was submitted by PLK Communities, Cincinnati. The property is owned by The Siebenthaler Company.

As indicated in the submitted materials, the applicant is proposing to construct 168 apartment units on a 16.05-acre site located on the northeast portion of The Springs PUD. The site is situated between The Falls apartment complex on the east, and the Waterside condominiums to the west. Both The Falls and Waterside condominiums are also in The Springs PUD. The property has frontage on Springs Boulevard; access is also proposed from the east through The Falls apartments to Yankee Road. The northern property

line for the site coincides with the Warren-Montgomery county border. Lands to the north are within Washington Township.

The 16.05-acre site was approved for apartment development as part of the general plan for what is now The Springs PUD in early 2002. A total of 305 apartments were approved at that time consisting of 30 10-unit buildings and a 5-unit building including the management office, clubhouse and pool. Later, two phases of apartment development were approved by the Planning Commission, one each in 2002 and 2003, based on an application filed by the developer, Coffman Development. The northern tier of the apartments were reviewed and approved first, consisting of 15 apartment buildings and the clubhouse, with 15 additional buildings on the southern tier. The phases were oriented east to west, with both phases crossing the utility lines that bisect the 16.05-acre site. Coffman Development then developed just the eastern portion of each phase along the Yankee Road side of the property beginning in 2005. Development of this portion of the site continued until 2010/2011 when the current 135 apartment units—13 ten-unit buildings and one 5-unit building with clubhouse—configuration was arrived at. The Siebenthaler property was later split from The Falls apartments. The 2002/2003 City approval to construct 170 apartment units on the site remains in effect. A copy of the plans for the apartment component of The Springs PUD as proposed is included in the meeting materials.

PLK Communities is proposing to construct 168 apartment units on the site. The proposal includes 10 16-unit apartment buildings, an 8-unit apartment building, a clubhouse facility, and a number of stand-alone garages and dumpster enclosures. Access will be provided with a driveway connecting to Springs Boulevard and two drives to The Falls apartments and in turn Yankee Road.

The City's PUD ordinance defines three types of revisions to approved general plans: major, minor, and administrative. Major revisions include proposals that change the list of permitted uses within a PUD or any increase of 15% or greater in the number of residential units for a site, and require the approval of the Planning Commission and City Council. Minor revisions involve no change in permitted uses within a PUD and involve density increases between 5 and 15%, and require the approval of Planning Commission. Administrative revisions include revisions involving 5% increases in development density or less, and are approvable by City staff. The PLK Communities proposal represents a minor revision to the approved general plan for the apartment component.

Following Planning Commission's review of the requested general plan revision—first in preliminary format, the final approval at a subsequent meeting—review and approval of a final development plan by Planning Commission may commence. PLK Communities has indicated their intention to develop the 16.05-acre site in one section.

Existing zoning in the vicinity of the site is PUD to the east, south, and west, all part of The Springs PUD. Zoning to the north is zoned PD-T, Planned Development Transition District, under the Washington Township Zoning Resolution, a district whose purpose is "...to allow for orderly growth and development Washington Township and abutting municipalities." Existing land uses in the vicinity of the site include The Falls apartments to the east, St. Mary's church to the southeast, the single-family residential component of The Springs to the south, to the west the Waterside condominiums component of The Springs, and to the north in Washington Township, Montgomery County, and the Yankee Terrace single-family residential subdivision.

Staff Comments

City staff has identified the following comments for the general plan revision request:

1. Provide minimum 9-foot buffer from property lines for parking areas.

2. Provide architectural details for clubhouse and accessory structures. Applicant is advised that one accent color is permitted for the development.
3. Landscaping Plan required at second stage of approval process, final development plan. Plans to comply with Chapter 1279. Items to include the identification of existing vegetation greater than 4 inches DBH to remain on the site for credit against other landscaping requirements, site development landscaping at the rate of 1 tree/3,000 square feet for developed portions of the site, parking lot landscaping, buffers to adjacent uses, and landscaping along road frontages.
4. Lighting plan consistent with Chapter 1273 of Planning and Zoning Code to be developed that meets color-temperature, intensity, and cut-off lighting requirements during final development plan stage of approval process.
5. Applicant to develop signage plan for review by City staff.
6. Plans to be signed by the owner/developed at the final approval stage of the general plan review process.
7. Provide complete site design and development standards for building placement and ancillary facilities.
8. Provide bicycle parking consistent with Section 1279.01(f) of the Planning & Zoning Code.
9. To maximize safety and minimize property damage, 24-foot drive aisle are recommended in all parking areas.
10. Provide water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer details and any associated calculations for review.
11. Provide the mechanism for the retention basin maintenance, which shall include wording for the City of Springboro to complete maintenance and assess owner if owner/HOA fails to maintain.
12. Please be advised that the Clearcreek Fire District utilizes the provisions from the Ohio Fire Code and the Ohio Building Code and that all fire hydrant components shall meet those of the City of Springboro Water works.
13. Pursuant to Section 105.4.3 and 105.4.4 of the 2017 Ohio Fire Code, it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the construction documents include all of the protection requirements and shop drawings are complete and in compliance with the applicable codes and standards. Construction documents reviewed by the fire code official in accordance with paragraph (D)(2)(a)(104.2.1) of this rule or construction documents approved with the intent that such construction documents comply in all respects with the code. Review and approval by the fire code official shall not relieve the applicant of the responsibility of compliance with this code.

Discussion:

In attendance to discuss their application were Nick Lingenfelter and Mick Oaks, PLK Communities, Matt Davis, DSD Advisors, and Tyler Amicon, Viox & Viox.

Mr. Boron reviewed the background on this project explaining that the 16.05-acre site was approved for apartment development as part of the general plan for what is now The Springs PUD, Planned Unit Development, in early 2002. In 2002/2003 total of 305 apartments were approved at that time consisting of 30 10-unit buildings and a 5-unit building including the management office and clubhouse. The apartment component of the PUD was partially completed and is The Falls apartments. The apartments were approved in two phases, the first on the northern half, the second on the southern half, but only the east portion of each phase, along Yankee Road, was developed.

Mr. Boron reviewed the three types of revisions to a general plan, major, minor, and administrative review. The proposal constitutes a minor change to the approved general plan. Minor changes are reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

The current proposal is to construct 168 apartment units on the site, a reduction of 2 units from the 2002/2003 approval for the site. The proposal includes ten 16-unit apartment buildings, an 8-unit apartment building, a clubhouse, and a number of stand-alone garages, dumpster enclosures, and

other accessory facilities. PLK Communities has a letter of authorization from Siebenthaler to act on their behalf through the City's review process.

Mr. Boron stated following the general plan revision review process a final development plan would need to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Amicon explained that they have addressed all staff comments the best they can at this time, and will resolve any other issues, such as landscaping as the project develops. He indicated a number of comments cannot be addressed until more detailed plans are developed later in the approval process.

Mr. Amicon asked about the 9-foot buffer for landscaping.

Mr. Boron indicated the 9-foot buffer is from the parking ordinance and is the minimum area needed to accommodate landscaping.

Mr. Lingenfelter expressed concern about the garages on the north side of the property if a 9-foot buffer is a requirement. He also indicated that PLK Communities is still working on the access easements to the east, their goal is to work with the operator of The Falls to secure that access that were never recorded. If they cannot, other access points to the west would be examined. The access to the east would also help The Falls provide a second access point as well. He understood the City's directive to have multiple access points to the site. He added that the other staff comments should be easy to address.

Mr. Pearson asked if a clubhouse was shown for this area in the original plan and if that changes the nature of the PUD.

Mr. Boron replied that no clubhouse was shown, the existing clubhouse near Yankee Road was intended to serve the entire apartment complex.

Mr. Lingenfelter reviewed the plans for the clubhouse, mailboxes within, and that they are adding approximately 0.75-acre of greenspace relative to the original plan. There will also be roughly a 12% reduction in impermeable surfaces from the 2002/2003 plans.

Mr. Pearson asked for additional details on the architectural plans and color schemes.

Mr. Lingenfelter reviewed the design and colors of the units as well as the exterior of the buildings, as well as some details of the interiors. He noted that similar apartments are available to review on their website.

Mr. Boron indicated said he would distribute the architectural plans to members of Planning Commission following the meeting.

Mr. Pearson asked if the applicants were familiar with the City's exterior color provisions.

Mr. Boron clarified that the accent color was a maximum number, not a requirement, otherwise neutral colors may be used, along with an allowance for trims.

Ms. Iverson stated that colors all seem to be neutral and this type of housing is much needed in Springboro.

The Planning Commission, applicants, and City staff discussed the colors scheme and exterior materials.

Mr. Pearson asked about similar developments in the region.

Mr. Lingenfelter answered Alexander Point in Hamilton Township, and Gentry East in Eastgate. He indicated there is no name at this point in time for the development. He closed by saying he will continue to work through the comments.

Mr. Dimmitt asked if losing the garages would be a deal breaker.

Mr. Lingenfelter said it would impact revenue but it would not be a deal breaker.

Mr. Boron stated that if members are comfortable at this point, the minor revision of the general plan can be put on the April 13th agenda for formal approval. He indicated that additional details would be provided later during the final development plan following general plan.

Mr. Mark Davis clarified this was for the revision to the general plan that will be reviewed in April.

Mr. Boron said that is correct.

Mr. Boron explained that this approval would take two meetings, the first for the revision to the general plan, and two for the final development plan, preliminary review and formal approval.

Mr. Lingenfelter asked about tree species.

Mr. Boron replied they would provide that.

VI. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Mr. Boron reported that at a future meeting, a solar energy ordinance will be on the agenda. Solar energy, primarily roof top units, have become increasingly popular and our current standards may be too restrictive relative to the region and we need some modifications to make them more manageable for staff, applicants, and contractors. Issues to consider are visibility from the street, screening of hardware, arrangement on roof tops, and more.

Mr. Thompson asked what the status on the LaComedia project.

Mr. Boron explained that the applicant should be back for final approval sometime in the spring. A plan was submitted in February showing a much larger building.

Mr. Boron thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and the communications from City staff as we tried to put together a quorum.

VII. Adjournment

*Mr. Davis motioned to adjourn the March 9, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting at 6:40 pm
Mr. Pearson seconded the motion.*

Vote: Iverson, yes; Dimmitt, yes; Thompson, yes; Pearson, yes; Davis, Yes (5-0)



Becky Iverson, Planning Commission Chairperson



Dan Boron, Planning Consultant



Ann Burns, Planning Commission Secretary