

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

Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, February 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, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld, 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

II. Agenda Items

A. Rezoning, 945 West Central avenue, (SR 73), ED, Employment Center, to B-1, Highway Business District

Enclosed in your packets please find an application, filed by GDP Group, agent for the property owner, to rezone a 2.43-acre parcel located at 945 West Central Avenue from ED, Employment Center District, to B-1, Highway Business District. The property is located on the southwest corner of West Central Avenue (SR 73) and Sharts Road. The site was formerly occupied by Northern's Sunoco but is presently vacant. The property has direct frontage and access to both West Central Avenue and Sharts Road. The property also directly abuts the on- and off-ramps located on the southeast corner of the I-75/SR 73 interchange.

The requested rezoning is intended to allow the agent for the property owner to erect a Thornton's gasoline fueling station and convenience store along with the other uses permitted in the B-1 District. A list of those uses is provided below.

The subject property is presently zoned ED District which was applied onto the site along with large portions of the west end of the community in the 1980s. The ED District, generally, allows light industrial uses, offices and affiliated uses and was intended to enhance the tax base of the community following the adoption of a "General Development Plan" in 1978. The B-1 District, according to its purpose statement, is "...reserve land for business uses which by their nature are typically dependent on having a high traffic, high visibility location and/or which generate substantial amounts of traffic either continuously or at peak periods..."

The B-1 District allows as permitted uses all uses permitted in the B-2, Local Business District, along with the following:

- Automobile fueling stations on less than two acres;
- Car washes;
- Automobile rental agencies;

- Vehicle repair and service facilities; parts and accessory sales;
- Theaters with not more than two screens or stages;
- Plumbing, electrical and HVAC contractors and wholesale/retail supplies;
- Farm equipment and agricultural supplies;
- Medical care facilities occupying more than 15,000 square feet of floor area;
- Animal hospitals and veterinarians occupying more than 3,000 square feet of floor area;
- Department stores occupying not more than 20,000 square feet of floor area;
- Fitness, dance and martial arts facilities occupying more than 2,000 square feet of floor area;
- Food stores occupying not more than 20,000 square feet of floor area;
- Hardware/home supply stores occupying more than 3,000 square feet of floor area;
- Video stores occupying more than 3,000 square feet of floor area;
- Sporting goods stores occupying more than 3,000 square feet of floor area;
- Pool, spa, outdoor furniture, play equipment or home improvement sales;
- Shopping centers or malls containing not more than 40,000 square feet of retail space; and
- Drug stores occupying not more than 20,000 square feet of floor area.

Adjacent land uses include retail commercial development to the east (Arby's and Bob Evan's on the east side of Sharts Road), south (Comfort Inn) and north (Chipolte, Smyth Automotive on the north side of West Central Avenue). To the west is I-75 and on- and off-ramps associated with the I-75/SR 73 interchange that is currently under construction.

Adjacent zoning includes B-4, Destination Business District, to east; ED District to the south; B-1 District to the west, north and northeast.

The *Springboro Land Use Plan*, adopted in April 2009, through Policy Area #6, "I-75 Gateway," recommends as preferred land uses retail generally and specifically restaurants; hotels; shopping centers; theaters; personal services; bank and financial institutions; automotive filling stations (when pump and car wash facilities are located to the rear of the building and not directly visible from S.R. 73); medical care facilities; offices (professional, business, medical, dental); research laboratories; business colleges, trade schools and art schools; new car sales; used car sales but only when accessory to a new car sales operation; and public and semi-public uses.

Policy Area #6 extends from I-75 to Clearcreek-Franklin Road and includes all properties that directly front West Central Avenue as well as others on Sharts Road, Greenwood Lane, Tahlequah Lane, Hiawatha Lane and North Pioneer Drive.

It should be noted that Northern's Sunoco operated on the site as a nonconforming use and structure. This status allowed the use and building to remain legally on the site as "grandfathered" conditions. Once the use was discontinued, and later when the building(s) were removed from the site, the nonconforming status of the use and building were lost after a grace period provided for in the Planning and Zoning Code.

Staff Comments

City staff has advised the applicant that the proposed site plan included in the packet is not necessary at this point in time for a conventional rezoning request and may, in fact, complicate the rezoning process. The rezoning of the site should be reviewed in relation to the City of Springboro's *Land Use Plan*, adjacent zoning and land use among other factors. The site plan would be reviewed under the terms of Chapter 1280, Site Plan Review, of the Planning and Zoning Code. Having said that the applicant has been advised of the need to screen the proposed fueling

points from West Central Avenue frontage of the site in consideration of Section 1280.08(b), Site Plan Review Criteria Applicable to Particular Land Uses, Gasoline Service Station, Drug stores and Grocery stores occupying more than 3,000 square feet of floor area; Drive-In or Drive-Through Restaurants; Drive-Through Banks; Car Washes; all Business Uses with Drive-In or Drive-Through Facilities

Discussion

Michael Rubino of the GDP Group and Eric Zoph, Vice President of Construction for Thornton's, were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Zoph reviewed the history of Thornton's. They have 165 stores and are based out of Louisville, Kentucky. He explained that they are planning to build a new prototype store at this location with 10 pumps and 20 fueling positions. He reviewed some of the possible details for the project.

Mr. Rubino explained that a rezoning is required for their use. They chose B-1 because it is a little less restrictive. They have met with ODOT about the access on SR 73. Their plan shows a right in-right out on SR 73 and a full access on Sharts Road.

Mr. Zoph commented that the discussions with ODOT are in limbo with what they would agree with and what ODOT would provide. They are looking to put a continuous right turn lane in the right-of-way which may close the right out on SR 73.

Ms. Ridd expressed her concern about the rezoning. She does not want it to be rezoned B-1 if the project is not going to work.

Mr. Boron commented that staff has done quite a bit of work on this. He felt that the discussion with ODOT was much more permissive and they are talking about worst case scenarios. ODOT was talking about losing the right out only should accident data show that the right out would be a hazard. The right in-right out would become a right out only at a future date due to a median that will be build on SR 73.

Mr. Vomacka asked about the timing of the median.

Ms. Thompson commented that it could be five years out to never.

Ms. Ridd stated that she thought that they did not want any access within 600 feet of the ramp.

Mr. Boron answered that there are extenuating circumstances that lead to that access point being there which ODOT has to work out because there are two easements across the property to properties to the south. Staff's understanding was that none would be permitted but in conversations with ODOT, ODOT was under the assumption that this could continue for the short term and long term right out. If accident data necessitated removing the right out then it would have to go.

Mr. Zoph stated that their quandary is spending money on this facility and having ODOT remove that access.

Ms. Ridd stated that she has more of a concern that everyone that is coming out will have to turn left onto Sharts Road.

Mr. Zoph answered that they have put the access is at the back of the property.

Mr. Dudas commented that that is the best that they can do.

Mr. Vomacka commented that that may argue that this is not a good use for the site.

Mr. Zoph answered that this is an appropriate use for the site; it has interstate access and heavy traffic.

Ms. Ridd asked if the access isn't safe.

Mr. Zoph commented that if the access wasn't safe then they wouldn't they be here.

Ms. Ridd commented on the nightmare that they have with the access to Speedway on South Pioneer Boulevard with it being so close to SR 73. It backs traffic up onto SR 73. Her concern is that should this project not work out, she doesn't want to see it rezoned.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he doesn't have any problem with the proposed zoning. He does not see this access working at all. This site plan is not acceptable. He is concerned about what was mentioned about the lighting. There are a number of serious problems that he has but those are down the road. He doesn't have an issue with one zoning or another.

Ms. Gibson agreed; whether this use or configuration is a good fit remains to be seen.

Mr. Zoph asked why he felt that the site plan doesn't work.

Mr. Vomacka answered that location of the pumps visible from the road goes against the zoning. There are too many pumps for the amount of space.

Mr. Landefeld commented that he thinks the use is okay; the zoning designation is fine. The plan as drawn here wouldn't work for him.

Mr. Zoph commented that they need the customer to know that they are a gas station; they don't want to bury the pumps behind the building. He reviewed possible options.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she wants to make sure that he understands where Planning Commission is coming from as far as the site itself. She has no problem with the zoning request.

Ms. Ridd asked whether they were in agreement that if they were to rezone it, that B-1 would be the preference.

Ms. Hartle agreed; the zoning is appropriate for the space.

Mr. Papakirk agreed. The use could be appropriate; it is just a matter of the site plan. They have done what they can to move the access to the back of the property.

Mr. Zoph stated that they will work with the City to be accommodating.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for any further comments from staff.

Mr. Boron clarified that it is his understanding that their concern is with ODOT's comment about the access and the term forever.

Mr. Zoph thanked Mr. Boron for facilitating that meeting with ODOT. It makes them anxious when, in an e-mail, someone puts that they reserve the right to shut the whole thing down.

Mr. Papakirk asked about the certainty of the connection to the hotel.

Mr. Rubino answered that there is an access easement. They will maintain that easement.

Mr. Landefeld asked where their closest location was to Springboro.

Mr. Zoph answered, Tylersville Road or Sharonville.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether there were any other questions.

There were none.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that this item will be on the agenda for the formal meeting February 23rd at which time Planning Commission will vote on a formal recommendation to Council. There will be a public hearing process.

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 and January 12, 2011 Planning Commission Work Sessions.

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 earlier this year by 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 three Planning Commission Work Session 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 present that number is 65 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? The Planning Commission directed Fischer Development to work with City staff in revising their plans for the exterior appearance of dwelling units proposed for the project area at the conclusion of the January 12th Work Session. The result is the “Housing Details and Architectural Guidelines” folder included your meeting materials. As indicated in the comments below, City staff had directed the application to simplify, clarify and revise their plans and be prepared to discuss and revised their proposal at the February 9th Work Session based on feedback from the Planning Commission.
- 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 three previous Work Session and communications between meetings the applicant has made significant progress on the overall layout of the revised General Plan. A total of 9 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. The relationship of the materials included in the folder is not clear. For example the spreadsheet “Minimum Housing Materials Standards Table” and the sets of home plans for the various parts of the project area do not match up well to the document “Housing Details and Architectural Guidelines.” The latter refers to subareas, for example 4A, 4B and 4C, but there are no provisions spelled out in the spreadsheet or home plans as to what these subareas mean. Are the standards included in Minimum Housing Material Standards Table applicable to

- all subareas within Section 4, for example? Are all 71 homes proposed for Area 4 usable throughout Area 4?
2. 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.
 3. Per the January 12th Planning Commission Work Session please provide masonry-to-vinyl percentages for side and rear elevations on a subarea by subarea basis.

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. Provide conservation easement language and maintenance responsibility of the easement area. This information shall be shown on the appropriate record plan for that section of development.
4. Will sidewalk be provided throughout the condo portion of the development?
5. Vacation of right of way details west of the round-a-bout to be provided at a later date.
6. Which vegetation areas on the "Community Features Plan" will be retained?
7. Revised HOA documents to be reviewed by the City prior to recording.
8. 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.
9. The Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Discussion

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

Mr. Huss reviewed the current plans for housing and exterior materials. Housing and exterior materials are separated into areas and subareas. In the folders are sheets showing the areas and the masonry to vinyl siding percentages for the front elevations, the minimums and averages and the number of elevations. Included are minimum standards for the various areas for the sides and rears of the housing. It also summarizes this plan in comparison to the 2005 plan in terms of proposed housing by area. Also included are the elevations, separated by area.

Mr. Huss reviewed the map, showing the areas and subareas.

Mr. Huss reviewed the elevations in Areas 4a, 4b and 4c.

Mr. Huss commented that the covenants for the community were also in the packets.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that covenant #3 refers to the zoning ordinance of Warren County and asked that it be amended to refer to the zoning ordinance of the City of Springboro.

Mr. Patterson agreed that it would be amended.

Mr. Vomacka asked for clarification whether all buildings in Area 4 would be brick or Hardiboard on all four sides.

Mr. Huss stated that that was correct. The minimum percentage of masonry on the front elevations is 100%. Hardiboard is considered a masonry product. In Area 4, there is a requirement for a first floor and rear brick wrap. He presented side and rear elevations showing the brick wrap.

Ms. Gibson asked why vinyl siding is listed on the wood product for Area 4.

Mr. Patterson answered that there are a couple of elevations that have a fish scale looking material that they believe that they can get a Hardibased or cedar based product but at this point they do not have a manufacturer for it. That product as of now would be vinyl.

Ms. Gibson stated that she has a problem leaving it in there. She understands why it is in there, they may have to use it in that small amount on one plan, but it bothers her that it is listed.

Mr. Huss stated that it would be eliminated.

Mr. Huss stated that in Area 5, they will meet the minimum requirements in Area 4c. The future model court will meet the requirements of Area 4c with the exception of one lot. The one lot, 3b, will be a model of what is being built in another area.

Mr. Patterson stated that the model for Area 2 would not be in the model court, it would be in Area 2.

Mr. Huss continued to Area 3. The requirements for 3a would be the same as in Area 4c; brick wraps with Hardi above. In Area 3b, the commitment is for first floor brick wraps on the sides and the rears. It does allow for vinyl above the brick wrap. The remainder of Area 3 includes a low brick on the sides, a three to four foot brick swath along the sides of all of the homes.

Mr. Vomacka asked what areas would have vinyl.

Mr. Huss answered that 3b could have vinyl above the brick wrap on the sides and the rear.

Mr. Patterson added that it has components of vinyl on the front.

Mr. Huss concluded Area 3 by saying the there are 48 elevations. The minimum masonry to vinyl siding percentage is 23 and the average is 78.

Mr. Vomacka asked whether all of the houses could use the minimum percentage.

Mr. Patterson answered that they couldn't because of the home mix guideline which doesn't allow the same plan or elevation to be built next door or across the street. The table wasn't meant to signify the number of times it could be built but the number of elevations that meet that criteria.

Mr. Vomacka asked if everybody selects the most vinyl package out there how much vinyl will be out there.

Mr. Patterson answered that it would be 23% masonry to vinyl on the front elevation. The sides would be vinyl above the three to four brick plinth. The rear would be vinyl.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he is concerned that they will have a heavier percentage of vinyl than the averages might imply.

Mr. Patterson compared elevations and explained that the fact that there is vinyl on the front of some elevations may not correlate to its final value.

Mr. Vomacka answered that that is a fair argument.

Ms. Gibson asked about the housing details and guidelines; "In areas 2 and 3 where no standards currently exist, significant amounts of brick and Hardiplank will be required on the front and side elevations". When she referred to their comparison of plans under the materials standards table she doesn't see Hardi on any of the side elevations only vinyl and is confused by the statement.

Mr. Huss stated that the bullet point could be made more clear and needs to be restated.

Ms. Gibson asked what manufactured wood was.

Mr. Patterson answered that it was LP, a Louisiana Pacific manufactured wood product. It is used in trim and fascia board, not as vinyl siding.

Mr. Patterson explained that the main portion of Area 3 will have vinyl rear, vinyl above a brick plinth of three to four feet on the sides capped with a limestone sill. In other sections, there will be brick on the first floor sides and rear with vinyl above that. In another section, there will be the same sides and rear applications as Area 4.

Mr. Vomacka asked what the rear elevations would be; what the residents of The Manor who back up to the new construction would be looking at.

Mr. Patterson answered that the people who live in The Manor have vinyl; it will be vinyl on the rear of the new properties. It will be consistent with what they have purchased.

Mr. Vomacka asked about the grades and qualities of the vinyl. He asked whether it was consistent with the grade of vinyl of the properties of The Manor.

Mr. Patterson answered that they use a high grade. He cannot look at the properties of The Manor without trespassing.

Residents in the audience volunteered for a comparison.

Ms. Belpulsi asked that quality be as good or better.

Ms. Ridd asked about the rear setbacks at The Manor.

Mr. Huss did not know offhand.

Mr. Huss continued to Area 2. The minimum masonry to vinyl siding ratio is 15%, the average is 54%. There are 31 total elevations that would be offered. There is one subarea where they are requiring ranch homes and first floor brick wrap on sides and rears with the remainder of the homes being Hardisiding.

Mr. Patterson pointed out specific homes and their locations that he intends to build as model homes. These would be high visibility locations.

Ms. Belpulsi asked about the square footage of the homes.

Mr. Patterson commented that it is a net square footage as opposed to a gross square footage.

Mr. Vomacka asked about other high visibility properties in Area 2a. He asked that two properties be upgraded due to their being in the entryway.

Mr. Patterson answered that there would be landscaped berm that would shield some areas. He agreed to look at the two properties.

Mr. Huss continued with Area 1. He reviewed the information in the packets; the elevations of the Gallery and Villa products.

Ms. Belpulsi asked about the materials that were used to build the apartments at The Falls.

Mr. Boron answered that the first phase to the south was Hardiplank; the area to the north was mostly constructed with vinyl.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that it looks nice and hoped that the abutting new construction could be similar.

Mr. Patterson explained that they use vinyl and have a difficult time with the Hardiplank is because of the reserves that need to be established for the condominium association in order to reseal and repaint. If you paint Hardi correctly it does hold paint for a very long time but it is painted and will need to be redone.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether they would use the same quality vinyl as on the homes.

Mr. Patterson answered that it is a higher/heavier gauge than is used on homes because of the length of the buildings.

Ms. Ridd asked about whether all of the units have garages.

Mr. Patterson answered that in the Galleria buildings, the two end units do not have garages. In the Villa building, all the units have garages, two have one car garages, and the others have two car garages.

Mr. Huss reviewed the modifications that were made to the previous submittal. The street configuration was been revised back to the previous plan. Area 2 and 3, block and cul-de-sac length items have been reviewed and revised with staff. The open space has been made bigger. A twenty foot conservation easement was added to some property lines that will tell the owner of the lot that they can't disturb the trees on the lot. Mr. Huss sated that they will have to finalize the engineering in terms of storm sewer and rear yard drainage. They may have to add catch basins.

Mr. Landefeld asked who would hold the easement.

Mr. Huss answered that the HOA would hold the easement and would enforce it.

Ms. Belpulsi asked about the future parking expansion for the clubhouse. She asked about who would be responsible for expanding the parking lot if needed and what criteria would be used.

Mr. Huss answered that Fischer would be responsible and they will hold seats on the home owners association who would determine any need.

Mr. Vomacka asked who becomes responsible for the maintenance of the trees in the conservation easement.

Mr. Patterson answered that the homeowner does.

Mr. Huss commented that they have increased the lot widths from 60 feet to 65 feet. The changes resulted in a loss of five lots and increased some open space.

Ms. Gibson asked whether the number of lots was 71 or 65, the application and layout are conflicting.

Mr. Huss answered that the plan is correct, the application is the original.

Mr. Vomacka asked Mr. Dudas whether he was satisfied with the phasing plan for roads and linkages.

Mr. Dudas answered that he was.

The entry configuration to the condos and the snow plowing responsibility was discussed.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for any further questions from Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission whether they were comfortable with the types of materials, the layout of the streets and open space and the number of dwelling units which now has been decreased from 105 to 65 units.

Mr. Landefeld commented about the roofing in Area 1. He asked why dimensional shingles were called out in Areas 3, 4, and 5 but not in Area 1.

Mr. Patterson answered that they do not use a single tab; they use a three tab 25 year shingle which does not have the dimensional look it does have the three tab effect to keep it from blowing off. They have found for the cost versus the life that it is the best shingle to use for that product.

Mr. Landefeld stated that he likes the look of the dimensional shingles; it would dress up the front of the buildings.

Mr. Huss stated that they would take a look at it.

Ms. Ridd stated that she still has a problem with the density.

Ms. Gibson stated that she is pleased with a lot of the changes that were made as far as the layout goes. It appears that the green space has been moved around, the placement is more pleasing. She wishes the density could be lower than the 65. She suggested that they increase the condos. They have increased the size of the lots from the original layout.

Mr. Huss answered that the density is due to the stacking in the condos.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he is generally pleased with what has been done. He is not as concerned about the density as his colleagues. He is concerned about the amount of vinyl.

Ms. Hartle commented that they have worked very hard to do what Planning Commission has asked of them. She is impressed on how far they have come. She is not crazy about the vinyl but they have lowered the density.

Ms. Ridd stated that she is concerned about the 10 foot setback. She also asked that a maximum of the amounts of materials be assigned and the owner can decide how they want to use it on the house.

Mr. Huss answered that the question becomes how you police the average. There is a minimum by section.

Mr. Papakirk stated that he likes that they respected the existing homeowners by providing a detailed explanation. This has come a long way.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she is pleased with what they have presented. Planning Commission is trying to get the very best for Springboro. She would like it to be less dense with more green space but she does appreciate their sensitivity to the residents and that they have made every effort to make sure that the homes that will be built next to them will be of the same quality. She does believe that there is more vinyl than what she would like to see and asked that they reduce some of that. The vinyl products that she has seen have not been of a high quality; that is her concern.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether this was the same vinyl percentages as Shaker Run.

Mr. Patterson answered no; this exceeds Shaker Run. It has much less vinyl.

Mr. Papakirk commented that it is not so much the vinyl but how the homes are articulated in the architecture and the facades. If you have a blank façade on the rear, that could be a problem.

Ms. Ridd commented that that is what she would like to see improved, some of the rear elevations that are wall to wall wall.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for comments from staff.

Ms. Thompson wanted to thank the applicant for working with staff to reduce the number of comments. She also thanked staff for their work.

Mr. Boron commented that staff has received some feedback on vinyl and determining the direction they need to go.

The applicant will work with the staff to determine the quality of the vinyl on Stanton and present vinyl samples and look at the rear setbacks.

Mr. Boron commented that some of the staff comments on standards were intended for use by the building department. He commented that the General Plan is the first step which leads to the Final Development Plan.

The applicant was asked to have a submittal ready on Wednesday, February 16th for the Planning Commission meeting of February 23th.

Ms. Belpulsi asked the applicant to display the layout for the audience members and stay after the meeting to answer any of their questions.

III. Guest Comments

Mike Hingsbergen, 48 Stanton Drive, commented that he is disappointed in the latest proposal from Fischer Homes in regards to the twenty foot conservation easement. He stated that it offers him no protection at all. He paid a premium for a wooded lot with a twenty foot common space on the other side of his property line. While they say that they can't cut it down, what happens if the homeowner cuts down the trees? What recourse does he have? His concern is that it can happen. He feels that twenty feet is not much to ask for the protection of his neighbors and himself for what they have invested in their properties. He would like to see the area as a common space and not owned by himself or any property owners in The Springs.

Ron Woeste, 178 Winding Creek Drive, praised Fischer Homes for how far they have come regarding Area 4 and connecting Sycamore Springs Drive. He commented that his issues come down to three things, the minimum requirements, the density and comments on the condos.

Mr. Woeste presented photos of the Winding Creek subdivision and compared them to the Fischer Homes. He asked for consistency in the neighborhood and made suggestions about the materials, roof pitches, width of the homes and lots and the square footages. He compared the current homes' square footage with the proposed square footage. He suggested that the condos should all have two car garages.

Richard Cormier, 10 Cascade Court, president of the Sycamore Springs Homeowner's Association commented on the history of Sycamore Springs. He stated that there is no vinyl in Sycamore Springs and will be abutting up against an area that will drive the cost of the homes down if vinyl is introduced into these areas.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that there will be no vinyl in the homes abutting Sycamore Springs.

Mr. Cormier requested stoppage to this work shop of Planning Commission take place at this time. He requested that Fischer Homes PUD be placed into an inactive state until all impact studies are complete and the following concerns and issues have been properly addressed. He would like to stick to the original plan of 2005 if possible. Any additional homes will have an effect on the traffic into his facility.

Mr. Cormier claimed that the City is currently reviewing layoffs for police and fire.

Ms. Belpulsi disagreed; as a member of Council, they are not discussing layoffs.

Mr. Cormier stated that opening Woodstream Drive would allow shortcuts from Yankee Road. The City and Fischer Homes needs to show the homeowner's association how the traffic will be guided in from the start to the finish. He requested a site meeting at the entrance to Sycamore Springs; this entrance is not designed to handle the requested change, the plans of 2005 were. He requested a meeting at the entrance and a survey by the engineers before any plan goes forward.

Mr. Cormier commented on the impact on the schools.

Mr. Cormier would like to see an impact study on the power grid and its impact on continued outages in his development.

Mr. Cormier, for the record, asked for a stoppage and the PUD be placed in an inactive state until Fischer Homes takes responsibility for the cleanup of the existing community center, create a nature way for the existing homeowners at The Springs to include and maintain landscaping of all common areas and roads. He asked that they show where the water from the existing fountain is going.

Mr. Cormier commented on problems that Sycamore Springs has had with their pond.

Mr. Papakirk stated that this has been designed to handle the storm water independent of his development. It will improve his situation.

Mr. Cormier expressed his concern about the construction traffic.

Ms. Thompson explained that it will be addressed.

Mr. Vomacka explained that when the City makes the connection from Sycamore Springs into The Springs then the City can rebuild the last piece of Lytle Five Points and make the entrance into his subdivision safer.

Mr. Cormier stated that he wants to go on record that they oppose the additional 65 home and the vinyl.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that this item will be on the agenda for a formal vote of the Planning Commission meeting of February 23rd. The Planning Commission recommendation either for or against will then go to City Council.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Mr. Vomacka presented Planning Commission with a flyer for the 2011 Community Planning Forum being held Saturday, February 26th in Cincinnati.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, February 9, 2011 Planning Commission Work Session at 8:11 P.M.

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chairperson

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary