

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

Planning Commission Work Session  
Wednesday, August 13, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the Springboro Planning Commission Work Session to order at the temporary Springboro Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 425 South Pioneer Boulevard, Springboro, Ohio.

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Chairperson, Jim Chmiel, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld, Becky Hartle

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

II. Agenda Items

A. Site Plan Review, 5 Greenwood Lane, northwest corner West Central Avenue (SR 73) and Greenwood Lane, reuse of building for restaurant

Background

This agenda item is a request submitted by Steve Schwope, Glavan Feher Architects, Columbus, agents for the property owners, for the reuse of the former Tom Katz restaurant located at 5 Greenwood Lane, located at the northwest corner of West Central Avenue (SR 73) and Greenwood Lane, for a Chipotle restaurant.

As proposed the majority of the existing 4,848-square foot restaurant would be retained; about 731 square feet of the existing building would be demolished—comprising a cooler on the rear (north) side of the building and the southernmost (front) part of the building. The existing parking area would be retained but reconfigured and resurfaced. As such much of the proposed reuse of the building and site is grandfathered and not subject to Planning Commission review; Planning Commission's review is limited to the exterior of the building and some site plan details such as landscaping and lighting.

The property is zoned B-1, Highway Business District. The B-1 District allows the restaurant as a permitted use.

Adjacent land uses include the Hampton Inn to the north; a veterinarian's office to the east on the east side of Greenwood Lane; to the south a vacant site formerly occupied by a gasoline/service station south of West Central Avenue; and Smythe Automotive to the west.

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

## Staff Comments

1. Signs not subject to review by Planning Commission; contact Dan Fitzpatrick, Zoning Inspector, (937) 748-9791, for provisions of Springboro Sign Code.
2. Please indicate plans for existing landscaping on the site following August 13th Planning Commission Work Session.
3. Please indicate plans for existing lighting on the site following August 13th Planning Commission Work Session.
4. Applicant to coordinate with Springboro Building Department and/or state agencies for minimum requirements for the proposed outdoor dining area relative to liquor control requirements.
5. Proposed building elevations include materials not permitted per Section 1271.03, Exterior Façade Design Standards, of the Planning and Zoning Code. Please review plans accordingly. Specific problems areas are as listed below:
  - a. Metal panels not permitted as elevation treatment as indicated on all elevations.
  - b. EIFS not permitted below pedestrian grade as shown on east, south and west elevations.
  - c. Curtain-wall type windows not permitted as show on south elevation.
6. The dumpster enclosure and gates to be solid with no openings and six foot high. Enclosure material to be brick, concrete block or wood. Gate material to be metal, wood or combination of metal or wood.

Steve Schwope of Glavan Feher Architects and Eric Shafer of Hull & Associates were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Schwope if he had any questions regarding the staff comments.

Mr. Schwope and Mr. Shafer stated that they had no problems with the staff comments

Mr. Schwope presented a revised elevation proposal in response to staff comment #5.

Ms. Gibson asked for a review of the materials to be used.

Mr. Schwope explained that the front façade will be replaced with red hardiplank, the existing masonry will be painted to match and new EIFS will be installed. The dining area on the front of the building will be replaced with a patio. It was explained there would be entrances on the east and west sides of the building. The existing coolers at the back of the building will be removed and replaced with landscaping.

Ms. Belpulsi asked members of the Planning Commission and staff if they had any questions or comments.

Ms. Gibson asked whether there would be any changes to the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Schwope answered that the parking would be grandfathered in, but no additional parking spaces are planned.

Mr. Boron explained that though there are still engineering issues to work out, with Planning Commission's approval the site plan could be placed on the August 27th Planning Commission meeting for final approval.

Ms. Belpulsi confirmed that the site plan could be placed on the agenda for August 27th and asked Mr. Schwoppe to meet with Mr. Boron to work out any engineering issues.

- B. Rezoning and General Plan, Lytle-Five Points Road east of North Main Street (SR 73), O-R, Office-Residential District, to PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use

#### Background

This agenda item is based on a request filed by John Burkhardt, Burkhardt Engineering, agent for the property owner, for Rezoning and General Plan approval for an approximately 6.29-acre site located on Lytle-Five Points Road approximately 500 feet east of the intersection of Lytle-Five Points Road and North Main Street (SR 741).

The proposed site for the PUD-MU is presently zoned O-R, Office-Residential District. The O-R District allows single-family residences, home occupations, studios, offices, churches, schools, playgrounds, parks and community centers, greenhouses, agricultural uses, civic clubs and organizations and animal hospitals and veterinary clinics. The purpose of the Rezoning and General Plan approval application is to allow the development of a day care facility on the site as well as other uses. The applicant has not provided a summary of the proposed categories to be included in the PUD-MU (e.g., using the B-2 and O-R Districts as a basis for a list of permitted uses) at this time however some form of B-District would need to be included to allow a day care facility (see following paragraph). As such staff has provided as an exhibit to this packet a list of permitted uses for both the B-2 and O-R Districts.

Day care facilities are a permitted use in the following zoning districts: B-1, Highway Business District; B-2, Local Business District, B-3, Central Business District; B-4, Destination Business District; RBD, Residential Business District and ED, Employment Center District.

Rezoning together with General Plan review and approval are the first stage in the three-stage PUD review and approval process. Approval by both Planning Commission and City Council is required. Final Development Plan review and approval by Planning Commission is the second stage in the process followed by Record Plan review and approval by both Planning Commission and City Council.

The site is presently vacant.

Adjacent land uses include single-family residential within the Woodland Greens subdivision both in Clearcreek Township and Springboro; undeveloped land to the south and east; and to the north common space (detention area) within the Settlers Walk PUD to the north of Lytle-Five Points Road.

Adjacent zoning includes (T)R-1, Clearcreek Township Rural Residence District to the east (both in the Springboro and Clearcreek Township portions of the Woodland Greens subdivision); O-R District to the south; B-1, Highway Business District to the west; and PUD to the north for the Settlers Walk PUD.

The *Springboro Comprehensive Land Use Master Plan*, initiative NE10—that corresponds to the subject property as well as a large area of land to the west and south—states that “Develop this parcel as professional offices. Retail is not appropriate....”

#### Staff Comments

1. Application for rezoning is incomplete: rezoning application fee is required before Planning Commission Work Session. Please coordinate with Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary, at (937) 748-4343. Applicant to provide names and addresses for all adjacent property owners within 300' of property line for subject property. Please coordinate with Dan Boron, (937) 748-6183, on format of address information.
2. Application for rezoning needs to include an indication of the proposed uses that the applicant desires to allow on the site using underlying zoning (e.g., O-R, Office-Residential, B-2, Local Business District) as a basis for discussion at the August 13th Planning Commission Work Session. Please contact Dan Boron, (937) 748-6183, for more information.
3. Please indicate proposed land uses in schematic form on supplied General Plan; the General Plan map may need to be modified to meet requirements of Chapter 1272, Planned Unit Development, of the Planning and Zoning Code.
4. Lot splits as shown, except for Lot 1, are not permitted under the provisions of the City of Springboro Subdivision Regulations; as proposed unbuildable lots (lots with no frontage on a legal street) would be created and are not permitted.
5. Proposed 8" water main to be public. Install two additional 8" valves at its connection with 12" water main. Move the fire hydrant, next to Lot 1, to the east side of the proposed private road. Extend proposed 8" water main to the south side of the cul-de-sac.
6. Provide 10' wide easement on both sides of the proposed water main up to the south property line.
7. Is the proposed sanitary sewer public or private? If public provide 15' wide easement on both sides of the proposed sanitary sewer. Extend sanitary sewer next to Lot 3 & 5.
8. Dedicate additional right-of-way as shown.
9. Relocate existing catch basin at the intersection of the private road with Lytle-Five Points Road.
10. Provide a public access easement over the proposed private drive.

Skip Schafer of Commercial Realty Associates was in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Schafer reviewed the proposed concept plan for the site. He explained the reasons for the rezoning request; including a need for flexibility of setbacks and the need for zoning that will allow for an interest in a day care center on the site. A site plan and renderings for the day care center were provided.

Mr. Schafer asked Planning Commission to consider the PUD-MU to allow the same uses as allowed under O-R in addition to uses allowed under B-2 such as business and professional offices, banks and financial institutions and public schools, private schools and day care centers.

The various options within PUD zoning and permitted uses within O-R and B-2 were reviewed and discussed.

Mr. Chmiel commented that PUD zoning includes a trade off for green space that the concept plan proposed did not include.

Ms. Belpulsi added that green space would be required at 25-30%.

Mr. Schafer stated that he felt that the concept plan presented should exceed that requirement.

Ms. Ridd asked about the distance between access roads on Lytle Five Points Road. Mr. Schafer explained the reasoning for the placement of the road.

Mr. Landefeld asked about the drainage easement on the property.

Mr. Schafer stated that there was no flood plain on the property.

Mr. Landefeld asked Mr. Schafer how the property would be developed, given the topography of the property.

Mr. Schafer explained that the property would be developed using retaining walls. He explained that there would be one detention pond for the entire property.

Mr. Boron interjected that the purpose of the work session discussion was on the applicant's proposed zoning change and permitted uses for the site; the engineering review of the proposed site should be deferred until the use and zoning is defined.

Ms. Ridd stated that she does not have a problem with the day care use. She did not feel that a bank would be appropriate, a bank would want a drive-thru; a financial institution would be fine.

Mr. Chmiel stated that the issue with most of the uses concerns the amount of traffic it would create without the ability for signalization. He also stated his concern about the transition from residential to business. He would like more information about the traffic needs for schools compared to preschools.

Mr. Landefeld pointed out the congestion that already exists at Lytle and SR 741.

Mr. Boron commented that there is property for sale that fronts on SR 741 that could be tied to this property and create better access. It has been suggested to local realtors that these two properties be marketed together.

Mr. Landefeld commented that having two access points would make the property more attractive. He added that with a single access point, he would be leaning to low traffic volume uses.

Ms. Hartle commented that with a day care center the traffic would be spread out over the day and not be limited to two times a day like a school.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that this lot is challenging. A second access would be preferential. With the plan that is being presented today, she would not be in favor of the rezoning. When the O-R zoning was created, she felt that it was the perfect balance between the residential and retail on SR 741. Her concern is for the other uses for the property and being specific about what can be built on the property.

Mr. Schafer stated that he is fine with the uses listed under the O-R zoning. He would like clarification about public school, private school and day care. He also would like to clarify the use of banks and financial institutions if a drive-thru is objectionable.

Ms. Ridd commented that under the proposed PUD plan, the buildings getting away from the scope of the O-R just by their size, which is more of a concern to her than the day care center.

Ms. Gibson also has a concern with the drastic changes in elevations on this lot and the need for green space under the PUD, which she does not see on this concept plan. She commented that she does not have a problem with a day care center, but would like to see a traffic study of a single access at that site. She expressed concern about the saturation of buildings on the site.

Mr. Schafer asked about the approval of a rezoning in relation to approval of the concept plan.

Ms. Ridd explained that it doesn't have to be this plan, but Planning Commission would consider the building sizes proposed. She stated that for her to consider the rezoning, she would like to see the building size in the same realm as the O-R zoning that was already approved, which limits the building size for a more residential feel.

Mr. Schafer explained that he understands that any building would be coming back to Planning Commission for approval, his purpose for requesting the rezoning is to clarify the issues of the uses specifically with the day care center and provide flexibility in the setback issues. He understands the need for green space and uses under the O-R rezoning.

Ms. Ridd explained that should Planning Commission approve the day care and the other O-R uses without any other information about the rest of the property, once it is rezoned than Planning Commission is stuck.

Mr. Landefeld explained that it is hard to look at the whole lot based on one building proposal.

Ms. Gibson added that that is the purpose of the concept plan, once the property is rezoned and this general plan accepted, then the Planning Commission cannot ask for two buildings instead of the five buildings proposed. She explained that the Planning Commission must assume that the general plan is what the developer is looking for.

Ms. Ridd asked whether the property could be rezoned PUD and still keep the O-R specifications, with the exception of allowing the day care center.

Ms. Thompson explained that the rezoning could be done allowing the O-R uses with any use that the Planning Commission did not wish struck out. She commented that the issue is that Planning Commission does not traditionally approve a rezoning without a concept plan showing square footage and access points.

Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Schafer to work with staff to provide a general plan that would create a transitional zone from the residential to the office and allow the Planning Commission to consider the saturation, access points and other issues.

Mr. Chmiel commented that specific details of the buildings can be worked around but the density needs to be established.

Mr. Schafer asked whether under the PUD, 25% green space is required.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that the 25% green space is a minimum.

Mr. Landefeld asked whether the total square footage could be limited.

Ms. Thompson answered that the limitation would follow the Land Use Master Plan.

Ms. Ridd commented that while she does not have a problem with the day care, since there is a specific user in mind, she would like to know the number of children the building is being planned for. This would affect the amount of traffic the school would generate.

Ms. Belpulsi agreed that a traffic study needs to be done, with the assumption for the amount of square footage for the parcel.

The renderings for the day care center were reviewed and two-story versus one-story buildings were discussed.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that she is sensitive to the area that abuts up to the residential and would ask for significant buffering.

Ms. Ridd added that that is why this property is O-R and the residential feel needs to be maintained.

The topography was reviewed the possibility of one or two story buildings discussed.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for any further comments.

Ms. Gibson commented that the developer needs a better concept plan and a traffic study and asked what square footage would be requested, what it would take to make the project economically feasible.

Mr. Schafer stated that that number has not been determined, but the a rule of thumb is 8-10,000 square feet of office space per acre and with this site being 6.2 square feet, then 50,000 square feet of office space would be expected including 25-30% green space.

Ms. Ridd stated that the buildings needed to be kept within scope of the O-R zoning, with smaller buildings.

Ms. Belpulsi summed up the discussion by stating before rezoning could be approved a concept plan would be needed that would address the issues under discussion including the percentage of green space, details about the day care center, saturation and amount of square footage and that a traffic study is needed.

Mr. Boron added that the uses for the property needed to be defined.

Mr. Schafer asked whether Planning Commission felt that a day care center was acceptable for the property.

Mr. Chmiel stated not without a traffic study to determine whether it is a good idea to rezone it for that purpose.

The possibility of acquiring another access property was discussed and Mr. Schafer reviewed the map of the area and stated that it is currently not possible.

Mr. Schafer will review the comments of Planning Commission and return to a future work session for further discussion.

### III. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Ms. Ridd asked about the progress of the proposed dentist's office at 365 North Main Street. Staff will follow up and report.

Mr. Landefeld will not be in attendance for the August 27th Planning Commission meeting.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, August 13, 2008 Work Session at 8:09 P.M.

---

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chair

---

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

---

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary