

City of Springboro
320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio 45066
Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, June 12, 2019, 6:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

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

Present: Becky Iverson, Stephen Harding, Chris Pearson, Becky Hartle, Jack Hanson, John Sillies.
Absent: Robert Dimmitt

Staff: Dan Boron, City Planner; Elmer Dudas, Development Director, Chad Dixon, City Engineer;
Amy Brown, Planning Commission Secretary

Ms. Iverson said that Mr. Dimmitt was unable to attend tonight's meeting due to a previous conflict.

II. Agenda Items

A. Extension of Approval on General Plan
1360 South Main Street, Streamside PUD-R, Planned Unit Development-Residential

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for the second and last six-month extension on the City's approval of the general plan for the Streamside PUD-R, Planned Unit Development-Residential, located at 1360 South Main Street (SR 741). The extension is at the request of the property owner, the Daniel Family Trust.

The property is a 2.35-acre parcel that was rezoned to PUD-R in early 2018 along with a general plan that called for the development of a 7-unit residential subdivision served by a private access drive connecting to South Main Street on the west end of the property. The general plan was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission at its October 25, 2017 meeting. The general plan was approved by City Council on January 4, 2018 concurrent to the adoption of the rezoning ordinance. A copy of the general plan is included in the meeting materials.

According to the Planning & Zoning Code, general plans must be executed within 12 months in the form of a final development plan, the second step in the three-step PUD approval process. Final development plan reviews and approvals are by the Planning Commission. To date no final development plan has been filed with the City.

The Planning & Zoning Code allows for up to two six-month extensions of the initial general plan approval. The applicant received a six-month extension at the January 30, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. That extension expires on July 31, 2019.

Formal action on this extension may occur as soon as the June 26, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. Staff recommends an extension that would run from August 1, 2019 to January 31, 2020.

No City Council action is required following Planning Commission consideration of this agenda item.

Discussion:

Elizabeth Daniels, trustee for the Daniels Family Trust, was present this evening to answer questions.

Ms. Iverson said that the applicant was here this evening to ask for a six month extension, and just to clarify, this is the last extension available.

Mr. Boron said, correct.

Ms. Iverson asked if the applicant had any questions, and Mr. Boron if he had any comments.

Ms. Daniels said they do have an option to buy on the property, and she didn't know yet what they are considering doing. She added that she hoped it could be resolved before the end of the second extension. She asked if they would we have to go through the process the same way if nothing happened before the end of the second extension.

Ms. Iverson said the process would start over.

Mr. Sillies asked how long would they have to wait before they submit again if this extension expires.

Mr. Boron said they could submit again without any delay, but the process would have to start over.

Mr. Harding said that the zoning is already done, but the general plan would have to start from scratch.

Ms. Daniels asked if that would that require new drawings, or could they use the existing drawings if they had to reapply.

Mr. Boron said that they could, but then the discussion would open up again almost from scratch.

Ms. Daniels confirmed if that would be notifying the neighbors and all of that.

Mr. Boron said that was correct.

Ms. Daniels said she hoped they didn't have to go through that again, but if they have to, they would.

Ms. Iverson said that this could be on the regular agenda at the end of this month for a vote.

Mr. Boron said, yes, if Planning Commission members are comfortable with that, and it would then extend until January 31st of next year.

Ms. Daniels said if the option to buy is exercised, and they come forward with their proposal, would they have to provide new drawings of what their finished product would be.

Mr. Boron said that as long as the plan does not change from what was approved back in 2017 by Planning Commission and in 2018 by City Council. He said that general plan is in force, and they would have to submit a new plan showing the use of the land, drawing of the streets, and the open space would have to match up. He said as for the building of homes, they have not seen homes yet, and they would need to see that as part of the final development plan.

Mr. Harding said that if it changes from that approved layout, they would have to submit a new application.

Ms. Iverson added if they want to do anything different from what you are approved for. She said the approval is not tied to the developer, it is tied to the plan, but if the plan changes, they would have to submit that.

Mr. Boron said that is what would be needed next, and it is almost like a site plan review.

Ms. Iverson said the vote on the extension would be on Wednesday, June 26 at 6:00 p.m.

B. Revision to Approved Site Plan

125 Commercial Way, Woodhull LLC, proposed change from office/warehouse to warehouse

Background Information

This agenda item is based on an application filed by Roll & Associates, Inc., representing Woodhull LLC, property owners, seeking site plan review approval to allow construction of a 4,000-square foot accessory building at 125 Commercial Way. The property is the site of Woodhull's operation including an 11,620-square foot building constructed in 2007, and a 4,186-square foot addition built in 2016. The addition is needed to provide space for the servicing of office equipment.

The subject property is zoned ED, Employment Center District. The ED designation includes an allowance for Planning Commission to established setbacks during the site plan review process. The proposed 10-foot setback for the structure is consistent with setbacks for other properties developed on Commercial Way using this provision.

The subject property is located at the western terminus of Commercial Way. The property has frontage on I-75. Both the existing building and proposed accessory structure are visible from I-75. Adjacent land uses include the I-75 right-of-way immediately to the west, a dialysis center to the north on the north side of Commercial Way, an industrial facility to the east, and undeveloped land owned by Woodhull LLC to the southwest.

Immediately to the south of the property is an east-west overhead power line. Although not immediately abutting the subject property, the Springboro corporation line is located less than 10 feet to the southwest of the property. A single-family residence, with access provided to Sharts Road to the south, is located approximately 430 feet to the southeast of the property line.

Zoning for most of the vicinity is also ED. The property in Franklin Township described above located is zoned R3, Multi Family Residential Zone under the Warren County Rural Zoning Code.

Following the Planning Commission's discussion at the June 12th work session, the Planning Commission may authorize this item to be placed on a future Planning Commission regular meeting agenda for formal approval of the site plan revision. The earliest date that could occur on is Wednesday, July 31, 2019. No action by Springboro City Council is required on this agenda item.

Staff Comments

City staff has the following comments regarding this agenda item:

1. Regarding proposed building exterior, address the following:
 - a. Elevation Options A are consistent with design standards for this site and match the existing principal structure.
 - b. Adjust plans to include a tripartite building design (base is needed)
 - c. Provide a color rendition of proposed building at June 12th work session.
2. Note that setbacks are measure from overhang. Adjust building placement accordingly.
3. Following the June 12th work session review indicate adjustments to existing lighting plan for site consistent with Chapter 1273 (Exterior Lighting) or Planning & Zoning Code.
4. Following the June 12th work session review indicate changes to approved landscaping plan for the site consistent with Chapter 1280 (Landscaping) of the Planning & Zoning Code.
5. Provide existing and proposed grades and drainage systems and structures with topographic contours at intervals not exceeding:
 - a. One foot for slopes zero degrees to six degrees
 - b. Two feet for slopes six degrees to eighteen degrees; and
 - c. Five feet for slopes over eighteen degreesElevation and contours shall be based upon USGS datum and identify benchmark utilized.
6. Provide boundary dimensions based upon a field survey.
7. Provide sizing details pertaining to the relocation of the detention pond and any corresponding storm sewer construction.
8. City staff reserves the opportunity to provide comments regarding this application at a future date.
9. The Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Discussion:

John Roll, architect with Roll and Associates, was present this evening representing Woodhull to answer questions and discuss the project.

Ms. Iverson asked Mr. Boron for a quick summary. She said they would address the staff comments with the applicant, and give Planning Commission members a chance to ask questions.

Mr. Boron referred to the aerial map, and pointed out that Woodhull owns two properties that were purchased from the City. He said that the whole development is proposed for site of the existing building. He said the aerial shows the site right around the completion of Woodhull's 2017 addition to the building. He said the original building was constructed here back in 2007, and they are proposing to build on the corner there. He said it is a permitted use, and meets all the setback requirements, and the building matches existing building in terms of material and appearance. He said he believed the applicant has an answer to why they aren't adding on again.

Ms. Iverson asked the applicant if he had any questions about the staff comments.

Mr. Roll said that he didn't have any questions, but he could walk them through the drawing, and maybe respond to a couple of comments. He said they are proposing a storage building at Woodhull, and they sell and service copy and business machines. He said they are running out of room in the last addition, and they can't add onto the building because it's a non-sprinklered building. He said he was not sure they were going to do this, but they are seeing what their options are. He said they proposed two options. He said the first option basically matches the existing building with block and a wood truss roof with shingles. He said they thought the second option might be less expensive, which would be a block front facing the street, and the other sides would be metal. He said he knows the staff preferred the first option, which is the more logical one to do, but the cost is about \$70,000 more to do that. He pointed out on the map where the current trash enclosure is which is where they are proposing putting the building. He said the addition that was done three years ago did not have a base element, so they weren't proposing that for this, they were proposing painted block. He showed the members examples of buildings in the surrounding area that are similar to what they would like to do. He said the second option seems to be consistent to what is going on in the area, and it is a big cost savings. He said the building would be tucked way in the back, and you wouldn't see the metal building sides from any other vantage point unless you are in those woods.

Mr. Pearson said unless somebody builds something in those woods back there, and clears it out, you would be able to see it from I-75.

Mr. Roll said that they own that property.

Mr. Pearson said that he knows they own it, and it doesn't matter who owns it. He said if they clear it, then we can see that building. He added that all of those pictures that Mr. Roll showed of those other buildings makes no difference to what they are doing now, because he assumes those were all built when the design standards were different.

Mr. Boron said that was correct, and added that some of the newer ones were built under the current standard.

Ms. Iverson said that the second option would require us to make accommodations whereas the first option is already in our design standards.

Mr. Boron said that was correct.

Ms. Iverson asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Mr. Pearson said that he was at the property today, and it seems pretty tight there, with the retention pond and storm drains.

Mr. Roll said that they would have to analyze if they were to come back to Planning Commission and they would have to have civil drawings that would recalculate the pond.

Mr. Boron said that the issue was identified in a comment stating that it had to be addressed.

Mr. Pearson asked if there would be employees working in this building.

Mr. Roll said, not many. He said they would just be unloading and loading things, and there would be no offices.

Mr. Pearson asked if there would be more employees because of this building.

Mr. Roll said that he didn't believe so.

Ms. Iverson asked Mr. Boron if the applicant wanted to go forward, when would have to submit by for a vote.

Mr. Boron said that the earliest would be the July 31st meeting, and they would need to submit plans by July 12th for review.

C. Site Plan Review

Industry Lane, new light manufacturing facility for Tomco Machining

Background Information

This agenda item is based on an application filed by Construction Managers of Ohio, Inc., representing Tomco Machining, property owner, seeking approval through the site plan review process to construct a 24,000 square foot office and light industrial facility on vacant property located on the east side of Industry Lane. The subject property is located approximately 450 feet south of the southwest corner of the intersection of Industry Lane and South Tech Boulevard. The property currently has no address: property addresses are assigned by the Springboro Engineering Department later in the site development process. The subject property is bisected by underground utility easements that constrain the development of structures on the southern portion of the property.

The subject property is zoned ADD-1, Austin Development District 1. The ADD-1 district was created to manage development of land in the former South Tech Business Park. The ADD-1 was an outcome of the Austin Center Land Use and Development Plan, a long-range plan developed by the City of Springboro in cooperation with Miamisburg, Miami Township, the Montgomery County Transportation Improvement District (MCTID), and others, to coordinate development of land near the then-proposed Austin Boulevard interchange of I-75.

The ADD-1 includes its own permitted land use, architectural, and site development standards. In addition to review by the Springboro Planning Commission, development in the ADD-1 is subject to approval by the Austin Center Land Use Advisory Committee, or LUAC. LUAC membership includes Springboro, Miamisburg, Miami Township, and the MCTID. LUAC review typically occurs following work session by the Springboro Planning Commission.

Zoning in vicinity of the subject property is exclusively ADD-1. Adjacent land uses are light industrial and office in nature, consistent with the ADD-1 zoning designation.

Following the Planning Commission's discussion at the June 12th work session, the Planning Commission may authorize this item to be placed on a future Planning Commission regular meeting agenda for formal approval of the site plan. The earliest date that could occur on is Wednesday, July 31, 2019. No action by Springboro City Council is required on this agenda item.

Staff Comments

City staff has the following comments regarding this agenda item:

1. Regarding the proposed building exterior, address the following:
 - a. Provide a color rendition of the proposed building exteriors at the June 12th work session.
 - b. Provide elevations for the north and east side of the proposed building.
2. Provide dimensions for the proposed building from the east property line. Also, note that setbacks are measured from any overhangs of the building.
3. Indicate number of employees at maximum shift in order to verify compliance with parking requirements under Chapter 1279 (Parking) of the Planning & Zoning Code.
4. Following June 12th work session, provide an exterior lighting plan consistent with Chapter 1273 (Exterior Lighting) of the Planning & Zoning Code.
5. Proposed signage is not subject to site plan review process. Contact Zoning Inspector for sign code provisions on message area, sign placement, and construction details. Also, indicate if a ground sign is proposed as part of the project.
6. Landscaping plan to be provided following June 12th work session under the provisions of the ADD-1 landscaping and buffer requirements, Chapter 1268 of the Planning & Zoning Code.
7. Review by Austin Development LUAC is required prior to formal review by the Springboro Planning Commission. Coordinate with the Planning Commission staff liaison following June 12th work session.
8. Provide written approval from the appropriate utility company for construction within the existing utility easements.
9. Provide boundary dimensions based upon a field survey.
 - a. Provide existing and proposed grades and drainage systems and structures with topographic contours at intervals not exceeding: one foot for slopes zero degrees to six degrees; and
 - b. Two feet for slopes six degrees to eighteen degrees; and
 - c. Five feet for slopes over eighteen degrees
10. Elevation and contours shall be based upon USGS datum and identify benchmark utilized.
11. City staff reserves the opportunity to provide comments regarding this application at a future date.
12. The Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Discussion:

Ron Hill, Construction Managers of Ohio, general contractor for the project, and John Roll, Roll and Associates, architect for the project, were present this evening to answer questions and discuss the project.

Ms. Iverson asked Mr. Boron for a summary.

Mr. Boron said that this property is on Industry Lane. He said the City sold the property to Tomco sometime ago roughly ten years ago. He said there are two gas easements that cross the property which come into play in the site design. He said the property is zoned ADD-1, which is the Austin Development District 1, that was created to guide development around the new interchange. He said all of the property that the City owned at the time that the interchange started to be developed was set aside for ADD-1. He said this zoning has a different review process and standards. He said it doesn't have setbacks, but it has buffers, which is why the building is so close to the other properties. Buildings in the ADD-1 also need to be reviewed by the Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) which is a review process that we jointly administer with Miamisburg, Miami Township, and the Montgomery County Transportation Improvement District. He said this project would have to go

through that review process, which usually happens between Planning Commission work session and regular meeting.

Mr. Pearson asked if this body was first, then LUAC, and then we vote, does LUAC vote also.

Mr. Boron said that they vote. He said Planning Commission reviews it, and then he writes a set of recommendations to LUAC, and then they write a letter to the City recommending approval or not.

Ms. Iverson confirmed that happens before Planning Commission votes.

Mr. Boron said, correct.

Mr. Pearson asked if the City Council votes.

Ms. Iverson said, no, we would be the ones to vote.

Mr. Boron said that the City Manager is still a representative for the review process.

Ms. Iverson asked if the applicant had any questions about the staff comments.

Mr. Hill said that he did not, and he thought they were very fair.

Ms. Iverson asked if anyone on Planning Commission had questions or comments.

Mr. Roll said that he would like to walk through the renderings. He said that the building is up against the property line, 35 feet away from the front setback, and they are trying to preserve room to the south. He said that Tomco needs a lot of flexibility where their office and warehouse might grow. He said they need about twenty parking spaces right now, but they have room for another ten, and he didn't think that was on what he originally submitted. He said it is a pretty simple building with a floor plan for office and production area. He asked Mr. Hill how he would describe what they do.

Mr. Hill said that it was just a small machine shop.

Mr. Roll said that it would be an assembly production space with office. He described the elevations of the building and said that the whole building would be pre-cast tilt up panels with reveals, and the thickness and heights will vary. He said they decided on a color scheme of black and shades of buff. He said they would come back with a more developed landscape plan, but he thought they were meeting the requirement as far as trees go.

Mr. Pearson said that currently there are a large number there, and asked if that is just going to be plowed under.

Mr. Roll said, no, not all of it.

Mr. Boron said that the sides of the building that are not visible from the street can be unadorned compared to the other two. He said since the building will be set back on the north edge of the property, the south and west elevations are the two that needed the most addressing.

Mr. Pearson said it seems like you would be able to see the north elevation as you're coming down Industry Lane.

Mr. Roll said there are some trees that they can keep back there.

Mr. Pearson said they might need to dress up that side.

Mr. Roll said they could maybe extend the striping around, and they would look at that.

Mr. Boron said that things like accent colors and other details can be used to make that happen. He asked if Planning Commission members would be comfortable with staff working with the applicant on this.

There was a consensus among members to allow staff to work with applicant.

Ms. Iverson said this would have the same deadline of July 12th for us to take a vote.

Mr. Pearson asked if they were moving from someplace.

Mr. Hill said they are in North Dayton right now, and they are moving the whole operation down, with a total of 6 or 8 employees, and they plan to grow here.

Mr. Roll said that the twenty parking spaces should be enough right now.

Mr. Pearson asked if the parking lot could go over that easement.

Mr. Roll said, yes.

Mr. Boron said that is why the staff comment was in there for them to be able to have this reviewed with the agencies that represent the two utilities.

Mr. Roll asked if they come back next month, what point would they submit to LUAC.

Mr. Boron said that they would submit to City staff the same documentation in digital format, they would take it from there through our review.

Ms. Iverson said that between the July 12th and the meeting at the end of July would be the LUAC phase.

Mr. Pearson asked if the applicant would go to the LUAC phase.

Mr. Boron said, no. He said it is mostly to make sure each community is following the rules in the zoning code that everyone agreed on for different areas of the area around Austin Landing.

Mr. Hill asked if the City needed full landscape and lighting drawings by July 12th.

Mr. Boron said, yes. He added that signage is the only other item, and that could be separate.

Mr. Hill asked when he needed the final determination on whether the additional ten spaces for parking would go in.

Mr. Boron said that they would need to know by July 12th, if not before, and they can mark them in for future use.

Mr. Hill said they may want to put them in now, but he would find out for sure.

Mr. Boron asked about the detention.

Mr. Dudas said there is a pond is back there that is collecting all the storm water.

III. Guest Comments

Ms. Iverson asked if there were any guest comments.

There was no response.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Mr. Harding said that he would be out of town for the meeting on June 26th.

Mr. Hanson said he would be out on July 31st.

Ms. Iverson said that she would also be out on July 31st.

Mr. Boron asked if it would be an option to move the August 28th meeting to Thursday, August 29th due to a conference that he would be attending.

There was a consensus among members to move the meeting to August 29th.

Mr. Boron said that there would be a public hearing on Thursday, July 18th at 7:00 p.m. regarding the requested addition of vehicle maintenance facilities to the list of permitted uses in the Central Business District (CBD).

V. Adjournment

Ms. Iverson adjourned the Wednesday, June 12, 2019 Planning Commission Work Session at 6:26 p.m.


Becky Iverson, Planning Commission Chairperson


Dan Boron, Planning Consultant


Amy Brown, Planning Commission Secretary