

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

Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, September 8, 2010, 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, Assistant City Engineer, Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary

II. Agenda Items

A. Preliminary Discussion, General Plan Revision, The Springs PUD, Planned Unit Development, Major Change to the Approved General Plan

Background Information

This agenda item is based on an application filed by St. Mary's Parish, Franklin, 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 relocate St. Mary's Catholic Church from its location in Franklin to Springboro at the northwest corner of Springs Boulevard and Yankee Road in The Springs PUD.

While no action is ever anticipated at a Work Session, City staff is approaching this review as a Preliminary Discussion; this will allow the applicant to provide the Planning Commission with an outline of what is proposed for the site, for City staff to report on progress made on this proposal and application to this point and to discuss further actions. No formal action on this item is anticipated until the October 27th Planning Commission meeting. Given the nature of the submittal at this point in time it is impractical for City staff to comment on the specifics of the proposed church and ancillary development in light of the minimum requirements of Chapter 1272, Planned Unit Developments, of the Springboro Planning and Zoning Code. City staff reserves the opportunity to comment when the General Plan Revision application is complete.

The proposal includes a Phase 1 consisting of a 45,000 square foot building including offices, sanctuary and narthex; Phase 2 consists of a 20,000 square foot parish center. Ancillary uses

include a 390-car off-street parking area, athletic fields and future parking along Springs Boulevard for 127 spaces. The three ponds located immediately adjacent to the intersection of Yankee Road and Springs Boulevard would remain, as proposed by the applicants, on the church property.

Access to the site would be provided by a curb cut on Yankee Road and a secondary access point on Springs Boulevard. In anticipation of questions regarding the curb cut locations and impact of the proposed church facilities on surrounding transportation infrastructure, City staff collaborated with the applicants and Scott Knebel, P.E., of LJB, Inc., City of Springboro Traffic Engineering Consultant, to examine traffic impacts of the development at this point in the time. The results of that study are included in your packets. The enclosed applicant-provided "Concept Site Plan" complies generally with the study results, one exception being the proposed athletic fields. Knowledge of the fields, their impact and the nature of their use and hours of operation were not considered at the time the traffic study was completed.

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 copy of the 2005 General Plan Revision is included in your packets; a larger version that General Plan will be provided at the meeting.

The area proposed for the church in the 2005 General Plan was proposed to be a Continuing Care facility; Coffman Development did not present specific plans for that use in the form of a Final Development Plan, stage two in the three-stage PUD approval process.

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 requires the approval of the Planning Commission and City Council.

Following consideration by Springboro Planning Commission and City Council on the General Plan Revision, a Final Development Plan, stage two of the PUD approval process, for this portion of the PUD would need to be submitted to the City and approved by the Planning Commission.

Staff Comments

No staff comments at this time. City staff reserves the opportunity to comment on this proposed General Plan Revision at a later date.

Mark Ruetschle of Ruetschle Architects, Steve Davis of Irongate Realtors, Doyle Key and Steve Bermick of St. Mary's Church of Franklin were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Boron reviewed the history of The Springs PUD. He explained that the property referred to as the Glennon property was approved as the Springs PUD in 2000, the original General Plan was approved in 2002 and a major revision was approved in 2005.

The General Plan revision zeroed out the residential units on this portion of the property and set the cap on the remainder of the development. The proposed use was a continuing care facility or zero residential units.

Mr. Boron presented an aerial of the property and reviewed the adjoining properties.

Mr. Boron explained that this revision constitutes a major change to the PUD and will involve three steps; an approval of the revision to the General Plan (approval by the Planning Commission and recommendation to Council), Final Development Plan involving more detailed plans, building elevations, lighting and landscaping plans (approval by Planning Commission) and Record Plan.

Mr. Boron commented that due to the scope of the change to the development, the suggestion was made and accepted by St. Mary's that a traffic study be completed by Scott Knebel, LJB, Inc., the City's traffic engineer, paid for by the applicants. The primary purpose of the study was to determine the location and appropriateness of the curb cuts on Yankee Road and a secondary connection into the Springs development.

Mr. Boron commented that what has been submitted is not a completed General Plan revision. The intent of this meeting is to talk about the traffic study and the proposed use of the property in general terms.

Mr. Bermick reviewed the history of St. Mary's Church of Franklin. The current building completed in 1913 holds 240 people. The parish population has grown by 300 families since 2005. Over 50 percent of the families reside in Springboro, 27 percent in Franklin and the rest are scattered in the outlying areas.

Mr. Bermick explained that the church has entered into an agreement for the purchase of the property and has gotten approval from the Archbishop to proceed. Closure on the property needs to occur on or before November 30, 2010. Stipulations for the purchase agreement include that there be access to Yankee Road and that the land use be approved as a church.

Mr. Ruetschle showed Planning Commission photographs of the current church and explained to the commission that the stained glass at the current church would be preserved for use at the new location. He added that some of the architectural features of the current church would be incorporated into the new design.

Mr. Ruetschle explained that Phase One would include the new church which would seat 1,200 persons and would include parish offices, classrooms and a fellowship hall within 45,000 square feet.

Mr. Ruetschle presented a computer depiction of the proposed Phase One which included a 360° view of the elevations.

Planning Commission and the applicants discussed options for the building footprint and phases and the challenges of the site.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from Planning Commission.

Mr. Landefeld asked about the ownership of the detention ponds.

Ms. Thompson recommended that the applicants consider a lot split in order that the detention ponds become the responsibility of the entire subdivision.

Mr. Berwick commented that the green space would be used for parish activities, that there are no plans for organized athletic leagues.

Mr. Vomacka asked whether anyone would be living on the site.

Mr. Bermick answered no.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he would prefer that the footprint be moved as far to Yankee Road as possible. He was complimentary of the design for the church. He expressed his concern about the mass of parking but agreed that they did need a lot of parking. He asked that it be buffered and shielded with vegetation and mounding from the traffic and the neighbors. He pointed out that the sketch of the plan shows a three lane drive in and off of Yankee while the traffic analysis calls for a four lane drive.

Mr. Bermick agreed that that would need to be discussed.

It was agreed that the Planning Commission concerns were the location of the building, the parking and the screening.

Ms. Gibson agreed that the building should be the primary focus.

Mr. Boron commented that the concern is also the build out once The Springs is complete. The Springs will interconnect to Settlers Walk. The access onto Yankee Road is important in order to balance the traffic flow to Yankee and The Springs internally.

Mr. Davis commented that everyone understands that the Yankee Road curb cut is critical.

Ms. Thompson commented that the City is concerned with the residential impact. The four lane entrance on Yankee Road would encourage the movement there rather than internally to The Springs.

Mr. Boron commented that this plan has come a long way; staff has been working with the applicants since May. The entrance points have been changed.

Ms. Hartle agreed that the parking lot would need to be screened.

Ms. Gibson asked should the building be moved closer to Yankee whether some of the parking could be moved to the west side of the property.

Mr. Ruetschle agreed that it could.

The issue of the maintenance of the detention ponds and the existence of a home owners association was discussed.

Ms. Thompson stated that the City is working with the City law director and prospective buyers of the rest of the development. She recommended that the applicant ask that the detention property be split out so that they are not required to maintain the detention ponds for the entire subdivision.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that they would also not want the liability.

Mr. Davis asked, at this date, whether there was anyone to turn them over to.

Ms. Thompson answered that there are potentially a number of people who they could be turned over to, but not at the moment.

Ms. Ridd commented that she approves of the change in use, but would ask that the building be placed so that the viewable side is on the street.

Mr. Landefeld stated that he supports Mr. Vomacka's position about the need for screening and mounding of the parking lot. He asked whether the church was planning any ancillary uses such as running a child care facility.

Mr. Bermick answered no; they do not plan for a child care facility.

Mr. Landefeld stated that he had further comments about pedestrian flow around and through the property, but would reserve those questions to a future meeting. He added that he does support the change in use.

Mr. Boron commented that there would be internal and external connections to the sidewalk system.

Mr. Papakirk stated that his questions have been answered; he fully supports the change in use and the other Planning Commission member's comments.

Mr. Papakirk asked, procedurally what is required in the PUD; whether they need to add church as a use.

Mr. Boron answered that that is one half of the process. What is also needed is a boundary survey of the area in order to legally tie down this property, plans for materials and concepts. Mr. Boron added that there is still quite a bit of work to do, but that it could be accomplished in time for the October 27th Planning Commission meeting. He suggested using the September 29th meeting as another Work Session to make sure that they are making progress.

Mr. Boron commented that should the Planning Commission approve the revision, it could be on the agenda for the November 3rd City Council meeting. No public hearing is required.

Mr. Bermick asked whether a new survey would need to be done.

Mr. Dudas answered that the information just has to be shown on the plan.

Mr. Boron commented that under PUD zoning, conventional zoning and setbacks are thrown out. Before this plan can go to Council, setbacks need to be established. In addition, other items are added such as architecture, landscaping and parking volume information are included. Other items such as building plans and elevations would be included in stage two of the discussion.

It was confirmed that what is needed is a legal survey to define the area where the applicant would be making the change along with the concept plan.

Mr. Boron will coordinate with the applicants to review what is needed for approval of the revision.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether the ball fields shown on the plan would be opened up to the public or would they would just be for the use of the parishioners.

Mr. Bermick answered that no; they would be for the parishioners only.

Ms. Belpulsi suggested that the plans show the area as green space.

Mr. Ruetschle asked what information would be needed in terms of a landscaping or buffering plan.

Mr. Vomacka commented that the details can be worked out later; what is needed is a statement in writing stated that the area will be densely landscaping to shield the parking.

Mr. Ruetschle asked what is needed to determine the amount of parking; he is projecting 390 spaces.

Mr. Boron answered that the projected building population should be shown. The City ordinances call for a minimum and maximum number of spaces.

Ms. Thompson commented that Mr. Davis should let the City know what he needs to close since he will not have site plan approval. The use is not objectionable and the traffic issues can be worked out.

Mr. Davis stated that the use change and the curb cut need to be approved. Issues such as soil testing can be worked out.

Ms. Thompson commented that a vote on approval for the use change and the curb cut can be done at the September 29th meeting.

Mr. Boron commented that any phasing for the project in buildings or parking needs to be shown.

Staff will work with the applicant to prepare for the next meeting.

III. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Save the date cards were passed out for the annual Planning and Zoning workshop which will be held December 3, 2010 at Sinclair Community College.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, September 8, 2010 Planning Commission Work Session at 7:12 P.M.

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chairperson

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary