

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

Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, February 10, 2010, 7:00 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; Raj Sharma, City Engineer; Elmer Dudas, Assistant City Engineer, Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary

II. Agenda Items

A. Rezoning, Eyler Drive, (T)R-1, Clearcreek Township Rural Residence District, to R-2, Low-Density Residential District

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for rezoning based on an application filed by Todd & Jennifer Harover, property owners, to rezone their approximately 1.989-acre lot from the current (T)R-1, Clearcreek Township Rural Residence District, to R-2, City of Springboro Low-Density Residential District. The property, as indicated in the support documentation included in your packets, is located in the City of Springboro at the south end of Eyler Drive near the intersection of that roadway with Bailey Lane. The irregularly-shaped property also has frontage on Sandy Court.

As indicated in the rezoning application, the proposed rezoning based on a request of the City of Springboro and is consistent with the policy of removing township zoning categories within the municipal corporation boundaries. This matter was discussed when the property owners contacted the City inquiring about a lot split and interest in constructing a new home on the Sandy Court frontage of the property this spring; a second home on the Eyler Drive frontage is also planned.

The R-2 District allows single-family residential, public (e.g., schools) and quasi-public (e.g., churches) uses. Residential development at a development density of four (4) dwelling units per acre is permitted on lots of a minimum of 9,000 square feet with 75-foot minimum lot frontage, 35-foot minimum front yard setbacks, 30-foot minimum rear yard setbacks and 5-foot minimum side yard setbacks. Principal building heights (maximum) of 35 feet or 2-1/2 stories are permitted and a minimum floor area of 1,250 square feet is required; accessory buildings may be no more than 15 feet in height and setback back no less than 5 feet from side and rear property lines.

Adjacent land uses include single-family residential uses to the north both in the City of Springboro and Clearcreek Township; single-family residential development to the east—in the City of Springboro—within The Fairways subdivision; the City of Springboro's Heatherwoode Golf Course to the south; and residential and dedicated open space to the west in the Sandy Court and The Fairways residential subdivisions, both within the boundaries of the City of Springboro.

Adjacent zoning includes Clearcreek Township (T)R-1 to the northeast in Clearcreek Township; PUD-R, Planned Unit Development-Residential, to the east in The Fairways PUD-R; the PUD that overlays the Heatherwoode Golf Course to the south; and PUD-R to the west and north in White Oak Estates PUD-R.

The *Springboro Land Use Plan*, adopted by Springboro City Council in April 2009, Policy Area #12, Southeast Neighborhoods, outlines preferred land uses and development densities for the primarily residential area on the east side of the community and fronting East Central Avenue (SR 73) and East Lower Springboro Road. Detached residential is identified as a preferred land use; for detached residential dwellings a development density of 4-5 dwelling units per acre also recommended.

Following Planning Commission consideration on this agenda item in Work Session, a formal recommendation to City Council will be necessary, as is the case for all requests to amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Springboro, at a formal meeting of the Planning Commission.

Consolidated Staff Comments

No staff comments at this time.

Todd and Jennifer Harover were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Harover explained that their goal for the property is to have a lot split and build another home on the property.

Mr. Boron commented that the rezoning in part is being requested by the City to eliminate the township zoning in the City. Two houses cannot be built on the property under TR-1 zoning because that zoning excludes certain conditions, flood hazards and bodies of water for example, from the density calculation

Mr. Boron explained that staff's recommendation was R-2 District based on the Land Use Master Plan; the density is four to five units per acre in this policy area. He said there were other options which we can discuss. More lots cannot be built in the area due to the site configuration and limited frontage.

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

Ms. Gibson asked what the zoning was in the circle (Sandy Court).

Mr. Boron explained that there are two PUDs, the White Oak Estates PUD (Sandy Court) and the Fairways PUD.

Ms. Gibson asked for the density for the White Oak Estates PUD.

Mr. Boron answered that the lot sizes surrounding the property are 0.58 acres (township), 0.5 acres (township) and 0.321, 0.318, 0.396 and 0.342 acres respectively.

Ms. Gibson commented that the rezoning could take the density to quarter acre lots even though the frontage is not there. She asked why R-1 was not considered.

Mr. Boron answered that they could not legally fit lots on the property under R-1 zoning.

Mr. Dudas explained that the way the owners would like to split the property, it would not fit the requirements of R-1 zoning.

Mr. Harover added that there is an area that cannot be developed because it is on a flood plain and inaccessible.

Ms. Gibson commented that under previous plans there had been plans to put a road on the south edge of the property. She added that he could still get that but because it is under the flood plain questioned whether it would be done.

Ms. Thompson added that a road would have to be built to City standards and approved by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Gibson commented that a house could be built on that part of the property but that it would have to be raised above the flood plain.

Ms. Ridd commented that there is only frontage for one lot.

Ms. Gibson explained that she was just looking at the worst case scenario. This two-acre parcel could have eight houses on it according to the zoning. She doesn't think it would be appropriate, only possible with the rezoning.

Mr. Harover asked how they would get access.

Mr. Vomacka added that it would be very expensive.

Ms. Ridd agreed but added that that has been said before.

Ms. Gibson questioned what the chances were that there would be more houses and stated that she would be comfortable with four houses not eight.

Mr. Boron stated that should that be a concern, since R-1 will not fit, the third option would be to rezone the property to PUD-R and limit the density in the General Plan. He added it had been talked about to tie this property in with the other PUDs next door. This would be a major effort. Also a new PUD-R would require setting aside 25 percent open space.

Ms. Gibson stated that she was concerned about opening up the property to the possibility of eight lots. She asked if the Planning Commission could come to the conclusion that given the configuration that even if there would be a road, that there would only be four houses, which she would be comfortable with.

Ms. Thompson restated that the road would have to be a public road which would have to be constructed with Planning Commission's approval.

Mr. Landefeld commented that the lot has such unique characteristics that it would prevent it from being developed. He added that he felt that R-2 zoning was appropriate.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he not only does not have a problem with the rezoning; it is a good use of the property.

Ms. Gibson stated that she does not have a problem with the rezoning but is concerned with the R-2 zoning.

Mr. Vomacka asked about the use of a post office box on the application.

Mr. Harover stated that he could provide a street address, that he is currently living with relatives.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether a parcel near the property was a right-of-way.

Mr. Boron answered that it was open space.

Mr. Papakirk asked should a road be built, where it would be located.

Ms. Gibson explained the history of the property and the location of possible roads.

Mr. Boron explained that on February 24th, Planning Commission would need to make a formal recommendation to Council.

Mr. Harover asked about a variance to build the home closer to the property line while the property is still under the current zoning.

Mr. Boron commented that he will coordinate with Mr. Harover on this question.

B. Revision to Approved Final Development Plan, Marketplace at Settlers Walk PUD, Planned Unit Development, outdoor displays for Phase 2 building

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for a revision to an approved Final Development Plan, submitted by Melissa DeHart, representative for The Marketplace at Settlers Walk, for outdoor displays associated with the existing Ace Hardware store located in the Phase 2 building of The Marketplace at Settlers Walk. The proposed use is not subject to Planning Commission's review; the propose retail use is consistent with the approved General Plan for The Marketplace at Settlers Walk PUD.

The Phase 2 building for The Marketplace at Settlers Walk was approved by the Planning Commission on July 26, 2006. At that time a reference to a "display area" was included in the site plans for the development along the sidewalk immediately in front of the building that now houses the Ace Hardware store, veterinary clinic and other tenants. The applicants were directed, based on staff comments, to delete references to the display and present to Planning Commission details

on the appearance of the displays would do and be managed. This agenda item is intended to satisfy that requirement.

Consolidated Staff Comments

1. Applicant to obtain a Certificate of Zoning Compliance from Dan Fitzpatrick, Zoning Inspector, prior to change of the new tenant occupying the space. Mr. Fitzpatrick is reachable at (937) 748-6845 or danf@cityofspringboro.com.
2. Provide details of the proposed display area. Are materials and equipment to be displayed on a permanent platform, behind a screening wall or other installation.
3. Please furnish for Planning Commission and Staff review any intended rules for the management of outdoor display areas proposed for the site. These rules should indicate hours of display, materials to be displayed (and/or materials prohibited).
4. Per the 2006 discussion of the outdoor display areas when the Phase 2 building was approved by Planning Commission, please provide a design for any temporary signage (e.g., "sandwich board" signs) to be used in the area

John Roll of Roll & Associates, Norman Mayne, representing the owners of The Marketplace at Settlers Walk and Melissa DeHart the property manager for The Marketplace at Settlers Walk were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Roll explained that when the original plans were presented to Planning Commission, he was instructed to leave references of the outdoor displays off of the plans and describe the details at a later time. He explained that there is a new franchisee who is interested in operating the Ace Hardware store and would like to display items outdoors.

Mr. Roll described the types of items that are proposed to be displayed.

Mr. Mayne explained that the current franchisee is an absent owner and willing to exit the space and the management of The Marketplace is looking for a new owner. A picture of the potential franchisee's current business is included in the packet.

Ms. DeHart commented that the management is also concerned about the displays and will put rules and regulations in place to police the displays.

Mr. Roll explained that there are a few different classes of display that the tenant is interested in using; equipment in the parking lot, tents for educational programs and displays, equipment on the sidewalk and pallets of materials. All items would be brought in every night. He discussed the issue of screening the pallets.

Ms. Ridd asked whether it would still be an Ace Hardware.

Mr. Mayne answered yes. He has been approved by Ace Hardware as a franchisee.

Mr. Vomacka commented that the Dorothy Lane Market does a good job of screening and asked whether it would be possible to create the space for screening at the loss of parking spots on the south side.

Mr. Roll explained that at Ace Hardware there is an enclosed area in the back. Material is purchased inside the store and customers can drive around back for pick up. He was not sure how the new franchisee would handle that.

Mr. Roll commented that originally the screening at Dorothy Lane Market was used for shopping cart storage.

Ms. DeHart commented that at a hardware store, pallets of mulch and salt are expected and she doesn't see how it will take away from the center because the business owner will be expected to keep it neat. The display needs to be in front where it will remind people that they may need those items.

Ms. Ridd asked if there was a way to have a display so that people would know that you had it without having pallets of the material.

Ms. Gibson commented that with the original design, when it was decided that the user was going to be a hardware store that the store be set back to allow more space within the sidewalk area for display. Planning Commission was told that that would not work. Options were given at that time.

Mr. Roll commented that there needed to be the outdoor enclosed area in the back.

Ms. Ridd commented that some limited outdoor display on the sidewalks could work, but that she would not like to see any display in the landscape buffer.

Mr. Mayne asked whether there was any objection to events in the parking lot.

Ms. Ridd stated that she did not because that would also bring people to the other merchants as well. She asked how it would be regulated about the length of time that the tent could stay and how many times a year.

Ms. Belpulsi added that she would only allow it if it were regulated.

Mr. Vomacka commented that something could be worked out.

Mr. Roll commented that there are plenty of parking spaces for the events.

Mr. Landefeld commented that the farther the displays get from the building, the less excited he is about seeing it.

Ms. DeHart asked whether it was just the stack of items or being on a pallet that Planning Commission was objecting to.

Mr. Mayne commented that mulch was not a year round item.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether everything would be brought inside every night.

Ms. DeHart answered that he brings everything in every day.

Mr. Landefeld asked what his operating hours might be.

Mr. Mayne answered that it should be the same as the rest of the center, the same as the Ace Hardware is now.

Ms. DeHart commented that the potential tenant told her that it takes him twenty minutes to set up in the morning.

Mr. Vomacka commented that his concern is that this tenant will leave and another tenant will replace him, there could be turnover in management and the Planning Commission has opened the door for a lot of storage.

Mr. Mayne commented that he has been in the same building since 1952.

Ms. Ridd commented that this one building could be sold off and Planning Commission must look at the long term. She added that limited display is fine, but not in the parking lot.

Mr. Roll agreed the rules need to be in place.

Ms. DeHart commented that the parking lot display is not critical, but the display by the door is.

Mr. Roll commented that if he ran the hardware store he would want certain display by the doors.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he would like to see some kind of shielding.

Ms. Ridd commented that he could have a display to let customers know that he has the item.

Mr. Mayne commented that he could put individual skids out in front that he could take in at night.

Mr. Roll asked whether he would object to displaying sample packages of mulch out front and asking customers to continue to pick it up in the back.

Mr. Vomacka agreed that he does not have any objections to a display with a few bags of mulch or salt, but he is visualizing ten or twelve pallets, four or five lawn mowers and a couple of snow blowers and it is Tractor Supply, which is a good company but not for this location.

Ms. Gibson commented that the potential user's current location is in a commercial area, a totally different atmosphere. She can understand that he would like to transfer some of those features, but it is not applicable to this location.

Mr. Mayne commented that there may be tractors and other equipment out for display during the day, the user would take everything in every night. He asked about areas where the user could put displays and limits on the square footage which as landlords he would be willing to enforce.

Mr. Vomacka asked for clarification about what area of grass he was speaking of.

The plans show the displays on the landscape buffer along SR 741 which Planning Commission does object to.

Ms. Belpulsi summarized for clarification the appropriate limitation for displays; displays in front and on the side of the building are acceptable, no outside storage of heavy duty equipment on SR 741, the tent is acceptable with controls.

Mr. Mayne commented that if you have a tent out there all the time it is not special anymore.

Mr. Vomacka suggested ten days a year maximum.

Mr. Papakirk suggested once per season.

Ms. Ridd commented that spring and summer will be his big time.

Ms. Hartle suggested four times a year.

Mr. Mayne asked about the length of time for each event, ten days per event.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she would not be in favor of that and suggested a four day weekend.

Mr. Vomacka asked about the length of the events at Dorothy Lane Market.

Mr. Mayne answered that the events occur, Friday through Sunday about fourteen times a year all concentrated in the summer months.

Ms. Ridd commented that they use a small tent, that the tent shown is much bigger.

Mr. Mayne agreed and added that sometimes they are just under the eaves.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she would not be in favor of the tent.

Mr. Mayne asked Ms. DeHart if the prospective tenant uses a tent.

Ms. DeHart answered that he does on occasion, not for all events; he may use a trailer.

Ms. Belpulsi asked if that would include outdoor storage for the equipment.

Mr. Roll commented that he feels that the answer is yes for special events in the parking lot that involve education but also a regular display area outside.

Ms. Ridd asked whether he could keep it on the side of the building.

Ms. DeHart answered that the concern then would be theft.

Mr. Roll commented that all there would be room for is one row of equipment.

Mr. Mayne asked whether a certain number of parking spaces could be designated for displays on the weekends and not through the week.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that that was too loose; she is not in favor of any equipment being stored or displayed in the front anywhere.

Ms. Gibson commented that there is a limited amount of space on the sidewalk by the design of the building and that they have limited themselves to what has been made possible. She does not have a problem with displays on the side. She stated that to put equipment in front of the building would be encroaching on the passageway.

Mr. Mayne commented that there would be no problem with lawn mowers or wheel barrows.

Ms. Belpulsi agreed and noted the large pieces of equipment that were shown in the examples. She stated that she would have no objection to large equipment on the side of the building and smaller equipment or small pallets of mulch or salt in front.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he would not have a problem with four (as an example) pieces of equipment as seen in the photographs displayed in front of the store on the sidewalk. He does not anticipate a large number of people walking on that sidewalk.

Ms. Ridd asked whether he would have room for such large equipment.

Mr. Roll answered that the sidewalk is twelve feet which allows for one row of display.

Ms. Gibson commented that once you say they can put display along the whole front, they will stack them up in any way they want.

Mr. Boron suggested that Planning Commission limit the number of machines.

Ms. Gibson suggested limiting the square footage or height. She commented that customers cannot load there so a display makes sense and customers can pick up the items somewhere else.

Ms. Belpulsi suggested that they could have one of each piece of equipment and the customer would go into the store for purchases.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that her concern is that she does not want to see the area get trashed up; it is a wonderful place and she does not want to take away from it and a concern is the residential area right behind the property. She added that she wants to make sure that it works from a City perspective for our residents and business owners.

Ms. Gibson commented added that they want to see the business successful but that large equipment sales may not have been what that building was designed for.

Mr. Landefeld commented that the pictures that were provided show that the user's current main business is large equipment instead of hardware.

Ms. DeHart commented that he will have large equipment inside the building also. He just wants to draw attention to what he has.

Mr. Landefeld commented currently the equipment does not take a lot of floor space and asked whether he would get that large equipment inside the building.

Mr. Mayne commented that the current inventory would have to change but that he felt that there was room.

Mr. Mayne asked about the number of days per year he could have an event.

Mr. Papakirk commented that he could have indoor events as often as he would like; the issue is the outdoor tent.

Ms. Ridd asked what the user is thinking.

Ms. DeHart answered that he has four or five events per year that typically run from Thursday through Sunday.

Mr. Vomacka stated that if he is thinking about pulling that trailer in and parking it out in front of the building for a long weekend, he does not have a problem with doing that multiple times. What he is having a problem with is the use of the work "tent". He is picturing a forty to sixty foot long tent.

Ms. Belpulsi asked if he had a problem with the trailer in the parking lot.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he did not, not for a few days at a time.

Mr. Mayne suggested a limit on the size and color of the tent.

Ms. Ridd stated that she would not like to see a semi and wanted to be specific about it.

Mr. Vomacka added that the parking lot could not support that weight.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that some guidelines need to be developed for Planning Commission to review.

Planning Commission suggested that Mr. Roll meet with staff and the tenant and set some limits.

Mr. Belpulsi commented this will impact the future and that Planning Commission wants to get this right. She would like to have something in writing that everyone can agree on.

Mr. Mayne commented that if the user will have to agree that he can have displays in the front and on the side and events four or five times a year that does not have a tent.

Mr. Landefeld suggested a scale drawing that shows the sidewalk and representative sizes of equipment.

It was also suggested that the ADA guidelines of safe limits for sidewalks be considered.

Ms. Ridd suggested that since there is storage area in the back for pick up that he come up with some kind of display that features the different kind of materials rather than stacks and stacks that may not be kept neatly.

Mr. Mayne agreed that he does not want a truckload of merchandise out there. He suggested a couple of skids that he could put away at night.

Mr. Boron commented that the reason that this item is before Planning Commission is not for use. He added that these conditions on displays would apply to the entire building. This item answers that need for a unified response to a comment in the original plans from 2006. This would make it easier for City staff to police.

Mr. Boron added that the tenant and Ms. DeHart have been great to work with. This corner gets a lot of attention and that the owners are very conscientious about the appearance of the center.

Mr. Boron asked Planning Commission for consensus about the points to be considered Use of the tree lawn on SR 741 is NO. As to the classes or events in the parking lot; staff needs to provide a number for duration and size. Display on the other side of the driveway, in the parking lot, is NO

Displays on the sidewalk on the west and south sides are okay.

He added that staff's comments would be that they would like to see something consistent for the whole center.

Mr. Papakirk commented that his concern with the south side is that there is some kind of screening. As you enter the shopping center that is the first thing that you see is that corner.

Ms. DeHart commented that the user does not want to put equipment of the south side due to theft concerns.

Mr. Vomacka commented that if there was screening then he would be more open to the range of items that could go out there.

Mr. Boron suggested that the recommendations from staff would be for the number of items instead of the square footage in order to make policing easier.

Ms. Ridd asked about the effect on the other businesses in the center.

Ms. Belpulsi explained that these regulations would be uniform for all of the businesses in the center.

Ms. Belpulsi asked that the applicants meet with staff to develop regulations for the Planning Commission to review at the formal meeting in the end of February.

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

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for review of 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.

As indicated in the July 29, 2010 letter from Glenn Brehm, Hills Communities, the property owners are seeking an extension to the Planning Commission's 2006 Final Development Plan approval; the project's development, as indicated in the letter, has been delayed due to economic conditions and the design and approval process associated with the bridge over Twin Creek.

Consolidated Staff Comments

1. Provide a revised copy of the General Plan including all incorporated comments from the July 26, 2006 Planning Commission approval

Due to the weather conditions, Mr. Brehm was unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting and asked that the agenda item be postponed to the March 2010 work session.

Mr. Boron explained on the applicant's behalf that this item is an administrative act that is necessary to allow the extension of the approval of the PUD Final Development Plan from July 2006 for an additional six months. One reason for the delay is due to a bridge that was required access the development. The bridge has been approved to meet the minimum clearance on the flood plain elevation, for capacity and size to service the development.

Mr. Boron asked Planning Commission for any questions and explained that if there were no questions or objections, he would place this item on the agenda for the regular Planning Commission meeting at the end of February.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether the Final Development Plan was current with the new Land Use Master Plan or whether there was any conflict.

Mr. Boron answered that the plan was both pre-existing and consistent with the Land Use Master Plan. The zoning has not changed.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether there was any objection from Planning Commission to placing the item on the February 24th agenda.

There was none.

D. General Plan, Lytle-Five Points Office Park PUD-B, Planned Unit Development (proposed), Lytle-Five Point Road east of intersection of North Main Street/Lytle-Five Points Road, office-retail park

Background Information

This agenda item is based on a request filed by Skip Shafer, doing business as CS Five Point, LLC, for General Plan approval for an approximately 6.29-acre site located on the south side of Lytle-Five Points Road approximately 500 feet east of the intersection of Lytle-Five Points Road and North Main Street (SR 741). The property bears Sidwell No. 04081010060.

This item was last discussed at the January 27, 2010 Planning Commission meeting at which time the formal action on the General Plan was tabled and the applicant was directed to address the list of comments provided by staff. See "Consolidated Staff Comments" below for an explanation of what has transpired on this agenda item since the January 27th meeting.

The applicant proposes to rezone the entire 6.29-acre site from the current O-R, Office-Residential District, to PUD-B, Planned Unit Development using the B-2, Local Business District as a basis. The rezoning of the property is pending before City Council at this time.

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.

Consolidated Staff Comments

Staff has categorized the comments regarding this agenda item into two lists. The comments are based on a revised General Plan received by the City of Springboro on January 27th (General Plan drawing) and subsequent supporting documentation requested by staff. Comments 1-21 below represent items (1) to make the General Plan application complete, (2) identify development design issues requiring Planning Commission attention and (3) errors in the provided information or where clarification is required. These comments need to be addressed as part of the review and eventual recommendation to Council of the General Plan for the proposed PUD-B.

1. Revised architectural concept drawing needed; plans reviewed at the December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session indicated unacceptable use of EIFS below 8-10' above grade.
2. Revised architectural concept drawing needed; plans reviewed at December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session do not reflect necessary screening of roof-mounted mechanical equipment from adjacent residential areas; likewise suggest that all mechanical equipment (e.g., including ground-mounted) be screened from adjacent residential areas.
3. Are no additional unifying signage standards intended for the proposed PUD, per the December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session discussion? For example, the applicant has furnished a decorative lighting hardware design for Planning Commission consideration but nothing to date has been proposed on signage save for the proposed "ground signs by others" on the proposed General Plan and a separate development sign graphic.
4. For the overall landscaping standard, provide the species, size and spacing.
5. Regarding the landscape buffer adjacent to the east property line, Planning Commission shall determine the minimum buffer requirement under the terms of a PUD and whether the proposed 20' area is acceptable. At a minimum whatever is approved needs to be extended to the south to screen the parking area on the southeast corner of the lot. Also the applicant needs to provide an explanation on the "10-foot natural buffer to remain undisturbed along the eastern boundary to preserve existing natural tree line." If this is the intent shouldn't the drip line be used to define how much of a buffer is needed? Also how will the preservation of this area be impacted by re-grading of the site? Is no re-grading proposed for the area? Lastly, please define "close" in note #1 on the upper right portion of sheet.
6. Other than for proposed daycare/school, is no internal landscaping proposed for the site?
7. Recommend moving the "Lot 1" parking area to the south/rear side of the building. Also the internal circulation on that site, as discussed at the December 16th Planning Commission Work Session, needs to be revised to provide better circulation and traffic/pedestrian safety relative to the proposed daycare/school use.
8. Revised driveway design solution creates undesirable intersection angle at Lytle-Five Points Road and conflict point with entrance drive to proposed daycare/school. See also comment #8 above.

9. Provide a public access easement over the proposed private drive at Final Development Plan phase of review process.
10. Provide erosion and sedimentation control plan for during and after construction as part of General Plan approval.
11. Revise label from Richards Run Creek to Pleasant Valley Run.
12. The total area shown in the title block (6.289 acres) does not match the "total site area" (5.99 acres).
13. Provide a total maximum building area for any one building; also indicate maximum number of stories per building.
14. Move the cul-de-sac to the south to provide improved traffic circulation.
15. Remove the first two parking stalls on Lot 1 and also the two parking stalls nearest to the private drive on lot (Building) 5.
16. Clearly show building setbacks from property lines along the lot 1 boundary.
17. Removed "PL" layer labeling from drawing.
18. Is the proposed lighting hardware submitted complete? Are no pole, under canopy or wallpack lights proposed?
19. What would a proposed bank/financial institution drive-through look like in plan view relative to the General Plan proposed?
20. Indicate General Plan revision date.
21. Add a five foot concrete sidewalk along the frontage of Lytle Five Points Road. Back of sidewalk to be located at the proposed right of way line.

Comments 22-26 are advisory comments, comments that represent issues that need to be addressed by the developer at a later stage of the PUD approval process. They are provided here by staff to advise the applicant and the Planning Commission that in the course of the General Plan review process these issues, in this case practically all address infrastructure improvements to support the site's development, where detailed design is required later but that need to be considered now in concept.

22. The water main and sanitary sewer shall be public utilities. Provide easements accordingly. The water main, sanitary, and storm sewer are not approved as shown. The layout and design shall be reviewed at the Final Development Plan stage.
23. Dedicate the additional right-of-way along Lytle Five Points Road as shown.
24. Relocate existing catch basin at the intersection of the private road with Lytle-Five Points Road to the east side of the drive. Tie into the existing 24" storm sewer on the north side by adding a manhole.
25. Clearcreek Fire District: Provide one (1) additional fire hydrant at the intersection of the proposed private drive and Lytle Five Points Road, located on the south side of the intersection, per 2007 OFC.
26. Incorporate improvements included in December 10, 2009 memorandum from City of Springboro traffic engineering consultant's review of the applicant's traffic impact study for the development of the 6.29-acre site.

Skip Shafer of CS Five Points LLC and John Burkhardt of Burkhardt Engineering were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Papakirk excused himself from the discussion and the meeting due to a conflict of interest.

Ms. Belpulsi noted that the list of the staff comments has not shrunk any.

Mr. Shafer commented that there were a lot of new items and thanked Planning Commission for opportunity to address those items. He added that on January 27th he received these items and fourteen of those have been addressed. For example he has correctly named Pleasant Valley Creek.

Mr. Shafer commented that he met with staff on February 8th to review the staff comments.

Mr. Shafer commented that the latest issues talks about a revised architectural concept drawing. That drawing has not been changed. He asked whether the drawing had been provided to Planning Commission.

Mr. Boron commented that it has not. He stated that what he is concerned about is that Mr. Shafer says that it is not changed; it does have the EIFS on it.

Mr. Shafer stated that it has not been changed on the drawing.

Mr. Shafer stated that he did have a new set of plans.

Mr. Boron asked him to pass them out.

Mr. Shafer commented that this sheet is nothing new; it was passed out at the January 27th meeting. On the building design criteria sheet, Item IC talks about building wall materials and he has listed EIFS could be applied but didn't suggest that it could be above eight feet. He made the note under C2 and C3 that it would only be applicable over eight feet to comply with the City code.

Ms. Gibson commented that she did not care for EIFS. He could do a textured block on the bottom and do EIFS for the rest of the building. That much EIFS would bother her but it is a personal preference. There is no city code that says that you can't use it.

Mr. Shafer commented that it was suggested that Item H be added and says "If any of the above building design criteria conflicts with the Springboro zoning code the zoning code will take precedence".

Mr. Shafer commented on Item E which talks about ground or roof mounted mechanical equipment. It was suggested that it be added "and adjacent residential properties" in response to one of the notes about screening.

Mr. Shafer noted the exhibits that are referred to in Item G to give the City an idea of the type of buildings that are proposed and pointed out that there is no EIFS on those buildings. The examples show that the buildings have a base, body and cap and an architectural style.

Mr. Vomacka asked whether all of the buildings would be following a style and not be a bunch of disjointed buildings.

Mr. Shafer answered that yes, they would follow a style.

Ms. Gibson asked what style the buildings would follow, the exhibits or the guidelines?

Mr. Shafer explained that the buildings would look like the exhibits in concept.

Mr. Vomacka commented that six different architects could come in and propose six radically different buildings that still follow the guidelines.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that they could have different shapes and that is not the purpose of the park that Planning Commission is looking for a unified look. The architectural design of the buildings has to be similar.

Mr. Shafer stated that under his building design criteria, Item A states that the "design, materials, shape and scale of all buildings shall create a unified design on the property".

Mr. Boron commented that at the meeting in December, it was asked if this was a design vocabulary or whether all of the buildings were going to be clones. He thought that it was the applicant's intent to have a design vocabulary similar to The Marketplace at Settler's Walk, which has some design characteristics that are carried through the building. He stated that the City needs to be direct about what their desires are. While the first building is the design for the day care center, he asked what the intent was for the other four or five buildings.

Mr. Shafer stated that that is what the building design criteria document provides for, to have the buildings similar in design.

Ms. Ridd commented that the document is contradictory; one building could be brick, one wood, one green, or one blue.

Ms. Gibson added that when she read the criteria, it meant that every building could be different. She did not get the impression that the applicant was interested in having a consistent look. He wants consistency in his guidelines in that he will control to a specific list the materials and how they will be used, but he is not bringing in specific materials by maker or color. Ms. Gibson commented that she would like to see more consistency, but does not know if the developer is required to give it to them.

Mr. Shafer stated that he does expect some of the buildings to look different. They will need to follow the guidelines.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that Planning Commission needs to give Mr. Shafer some guidance. She asked whether this was acceptable or should he come back to Planning Commission with something with the same overall design so they know what the development will look like. She would like to see something consistent.

Mr. Shafer stated that he is not looking to tie someone down that tight.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that Planning Commission is not asking for cloned buildings, but consistency in the building architecture and the signage for example.

Ms. Gibson stated, for example, if he said that all of the buildings had to have pitched roofs but the brick color could be changed, saying the height of the building had to be consistent. That would give you some continuity which would be a nice blending between the applicant's latitude for his customer's to have some individuality and having consistency.

Mr. Landefeld stated that he would like to see some commonality between the buildings even if it is a color palate. He stated that he was being generalized in his comments to give the applicant some freedom to sell the product to different applicants.

Mr. Burkhardt stated that the problem would be that some members of the Planning Commission may see continuity between the buildings and another may not.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that, in the past, applicant have brought in samples.

Ms. Ridd asked whether Planning Commission could do that on a case by case basis.

Mr. Shafer stated that his design criteria insures the continuity by having each building have a different color structure in the base, body and cap. This is very specific. The intent is to have five different buildings here.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Shafer to move on to other staff comments.

In answer to staff comment #3 that states there is no unifying sign standards, Mr. Shafer presented signage standards. He discussed the details of the entrance signage and the sign standards.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that Mr. Shafer has material that staff and Planning Commission has not had an opportunity to review.

Mr. Shafer stated that he thought that that was what the purpose of the work session is, to get the information to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Ridd commented that normally the information is given before and the Planning Commission comes in prepared with questions and to talk about it.

Ms. Ridd asked whether there were roof units on the buildings.

Mr. Shafer answered that they were ground mounted and that is addressed in the screening.

Mr. Shafer stated that the landscaping has been addressed on the plan that was submitted.

Mr. Boron stated that, respectfully, it has not been addressed. He added that there needs to be identification of the species for the site, a template with species, size and spacing. Staff discussed with Mr. Shafer and Mr. Burkhardt their February 8th meeting, recommendations on a landscaping theme or concept. Staff is not asking for specific locations but for the intent.

Mr. Burkhardt stated that they have discussed species and size but cannot do spacing.

Mr. Boron commented that Planning Commission is looking for a consistent template so that when subsequent plans or building come through, these buildings will have a template to work from. This makes the approval easier, the concept is carried forward and the goals of Planning Commission are achieved.

Mr. Vomacka commented that it needs to be decided at this time that each building would have a certain number of certain landscaping.

Ms. Ridd agreed; that each building should have a certain amount of landscaping around the perimeter.

Mr. Vomacka commented that at this time it is conceptual, that it will change as the plans change, but Planning Commission needs some indication of that the plans are.

Mr. Shafer stated that he would comply with the City's landscape code.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he does not see in the plans where Mr. Shafer has shown what he is doing. He added that this is a PUD; the rules are different.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that the landscape changes with each new plan. The plans went from 51 pines along the eastern edge to 35 pines. She explained that everything has to be understood for his benefit as well.

Mr. Shafer explained why the landscaping was changed. He was told that the pines could not be planted that close together.

Mr. Vomacka commented they can be planted in double rows and there can be mounds made from the topsoil that will need to be moved. He added that the forty foot zone next to the residential needs to be retained.

Mr. Shafer asked about the portions of the code that talks about should there be no landscaping it could be twenty feet.

Mr. Boron explained that the Planning Commission has the discretion to determine the landscape buffer. Mr. Shafer's reading of the code applies to conventional zoning. This is PUD-B. Staff recommended to Planning Commission the minimum buffer, they may ask for more.

Mr. Shafer stated that if he should stay in O-R it would be forty feet if he doesn't do any landscaping, if he does landscaping it would go to twenty.

Mr. Boron explained that Mr. Vomacka has stated what he would prefer. Planning Commission can ask for more if they feel that it does not provide the adequate screening.

Mr. Shafer stated that he was commenting on O-R zoning.

Ms. Thompson commented the even under the O-R zoning, it is up to Planning Commission's approval. He would have to do a great amount of screening to protect those neighbors.

Mr. Shafer commented that for parking the screening is only ten feet. He added that he wants to do more than that. He had discussed with the neighbors leaving ten feet of natural buffer undisturbed and adding the white pine at the end of the ten feet. He discussed having the building at a thirty foot setback but leaving the ten foot buffer as is and not adding any grading. He commented that he is willing to install retaining walls to maintain that natural buffer.

Ms. Hartle commented that she had always considered honeysuckle a scrub bush and was surprised that they would want to keep it.

Mr. Shafer answered that the neighbors wanted to save it.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he feels that the building needs a forty foot setback and a double row of vegetation.

Mr. Landefeld stated that white pines can get fairly tall and asked whether they would fit in the space shown on the map.

Mr. Boron asked whether the discussion could be more generic when it pertains to species. He wasn't sure whether white pine was on the list and having a variety of different species might be helpful.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission if the forty foot buffer was okay and stated that she would tend to agree with that.

Mr. Dudas asked about the buffer for the parking lot; would a twenty foot setback be okay.

Mr. Landefeld stated that it depended on the type of species that they wanted to put there; twenty feet may not be enough.

Mr. Shafer commented that in response to a question about taking the landscaping to the back, there is a detention pond to the back; it is all woods there.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether Planning Commission was in consensus that it should be a forty foot setback for the building; that the parking lot can be twenty foot.

Mr. Landefeld stated that there could be flexibility there depending on the species and the density.

Ms. Ridd agreed; depending upon how dense it is and how high it is how well it screens the lot.

Mr. Shafer mentioned suggestions to soften the parking lot on one side. It was labeled as future parking. The suggestion was to have as little parking as possible.

Mr. Vomacka commented that it is difficult for Planning Commission to respond to plans that they have not seen.

Ms. Belpulsi concluded that there should be a forty foot buffer by the building and a twenty foot buffer by the parking depending on what is planted there.

Regarding the staff comment about the relocating the parking lot that is currently along Lytle Five Points Road, Mr. Shafer stated that it is consistent with what is built around it. Other properties along SR 741 have parking in front of them. It is not practical for the day care business. It would be a safety issue. He has tried to address the issue with additional landscaping along Lytle.

Mr. Vomacka commented that the property that he mentioned does not have parking along SR 741 which is a major highway. Also, Lytle is more of a neighborhood street. Other businesses have either a single row or no parking adjacent to the street. He feels that it is consistent that there should be no parking or if any no more than a single row of parking along Lytle.

Mr. Shafer stated that he couldn't do the day care under that condition.

Mr. Boron handed out a letter that was received from Mr. Fenton, who is representing the day care provider and would be the lot owner for Lot 1, Building 1. This letter was received two weeks ago. He has spoken to Mr. Fenton about the issue. Mr. Fenton thought that the suggestion was to move the building pad up and then simply flip the building. Staff's comment was to move the building up and move the parking to the rear. Mr. Fenton's comment about the safety was assuming that the entrance would still be on the north side. That would not be practical, to have the children walking through a playground. Staff's comment was to have the building location moved up; parking moved to the rear and have the building site reconfigured.

Mr. Shafer commented that if you are flipping the building entirely then you are putting the playground next to the road. From a visibility and safety factor, he does think that it should be next to the front entrance to the park.

Mr. Boron asked if the playground has to be there.

Mr. Shafer explained that the building is fenced on three sides. If you flip the property then you are putting the playground next the road. He does think that is desirable from a development standpoint and Mr. Fenton does not think that it is desirable form a safety standpoint.

Mr. Vomacka suggested moving it to the back of the property.

Mr. Shafer stated that this was a plan that he thought could be worked with. He stated that he could not change the design of the building. He hoped that he could work through screening of the parking lot but he could not move the building from that side.

Mr. Vomacka stated that if this building was not suitable for this location then maybe he needs to find a different building design.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that Planning Commission has stated numerous times that they do not want the parking there. She would prefer the parking not be there either.

Mr. Shafer stated that the alternative would be to put the playground there and that is not acceptable from his point of having an office park.

Ms. Gibson stated that Kids R Kids is almost exactly the same thing.

Ms. Gibson stated that the other problem with the parking out front is the entrance with a singular flow to do a loop in and out. She asked whether it is too close to Lytle. She asked whether it would help the traffic flow to move the parking to the back.

Mr. Shafer commented that after his meeting with Mr. Boron on Monday that the traffic flow would be changed.

Mr. Dudas stated that they took the first driveway out, the angle of the private drive is straightened but he added that staff would not be able to approve the drive as shown.

Mr. Shafer commented that it has been changed based on his meeting with staff on Monday.

Ms. Ridd asked why Planning Commission is talking about this one then.

Ms. Ridd asked that staff review whatever it is that he sent that addresses this.

Mr. Boron commented that staff prepares comments for the applicant and the Planning Commission to review. He felt that it was unfair to everyone in the process including the neighboring property owners for Mr. Shafer to bring out a plan today that was intended to address these issues. Mr. Boron met with the City Manager and the City Engineer to review this new plan. He stated that it did address some issues but that it made others worse.

Ms. Thompson wanted to make clear to the Planning Commission that the issue of the entrance has not been resolved.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that the other staff comments need to be reviewed quickly due to the late hour. She reviewed the major issues. Planning Commission would like to see a forty foot buffer on the east side near the residential area and twenty foot from the parking lot. Regarding staff comment #7, the parking lot for the child care, she stated that she felt that the consensus was that Planning Commission would like the parking lot moved from the front.

Ms. Ridd stated that the problem for her was the traffic flow with the entrance so close.

Mr. Shafer stated that there was a way of looping it that should alleviate that.

Mr. Boron commented that the looping was assuming that the parking would be in the front of the building and the Planning Commission has given you specific direction, no to that.

Ms. Ridd stated that her problem is the entrance; she does not have a problem with the parking being in the front for a day care use.

Ms. Gibson stated that she does not have a problem with the parking lot but that she would ask for a lot of landscaping.

Ms. Ridd stated that for a day care use, she would prefer that the parking being there instead of a playground.

Mr. Landefeld stated that he is fine with the parking where it is with restrictions, landscaping.

Mr. Vomacka commented that there is a site distance issue there also.

Ms. Hartle stated that she is concerned about the back up on with the day care center parents coming in and getting stopped.

Mr. Shafer asked if he could make that work, did she have a problem with the parking lot.

Ms. Hartle answered that as long as it is shielded like Kids R Kids, she does not have a problem with it.

Mr. Vomacka commented that in order to meet ODOT standards the private drive needs to be a straight road.

Mr. Shafer stated that at his meeting Monday with Mr. Dudas, he asked if there were any safety concerns and he did not think that there were.

Mr. Dudas answered that yes there were. He added that the engineering department would not accept the road as it was submitted today.

Ms Thompson commented that if the parking in the location is not moved, then he cannot approve the entrance. So it is related. There is not the proper distance from Lytle to a curb cut. It is an engineering issue.

Mr. Landefeld stated that that is why he qualified his support for the parking lot where it is, he is not sure that Mr. Shafer can satisfy the requirements for ingress and egress.

Ms. Gibson stated that the parking lot is fine, but she wants it to be safe and that is why she questioned the entrances.

Mr. Shafer stated that he also wants it safe and will have the engineers work out the safety issues.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that the next time Planning Commission sees a plan, these issues will not be on staff comments that they will be addressed; staff comments #9, #10 (erosion and sediment control plan), #11 and #12.

Mr. Shafer asked to discuss staff comment #13, regarding the maximum size of any building. He asked what if someone came along and asked to combine two of the buildings and have a twenty thousand square foot building.

Ms. Ridd stated that that was what they were trying to avoid was one big building filling up the rest of the space.

Mr. Shafer stated that the building next door was about that size.

Mr. Vomacka asked what the maximum square footage was in O-R zoning.

Ms Gibson stated that there was none; that it was to be residential in scale.

Mr. Boron answered that it was based on capacity of the site along with Planning Commission's determination through the site plan process.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he would like to see more two story buildings in Springboro but he did not think that this is the property for it.

Mr. Shafer commented that these are all one story buildings.

Mr. Vomacka answered that he needs to stick with that.

Ms. Gibson stated that she would not have a problem with a two story building to the west; it opens up more green space

Mr. Vomacka stated that he would like it kept to one story. Should a tenant come in with a two story then Planning Commission could consider it.

Ms. Ridd stated that it would depend where on the lot that they would want it.

Mr. Shafer stated that the condition would be is that he shows these footprints, any change would require he to come back to Planning Commission. The question was asked would he limit the size of the building.

Ms. Ridd answered that it is limited if Planning Commission states that based on the footprint it should be one story.

Mr. Vomacka commented that if they went with a two story then he would have to take two footprints, add them together and have only one building.

Ms. Gibson asked if there was a need to have a maximum building size.

Ms. Ridd answered that the limit is that he can only have a one story building on these footprints.

Regarding staff comment #14 (moving the cul-de-sac to the south) Mr. Shafer stated that that part of the property would be undeveloped so he does not want to extend the cul-de-sac any further because he does not know what he is going to do with it.

Mr. Boron answered that staff was concerned about the number of conflict points presented by that design; where there were four driveways accessed from that site. The suggestion was that the cul-de-sac be extended to reduce the number of conflict points.

Mr. Dudas asked if the cul-de-sac would be built as part of Phase I.

Mr. Shafer answered that yes it would.

Staff comments #15, #16 and #17 have been addressed.

Regarding staff comment #18, Mr. Shafer stated that the lighting had been discussed before. He will present more information on the lighting plan.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he wants to be certain that there are no visible bulbs or light sources from the residences and light at the extreme of the property is one half a foot candle or less so that it does not wash onto the neighbors.

Mr. Shafer presented possible light fixtures. They were reviewed.

Ms. Belpulsi asked what a proposed bank/ financial institution drive thru look like relative to the General Plan.

Mr. Shafer presented pictures of an example of a bank drive thru. It was reviewed. He commented that there is no proposal for a bank institution at this time but the question was asked what it could look like.

Ms. Ridd commented that the only place a bank would want to be placed is along Lytle.

Mr. Shafer commented that he proposed a bank that would be two story and eleven thousand square feet making it more intensive and giving the property more green space than for an office building.

Mr. Boron commented that that is where the staff comment came from because this building would be up abutting the residential area. Regarding the canopy, though the lighting standard has a limitation on lighting, this building would be against a residential use when most banks are not.

Ms. Gibson agreed and commented that the ATM would be open 24/7. She commented that taking into account the bank would be close to the residential area and the needs for lighting, it could be very difficult for the Planning Commission to approve a bank at that location

Ms. Belpulsi commented that Mr. Shafer could propose a bank with no drive thru.

Mr. Shafer commented that a bank without a drive thru would be allowed.

Mr. Vomacka clarified that it would be allowed once the PUD rezoning is approved by Council.

Staff comment #20 has been taken care of.

Regarding staff comment #21, Mr. Burkhardt stated that they had a question about the need for a sidewalk but that it has been explained by staff.

Mr. Landefeld asked for an internal sidewalk along the private drive.

Mr. Shafer asked when those sidewalks would need to be completed. He will work with staff.

Mr. Shafer stated that staff comments #22 through #26 have been addressed. He asked for the memo for the traffic study from December 10, 2009.

Mr. Boron stated that he provided the memo that afternoon. He added that this memo is not new.

Mr. Dudas added that the improvements have to do with the traffic signal at Lytle and SR 741.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that the next set of plans that are submitted have to incorporate the discussions from tonight.

Mr. Vomacka suggested that staff have time to review all submission and that nobody provide additional revised plans until Planning Commission meets.

It was explained to Mr. Shafer how to handle any staff comments that may be provided by staff.

III. Guest Comments

Bud Hunter of 1859 West Tamaron Court expressed his concern that the planning process is in the second stage and he sees little progress in the plans. He stated that the O-R zoning states that everything must be residential in nature. He does not feel that a two story building would appropriate. He asked how long the process would continue.

Ms. Belpulsi explained that that the way it was left at the last Council meeting was that the decision on the rezoning was postponed until Planning Commission has reached an acceptable General Plan.

David Petroni of 25 Drew Court and member of the board of directors of the Settlers Walk Home Owners Association thanked Planning Commission for their work controlling, restricting and monitoring the community as a whole. His issue is a concern on drainage issues for his neighborhood.

Paul Van Maldeghem of 1860 West Tamaron Court thanked Planning Commission for their comments and commented that they are counting on Planning Commission to protect their interests. He added that his concern is that there is so much unknown yet.

Ms. Belpulsi thanked the guests for their comments and interest.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

There were no Planning Commission and staff comments.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, February 10, 2010 Work Session at 9:40 P.M.

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chair

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary