

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

Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, January 11, 2012, 6:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Acting Chairperson Hans Landefeld called the Springboro Planning Commission Work Session to order at the Springboro Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio

Present: Hans Landefeld, Acting Chairperson, David Vomacka, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk,
Barb Gibson, Sheila Lairson, Becky Hartle

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

Mr. Landefeld welcomed Ms. Lairson to the Planning Commission.

II. Agenda Items

A. Revision of Approved General Plan, The Fairways PUD-R, Planned Unit Development-Residential, modification to approved dwelling design and materials

Background Information

This agenda item is based on an application filed by Joseph Cristo, President, Cristo Homes, seeking approval on a revision to the approved General Plan for The Fairways PUD-R, Planned Unit Development-Residential. The applicant is requesting that a new home design, the "Waterbury" be approved for use in the subdivision. Presently 17 homes designs are approved for use in the subdivision based on a 2010 Revision to the Approved General Plan; while similar to the home designs approved in the 2010 Revision, review and approval by Planning Commission is required.

For the purposes of background The Fairways PUD-R was approved by the City of Springboro between 2002 and 2004: the Rezoning by Ordinance O-02-15 in March 2002 to the present PUD-R designation; the current General Plan by Resolution R-04-2 in January 2004. Together Rezoning and General Plan approval are the first stage in the three-stage PUD approval process. The Fairways PUD-R was approved for 51 buildable single-family residential lots. To date 22 single-family homes have been constructed (or are under construction) in the subdivision; that includes 12 dwelling units constructed or started since the 2010 Revision to the Approved General Plan was approved.

Following consideration by Springboro Planning Commission, approval by City Council is required for this and any other major modification to an approved General Plan under the provisions of the Planning & Zoning Code.

Staff Comments

No staff comments at this time.

Discussion

Adam Cristo, representing Cristo Homes, was in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Cristo reviewed the plans for the Waterbury.

Mr. Landefeld asked how the plan differs from the other plans that were approved.

Mr. Cristo answered that it is pretty consistent. The elevations have been upgraded. New elements have been added and the design has been updated.

Mr. Boron commented that it is similar in design to the current floor plans and elevations but was a departure significant enough as determined by staff to bring the change before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Ridd asked whether the exterior materials would be the same.

Mr. Boron answered yes; the same as Planning Commission's recommendation.

Ms. Gibson asked whether the two story homes would be in the back with the single story homes along the golf course.

Mr. Cristo answered that this home was for Lot One which does not back up to the golf course.

Mr. Landefeld asked how many lots have been sold; how many are left.

Mr. Boron answered there are about twenty built or under construction; fifty one were approved. Cristo Homes may not be in control of all of them.

Ms. Thompson asked for the price point of this design.

Mr. Cristo answered that it was approximately \$200,000 plus.

Mr. Landefeld asked Planning Commission whether there were any objections to this request being on the agenda for a recommendation at the January 25th Meeting.

There was none.

Mr. Boron commented that the item would be on the agenda at the January 25th meeting for their recommendation and then would be forwarded to City Council for their approval.

Mr. Boron asked Planning Commission whether they saw the need for Mr. Cristo to attend the meeting for further questions.

The Planning Commission members did not.

B. Extension of Approval of Final Development Plan, Twin Creek, PUD-R, Planned Unit Development-Residential, West Factory Road, conservation-type residential subdivision

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for a six-month extension on Planning Commission's approval of the Final Development Plan for the Twin Creek Planned Unit Development-Residential (PUD-R) located at 465 West Factory Road. The property was formerly known as the Swope Property PUD-R. The 28.77-acre property was rezoned to PUD-R in 2003 along with a General Plan. The General Plan was subsequently revised and approval by the Planning Commission at its April 26, 2006 meeting and the Final Development Plan was approved at the July 26, 2006 Planning Commission meeting. A similar extension was approved by the Planning Commission at the June 29, 2011 meeting. Formal action is requested at the January 25, 2012 meeting.

Staff Comments

No staff comments at this time.

Discussion

Mr. Boron reviewed the extension request and the history of the project.

Mr. Vomacka asked how many times this has been extended.

Mr. Boron answered three.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he favors of the plan and the extension and asked why the extension is only for six months.

Mr. Boron answered that there is a provision in the PUD ordinance that the extension must be for six months. There will be a discussion following the regular agenda to address this issue.

C. Discussion, Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Background Information

City Staff and Hans Landefeld, member of the Springboro Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), will introduce a discussion regarding modifications to the organization of BPAC that would reduce the size of this ad-hoc committee from 7 to 5 members. Action in the form of a recommendation to City Council is requested at the January 25, 2012 meeting. A copy of the organizational outline for BPAC, originally established in September 2009, is included for your reference.

Mr. Boron explained the history and issues of the BPAC and the reasons for the change in the number of members.

Mr. Landefeld explained that they have some real interested people in the group but not all of the members have been able to attend meetings regularly and it has been difficult to get a quorum. The group is at five members at this time; new members have not been reappointed.

Mr. Boron commented that they have a core group that is very engaged; members of the bike community and industry who build bikes and use the trails. Council appoints the members.

Mr. Vomacka asked whether a quorum was needed because the committee was not an officially chartered committee.

Mr. Boron answered that a majority is needed. This is a public committee appointed by Council and all meetings take place in the public forum in the public interest. They want to make sure that they are following the same rules as Council.

Mr. Vomacka asked if it becomes a smaller group will it help the group to become more aggressive and get more done.

Mr. Landefeld answered yes.

Ms. Thompson agreed with Mr. Landefeld.

Mr. Boron commented that Planning Commission will be asked at the next meeting to support this recommendation to Council. What will happen is that the current members of the board will remain.

III. Guest Comments

Andy Scott introduced himself as a new employee of Henkle Schueler and stated that he has been meeting with staff and is looking forward to working with Planning Commission in the future.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Following up on a discussion from earlier in the meeting, Mr. Boron explained that staff is examining the issue of unfinished or “zombie” developments; properties where the City has granted approval in the form of rezoning, site plan approval and Planned Unit Development approvals, and the properties are in varying states of inactivity. One example is property that has been rezoned for a specific purpose to accommodate a development that Planning Commission has seen a proposal for and that has been sitting inactive for over four years. There are developments without the benefit of the General Plan when rezoning took place. There are Site Plans that were approved by Planning Commission that go back six or seven years and were approved under the current zoning code that may change in the future. At issue is what will happen at a future date when the general provisions change such as the changes in the lighting codes. There are developments approved with the old standards.

Mr. Boron commented that this issue will be brought before Planning Commission and Council once staff has an accounting of the variety of inactive developments in the City.

Ms. Gibson commented that she thought that there was a provision in the PUD ordinance that indicated that if the PUD was undeveloped that after two years it would be gone.

Mr. Boron commented that there are developments without a General Plan in which case the clock never started.

Mr. Boron suggested that after consultation with the City Attorney that timelines be placed on approvals for conventional zoning as a matter of course while the Planning Commission is in the process of

revising the Planning and Zoning Code. Developments with current approvals would be provided a timeline to adopt or execute their plan in the meantime.

Planning Commission members received the 2012 Planning Commission work session and meeting schedule.

V. Adjournment

Mr. Landefeld adjourned the Wednesday, January 11, 2012 Planning Commission Work Session at 6:35 P.M.

Hans Landefeld, Planning Commission Vice-Chairperson

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary