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, Jack Hanson, Robert Dimmitt, John Sillies
Absent: Chris Pearson, Becky Hartle

Staff: Dan Boron, Planning Consultant; Chad Dixon, City Engineer; Amy Brown, Planning Commission Secretary

Ms. Iverson welcomed new member John Sillies to the Planning Commission and she appreciated him joining Planning Commission.

II. Agenda Items

A. Final Development Plan, CinDay Academy, 5-11 Sycamore Creek Drive and 20 Eleanor Drive, PUD-B, Planned Unit Development Business, access and parking lot reconfiguration

Background Information

This agenda item is based on an application filed by Gina Pangalangan, property and business owner, seeking final development plan approval for CinDay Academy that is located at 5-11 Sycamore Creek Drive and 20 Eleanor Drive. The property is zoned PUD-B, Planned Unit Development-Business. The three separate parcels that constitute the CinDay Academy campus total 7.34 acres of land located on the east side of North Main Street (SR 741) between Eleanor Drive and Sycamore Creek Drive. The three campus properties are described as follows:

- The northernmost property is addressed as 5 Sycamore Creek Drive and was until mid-2016 a medical office. The property is 1.97 acres in area and fronts both North Main Street and Sycamore Creek Drive with vehicular access provided from Sycamore Creek Drive. This property is labeled as tract 3 on sheet 1 or 1 in the plans submitted by the applicant.

- Tract 2 on sheet 1 of 1 is addressed as 11 Sycamore Creek Drive and has been part of the CinDay Academy since 2005 when the original school building was constructed. This parcel is 1.88 acres in area and has frontage on North Main Street with vehicular access provided from Sycamore Creek Drive. Until the school’s acquisition of 5 Sycamore Creek Drive this access was on an access easement.
The southernmost property is labeled as tract 1 on sheet 1 of 1 and is a 3.49-acre parcel that is addressed as 20 Eleanor Drive. This parcel has been part of the CinDay campus since 2007 when a former church was repurposed for use as a school building. A multi-purpose building was added in 2012 along with a reconfigured parking lot and playground areas. Access to 20 Eleanor Drive is provided from Eleanor Drive with frontage on both North Main Street and Eleanor Drive.

The submitted final development plan shows changes primarily to both the 5 and 11 Sycamore Creek Drive parts of the campus. Vehicular access to both properties would be combined with a single entrance and a single exit, both from Sycamore Creek Drive. The two existing parking lots would be consolidated into an expanded parking lot on the west side of the properties and between the two campus buildings. Most of the existing access drive to 11 Sycamore Creek Drive would be removed as would all but 3 parking spaces west of the two northernmost buildings. Most of this space would be repurposed as open space.

The final development plan also indicates the installation of a new monument sign at the intersection of North Main Street and Sycamore Creek Drive and relocation of an existing monument signs at the intersection of North Main Street and Eleanor Drive. No additional floor space is proposed as part of the submitted final development plan. No changes to the existing access, parking and circulation plan are proposed as part of the final development plan for the 20 Eleanor Drive/tract 1. Access and circulation to 20 Eleanor Drive would remain separate from the north part of the campus.

The entire CinDay Academy campus was rezoned to PUD-B, Planned Unit Development-Business, effective March 16, 2017. This rezoning accommodated the reuse of 5 Sycamore Creek Drive for school space. The buildings at 11 Sycamore Creek Drive and 20 Eleanor Drive were legal nonconforming uses prior to the 2017 rezoning, that is they were permitted to continued to be uses as school/daycare/preschool buildings under certain conditions. The rezoning allows for the use of the campus for a school, daycare center and preschool as well as accessory buildings, structures and uses to be fully compliant with current zoning for the site.

Adjacent land uses include office to the north of Sycamore Creek Drive, residential uses to the east on Robin Glen Court and to the south on Eleanor Drive and office uses to the west on the west side of North Main Street. Adjacent zoning includes O-R District to the north on the north side of Sycamore Creek Drive, R-1, Estate-Type Residential District, to the east and south and O-R District to the west on the west side of North Main Street.

**Staff Comments**

City staff identified the following comments for this agenda item at this time:

1. For 5-11 Sycamore Creek Drive properties, following July 12 work session provide landscaping plan consistent with the provisions of Chapter 1280 of the Planning & Zoning Code to screen the newly proposed parking lot. Indicated existing landscaping to remain, proposed vegetation species, size and number in tabular form.
2. Indicate proposed design details for ornamental fencing to screen parking lot.
3. Provide elevations of proposed dumpster enclosure and monument signage as well as any other accessory structures.
4. Indicate building populations for all campus buildings to justify the provision of 164 off-street parking spaces on the campus.
5. Provide a plan for exterior lighting for the new parking lot consistent with Chapter 1273, Exterior Lighting, of Planning & Zoning Code including photometric analysis, light fixture details, pole heights and compliance with color-temperature limitations.
6. City staff reserves the opportunity to comment on plans submitted following the July 12 work session.
7. Provide engineering details for the parking lot design for review, including storm drainage details, curbing, and pavement section.
8. The Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Discussion:

Tony Beckert and Tom Vanden Bosch from CESO Inc., were in attendance this evening to answer questions from Planning Commission.

Ms. Iverson stated that we are at the final development stage and asked for a brief summary from Mr. Boron.

Mr. Boron said that there was an application last year for re-zoning the property from a PUD-B because the owner of the property felt it was important to bring both 5 Sycamore Creek and 11 Sycamore Creek under the same zoning. He said that the zoning change became effective in March. He said that no new buildings are being proposed at this time and this plan would expand the parking lot. He said it would combine 2 existing parking lots on the north side of the campus, and reconfigure access to the parking lots on the Sycamore Creek side. He said much of the existing driveway along the east property line would be removed. He said that there would be no changes to the former church building, the multi-purpose building, or the existing parking area on the south side. He added that the changes are necessitating the reconfiguration of the storm water drainage area.

Ms. Iverson said there are several staff comments, and we can go through those one by one. She addressed the first comment regarding 5 and 11 Sycamore Creek Drive that stated following this work session, the developer would provide the landscaping plan consistent with the provisions of Chapter 1280 of the Planning & Zoning Code to screen the newly proposed parking lot. She said they need to indicate the existing landscaping to remain, proposed vegetation species, and the size and number. Ms. Iverson asked if the minimum height for the trees along S.R. 741 would be met.

Mr. Boron said that yes, in terms of size and number, the trees would meet the height requirement. He added that from where the proposed parking lot is, including the east side abutting Robinglen Court and Sycamore Creek Drive, it would be necessary to show the size, type, and number of trees.

Mr. Harding said that looking at the screening on the plans, with what is currently there, and what will be additional, asked how the screening would be for the residents in the back.

Mr. Beckert distributed a handout showing the existing and additional landscaping.

Mr. Boron said that credit will be given for all existing vegetation that remains.

Mr. Harding added that we need to take into consideration for ash borer, that if one tree is being taken out, one needs to replace it.
Mr. Boron asked if the handout shows the intention of the landscaping.

Mr. Beckert said that the plan is currently showing taxus evergreens along the parking lot. He said there will also be black gum, shingle oak, bald cypress, black hills spruce, and various other evergreens and shrubs.

Mr. Harding asked if the trees would be saplings, or more fully grown.

Mr. Beckert said that the shade trees would be 2-½ inch caliper with a 14 foot height, and the evergreens would be 8 feet high.

Ms. Iverson addressed the second comment regarding the ornamental fencing to screen the parking lot.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said it will match the fencing that is currently out there.

Ms. Iverson said that the third comment regards providing the elevation of the proposed dumpster enclosure, monument signage, as well as any other accessory structures.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said that the wooden dumpster enclosure would be 8 feet high on the back of the property.

Mr. Boron said that is the only new construction that is planned besides the sign.

Ms. Iverson said that on number 4, the populations for all campus buildings need to be indicated to justify the provision of 164 off-street parking spaces on the campus.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said that he spoke to Mr. Boron about that today. He stated that currently there are 216 students, and the owner anticipates future growth to about 315. He added that the staff is currently about 27, with future growth of another 10-12 on all buildings. He said that the total capacity of all buildings is 500.

Ms. Iverson said that number 5 is to provide a plan for exterior lighting for the new parking lot consistent with Chapter 1273 of the Code.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said that will be addressed.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said that they would like to address number 6 and 7 together.

Mr. Boron asked them to explain what they are doing because the existing storm water drain will be moving over with the expansion of the parking lot.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said that currently there is detention basin that takes care of one building. He said that their intention is to put in a new detention basin that will accommodate both sides of the property. He added that the signs would be moved out closer to the intersection.

Mr. Dimmitt asked if that would interfere with any sidewalks.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said no, it was all on the property.
Mr. Boron said that the Engineering Department will be looking to make sure site distance studies are completed, because the owner is looking at moving signs on both corners. He said that the Eleanor intersection has already been re-stripped with a left turn lane. He said that there was originally some concern about this being a drive-through type campus, but it will continue to be separate. Mr. Boron asked Mr. Vanden Bosch to explain the circulation on both sides of campus.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said that the circulation for drop-off would be in and out, with one entrance and one exit. He said there would also be a fitness course with different activities located in the back.

Mr. Boron said we would need to have details on that once you are seeking formal approval.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said that they would have drawings on that.

Mr. Harding asked about the times of schools, because he had concerns of increased traffic on both sides or one side at a time. He asked if there would be more students on one side of the property.

Ms. Iverson said that some of those students would be driving and parking if they are in high school.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said there would be 40 in the high school building, 106 in the school-age building, and 70 in the preschool building. He said that there would be a shift over time as the preschool is reducing and moving into the school-age building, 20 or 30 school-age students would be moving to the high school building.

Ms. Iverson asked if there were any comments or questions from Planning Commission members.

Mr. Boron asked Mr. Vanden Bosch to provide a digital copy based on what we have seen so far. He said we are still looking at the numbers that were projected for the amount of population during the day to see if the amount of parking is justified. He added that there would be an opportunity to talk about it between now and the regular meeting.

Mr. Sillies asked if there were a lot of students driving.

Mr. Vanden Bosch said he believed there were about 6 currently driving.

Mr. Boron added that the on-street parking is a concern, and we don’t want to add to it, there should be adequate parking without going overboard.

Ms. Iverson said that the anticipation would be about 200 people visiting the campus for an event. She asked about the deadline for the next submission, to be ready possibly for the end of this month.

Mr. Boron said that might be a problem, because they would have to prepare all engineering plans for the driveway, new parking lot, and new driveways in a short amount of time. He said that the storm water plans have been submitted and are currently being reviewed. He said that he realizes they were going to occupy the property for new school year, and we need to take a look at what is needed to support it, as far as parking and landscaping. He added that he would be willing to work with Mr. Vanden Bosch and Mr. Beckert to help with whatever they may need.

Ms. Iverson thanked Mr. Vanden Bosch and Mr. Beckert for attending.
B. Site Plan Review
45 Commercial Way, new landscaping business

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for site plan review approval, filed by Burkhardt Engineering Co., representing P.S. Four, LLC, property owner, to construct a 6,000-square foot light industrial building, storage yard and accessory uses at 45 Commercial Way. The property at 45 Commercial Way is currently a vacant 2.58-acre site with frontage on Commercial Way. The building/site is proposed to be used by the Brickman Group as a commercial landscaping service center.

The subject property is zoned ED, Employment Center District, a zoning designation that permits the proposed use. The City of Springboro corporate boundary coincides with the entire south property line and most of the east property line.

Adjacent land uses include light industrial to the west in the form of Complete Grinding Solutions located at 55 Commercial Way; to the north on the north side of Commercial Way, Pontecorvo Dance Studio located at 20 Commercial Way; an unoccupied office building at 35 Commercial Way to the northeast; a vacant property located at 7923 Sharts Road to the east in Franklin Township; a vacant residence to the east located at 7899 Sharts Road; and an occupied residence to the south at 7851 Sharts Road in Franklin Township. Adjacent zoning includes ED District to the west, north and northeast and Franklin Township R-1, Rural Residence District to the east and south.

Staff Comments

City staff identified the following comments for this agenda item at this time:

1. Provide architectural elevations for any accessory buildings including dumpster enclosures and walls or fencing proposed for the property.
2. Provide a dimension to rear (south) property line. Planning Commission determines setback requirements for properties within the ED District during the Site Plan Review process.
3. Provide building usage information to determine the necessity for 39 off-street parking spaces.
4. Following completion of work session review provide exterior lighting details in compliance with Chapter 1273 of Planning & Zoning Code including photometric analysis, light fixture details, pole heights and compliance with color-temperature limitations.
5. Following completion of work session review provide landscaping plan indicating landscaping details in compliance with Chapter 1280 of Planning & Zoning Code to screen adjacent properties, and provide landscaping for parking lot and site requirements. Provide information on proposed tree species, size and number in tabular form and indicate existing vegetation to remain.
6. City staff reserves the opportunity to comment on plans submitted following work session.
7. Make appropriate detention pond revisions as necessary.
8. Access from Sharts Road will not be permitted at the southeast corner of the property.
10. Provide detailed design drawings.
11. The Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Discussion:

John Burkhardt, from Burkhardt Engineering was in attendance tonight to answer questions from Planning Commission.

Ms. Iverson asked Mr. Boron to provide a brief summary.

Mr. Boron said that there was a proposal about 3 years ago for a gun range at the same site, which is located on Commercial Way, next to Complete Grinding Solutions. He said the site has a city boundary with Franklin Township on the east and south side, and the property has frontage on Commercial Way. He said the plan is to construct a 6,000 sq. ft. building, storage yard, and parking area for Brickman Landscaping, which was originally located further down the street. He said it is a permitted use under the current zoning, and it meets the Code for architectural style and color. He said that the staff had minor comments, and there would be more detail later in the formal approval.

Ms. Iverson asked Mr. Burkhardt if he had questions about the staff comments.

Mr. Burkhardt said that he had no problems with the comments, and he said he didn’t submit everything for the work session, but he knows they had to be in for the final. He did address the one question about the need for the amount of parking spaces and said that there are 20 full time employees, and the seasonal employees bring the number to 40, just to address the question of having 39 parking spaces.

Mr. Boron confirmed that all company vehicles would be in the yard.

Mr. Burkhardt said yes, the vehicles would be enclosed in the yard, and there would be a double drive entrance with very few street walk-ins.

Ms. Iverson asked Planning Commission members if they had any questions or comments.

Mr. Harding asked if the layout, permitted uses, and material and style of building were within the Code.

Mr. Boron said that the drawings that were submitted are compliant with design standards for light industrial development within the community, and the materials and color of the building are also compliant.

Mr. Sillies asked what is allowed for storage on outside, trucks, mowers, etc.

Mr. Boron said those items can be in the yard, but the yard will need to be screened with both landscaping and fencing. He said that the fencing they had before was decorative in the front, with an allowance to have chain link in the back. He said that heavy landscaping was required on the commercial side on the site Brickman previously had and a parking lot was used to screen it. He added that the equipment needs to be screened behind fencing and landscaping.
Mr. Burkhardt said that the building will be smaller in front, with a large yard in the back. He added that he thought there was an easement to the west to outlet the detention pond, but there is not, so there will be a detention pond out front to outlet for storm water.

Mr. Boron advised that there are different screening requirements for different land use relationships, and they can be mitigated by keeping existing landscaping.

Ms. Iverson said the next step would be the formal approval process.

Mr. Boron said they could come back in August for formal approval, and he believes it would be on the 31st.

Mr. Burkhardt asked when everything would need to be submitted.

Ms. Iverson said the Friday, August 11 would be the deadline for submission for the August 30 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Boron said he would be happy to work with Mr. Burkhardt so that they could be on the agenda for the late August meeting.

III. Guest Comments

Ms. Iverson said that this meeting is a work session and votes are not taken, invited guests to approach the podium, give their names and addresses for the record.

Mr. Rick Cull, 50 Robinlen Court, spoke regarding CinDay Academy and said he had been to a City Council meeting when CinDay Academy was making changes in 2005. He said at that time they would address the problem with the playground at the school building, which is exactly on his property line. He said there is no other area that they are using on their property that is directly against the property line. He said he doesn’t mind the kid’s area, but he would like the proper screening that everyone else has. He would like at least a 10 foot buffer zone, and believes this is a perfect opportunity to address this.

Mr. Boron said that did have a chance to speak to the representatives from CinDay Academy on this buffer issue. He said that the plan for this portion of the property was always a play area, and the assertion that there was a buffer requirement is not the case. He asked the representatives for CinDay Academy if they would reduce the play area, and they said no, but they were willing to provide landscaping within the play area. He said that we cannot retroactively ask them to remove or reduce the play area buffer.

Mrs. Lynn Cull, 50 Robinlen Court, asked if CinDay Academy offered to put landscaping in the play area, because it is not on the plan.

Mr. Boron said he spoke with Mr. Cull yesterday morning and talked to the representatives from CinDay Academy this afternoon and they have included the addition of some trees within that area. He added that the proposal is to remove almost all the parking area between the two school buildings at 5 and 11 Sycamore Creek Drive and the property lines include Robinlen and the detention area owned by the City and it would be replaced with landscaping as required under this final development plan. Mr. Boron said that the City has offered to provide landscaping on the Cull’s property to address the landscaping need.
Mr. Cull said that hedges on their property is something that they would have to maintain and it would be a burden on them that they shouldn't have to bear.

Mrs. Cull also commented about drainage issues at the rear of the property. Mr. Boron said the City would take a look at it.

Ms. Iverson said what the Culls are proposing may need to be discussed with Mr. Boron at a later time and thanked the Cull's for coming and speaking tonight.

Ms. Iverson said that Planning Commission received a letter from Barbara Gibson, 185 Sycamore Creek Drive, regarding the CinDay Academy agenda item. Ms. Iverson said that Ms. Gibson was unable to attend tonight’s meeting, but Planning Commission reviewed her comments, discussed many of them during the meeting, and thanked Ms. Gibson for her comments.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Planning Commission members had no additional comments.

Mr. Boron mentioned that if CinDay Academy would wish to come back for the meeting on July 26, 2017 Planning Commission, that would be the only item on the agenda. He said otherwise it wouldn't be necessary to meet on that date.

Ms. Iverson asked if everyone would be at that meeting if there would be one.

Mr. Hanson said that he would be out of town on the July 26.

Mr. Boron said the recommendation that Planning Commission made to City Council regarding medical marijuana would be on the agenda for consideration at the July 20 City Council meeting, and will be moving ahead for public hearing and first reading.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Iverson adjourned the Wednesday, July 12, 2017 Planning Commission Work Session at 6:50 P.M.

Becky Iverson, Planning Commission Chairperson

____________________________________________________

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

____________________________________________________

Amy Brown, Planning Commission Secretary