

**City of Springboro**  
**320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio 45066**  
**Planning Commission Meeting**  
**Wednesday, March 10, 2021**

**I. Call to Order**

Chairperson Becky Iverson called the Springboro Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. by video conference.

Present: Becky Iverson, Chair, Chris Pearson, Vice-Chair, Mark Davis, Robert Dimmitt, Steve Harding, Mike Thompson, and John Sillies.

Staff: Chris Pozzuto, City Manager; Dan Boron, City Planner; Elmer Dudas, Development Director; Chad Dixon, City Engineer, Ann Burns, Planning Commission Secretary.

Also present were Larry Dillin, Dillin Corp., Doug Borror, Borror Development, Wendy Moeller with Compass Point Planning, and Robin Hall, representing the Hall family.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**A. February 10, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes**

Ms. Iverson asked for corrections or additions to the minutes.

There were none.

*Mr. Harding motioned to approve the February 10, 2021 Planning Commission minutes as submitted. Mr. Sillies seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Harding, yes; Davis, yes; Sillies, yes; Dimmitt, yes; Iverson, yes; Pearson, yes; Thompson, yes (7-0)**

Ms. Iverson took this time to explain the process and the order of speakers for the meeting. She reported that 19 e-mails were submitted to share comments and 4 citizens requested to speak. The staff will provide their report first, then the applicant, next the other speakers and lastly, the planning commission members.

**III. Agenda Items**

**A. Final Approval, Planning & Zoning Code Text Amendment, sign code**

Mr. Boron reported that this agenda item was reviewed at length at the February meeting where Wendy Moeller from Compass Point Planning provided her presentation. Staff is requesting formal approval to forward this text amendment to council. Mr. Boron explained that this amendment is to incorporate changes to the code due to a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision that impacts how signs are regulated. He briefly reviewed the amendments and the

one major change that was discussed, mostly related to the flag and flag pole restrictions, which are reflected on page 6 of the draft ordinance.

Ms. Moeller had nothing to add.

Ms. Iverson asked for a motion for approval Planning & Zoning Code Text Amendment, Sign Code.

*Mr. Thompson motioned to approve. Mr. Harding seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Davis, yes; Sillies, yes; Dimmitt, yes; Iverson, yes; Pearson, yes; Thompson, yes; Harding, yes; (7-0)**

**B. Preliminary Review**

**Rezoning, Easton Farm, 605 North Main Street, from R-1, Estate-Type Residential District, to PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, retail and residential development**

**C. General Plan, Easton Farm, 605 North Main Street, from R-1, Estate-Type Residential District, to PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, retail and residential development**

**Background Information**

These agenda items are based on a request filed by Easton Farm Partners, Springboro, seeking rezoning and general plan approval for the Easton Farm, 103.31-acre located at 605 North Main Street. The applicant is requesting rezoning and general plan approval under the City's Planned Unit Development (PUD) process from R-1, Estate-Type Residential District, to PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use. The applicant proposes to develop a mix of commercial, single-family and multi-family residential development. While included in the PUD-MU rezoning, the applicant proposes to retain the 16.82-acre historic farmstead located on the west side of the property.

The proposed rezoning/general plan appears as two separate items on the Planning Commission work session agenda. The first stage of the PUD process, rezoning and general plan review and approval, will involve two separate recommendations to City Council, and later two separate pieces of legislation considered by City Council.

The subject property is located southwest of the intersection of Anna Drive/Lytle-Five Points Road and North Main Street. The subject property is presently farmed and includes two single-family residential units on the west side of the property within a historic farmstead. Vehicular access is presently provided by a single driveway from North Main Street.

The subject property is presently zoned R-1, Estate-Type Residential District. The R-1 District allows residential development at a density of 2 dwelling units per acre on 20,000 square foot lots. The R-1 District was applied to this property in 2015 as part of the implementation of the current Planning & Zoning Code.

The applicant has requested rezoning to PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, with three components: mixed-use, multi-family, and residential indicated on sheet C1.0 in the submitted materials.

Rezoning together with general plan review and approval are the first step in the three-step PUD review and approval process. Approval by both Planning Commission and City Council are required. Final development plan, similar to the City's site plan review process, review and approval by Planning Commission is the second stage in the process. Final development plan may be submitted in a number of sections in conjunction with a site's incremental development. Record plan review and approval by both Planning Commission and City Council is the last step in the PUD approval process, this allowing for the subdivision of lots and the dedication of right-of-way and open spaces. As with final development plans, record plans may be submitted in a number of sections as the development is completed.

Adjacent land uses include single-family residential development to the northwest within the Hunter Springs subdivision that includes homes on Deer Trail Drive. Open space in the form of the City of Springboro's Gardner Park, office and retail development to the north within the Village Park PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, retail development to the northeast within the Marketplace of Settlers Walk shopping center, a part of the Settlers Walk PUD, northeast of the intersection of Lytle-Five Points Road and North Main Street; retail and office development to the east on the east side of North Main Street; and retail and office development to the south including a day care facility and real estate office. To the south, residential development including condominiums within Springbrook Commons/Spice Rack subdivision, and the City of Springboro's North Park. To the west is single-family residential within the Tamarack Hills and Royal Tamarack subdivisions.

Adjacent zoning includes to the north R-2, Low-Density Residential District corresponding to the Hunter Springs subdivision, and PUD-MU corresponding to the Village Park development. PUD to the northwest associated with the Settlers Walk PUD. LBD, Local Business District, O, Office District, and O-R, Office-Residential District, to the east associated with the existing pattern of retail and office development. O-R District to the south, and transitioning to PUD and R-3, Medium-Density Residential District, associated to the condominium development to the south, and then transitioning to R-2 District corresponding to the single-family area along Tamarack Trail and into North Park. This R-2 District pattern continues to the west and the Tamarack Hills/Royal Tamarack subdivisions.

The *Springboro Land Use Plan*, adopted by City Council in April 2009, includes recommendations for the long-range development of the community.

It is divided into 16 policy areas that make specific recommendations for smaller portions of the community and are grouped together because of proximity, land use patterns, date of development and other general characteristics. Policy Area #3, North SR 741 Corridor, includes the subject area and land including Hunter Springs, Village Park, the non-residential portions of Settlers Walk and retail/office areas on east side of North Main Street. Preferred Land Uses identified in the plan include convenience retail, personal service, retail uses limited to a maximum of 75,000 square feet in floor area, among other uses. Residential development is preferred at an overall density of 6-8 dwelling units per acre.

The applicant's General Plan concept drawing proposes the following:

- An 18.75-acre mixed use commercial component on the northeast corner of the property fronting North Main Street. This component includes the following:
  - A 113-unit independent living facility.

- An 84,400-square foot assisted living/memory care facility.
- Outparcels for a fire station, restaurants and other retail facilities totaling 16,800 square feet.
- Two commercial buildings including 37,900 square feet of space.
- A 10.12-acre multi-family residential component on the southeast corner of the property fronting North Main Street that includes multiple buildings including 324 apartments, a 9,500-square foot restaurant, and 3.0 acres of open space comprised of storm water detention ponds.
- A 74.40-acre residential component covering the remainder of the property including the following:
  - Retaining the historic farmstead including 2 homes and preserving most farm buildings.
  - 24 townhomes.
  - 251 single-family lots most of that are served by garages accessed by private drives. The site of lots proposed for this large area ranges from large lots adjacent to the Hunter Springs neighborhood on the north end of the component to smaller lots to the south.
  - 12.82 acres of open space including two small parks, storm water detention ponds, a linear park, and a town green-type open space abutting the mixed use and multi-family residential component.

For proposed residential development areas, a gross density of 6.83 dwelling units per acre (577 dwelling units on 84.52 acres) is proposed.

Access to the proposed development would be provided by an extension of the existing Anna Drive through the development south to Tamarack Trail near the entrance to North Park, an extension of Fox Trail Drive from the Hunter Springs subdivision south into the interior of the site, and an access point onto North Main Street from the proposed Easton Farm Boulevard.

### **Staff Comments**

City staff has the following comments regarding the proposed rezoning/general plan application:

1. Rename the mixed-use component of the PUD to commercial or other to avoid confusion with the overall rezoning request, and provide a component to address historic farmstead design/development standards and proposed permitted uses.
2. Revise full-color illustrative plan to match b/w plan proposal.
3. Revise the submittal for the next review to include the following for each component area: design and development standards including but not limited to setbacks, building heights, dwelling unit sizes, lot coverage, and a list of land uses proposed for each component area. As a companion to this information, provide a color-coded version of the general plan.
4. Easton farmstead is listed as open space. Unless the farm is available for use as common space it should not be included in the calculation.
5. An additional 5.47 acres of open space is needed to satisfy the 25% minimum open space requirement for residential PUDs.
6. Indicate who will manage open spaces proposed in the development.
7. For trails proposed on common areas, if any, include no restrictions for their use by any person with the exception of areas specifically set aside for the members of an association such as pool areas.

8. The trail along Anna Drive to be designed to meet minimum standards for width, turning radius, and to avoid obstructions.
9. City to review Anna Drive extension to intersection with Tamarack Trail and North Park entrance.
10. Indicate proposed phasing including road connections and other improvements with surrounding developments.
11. Provide typical plans for buildings indicating materials, and other details for each component in order to determine concurrence between general plan's concept and specific building plans when final development plans are prepared for review and approval by the Planning Commission.
12. Sidewalks (or trail) to be located on all streets, both sides. This should be verified. The general plan is difficult to tell and a statement would address it.
13. Connect Alley 4 and Alley 8, provided it can be engineered due to elevations.
14. Central mailbox units need to be located on general plan (and approved by the post office). Include this information in the design guidelines.
15. Flag lots not permitted (lots off of cul-de-sac on Red Hawk View). Remove flag lots or extend roadway.
16. Road name proposals to be reviewed by City Engineer in consultation with the police and fire departments.
17. Anna Drive to extend off of existing Anna Drive, and not relocated as shown.
18. Provide Noel Drive typical section.
19. Add a possible drop right turn lane into North Park at the Tamarack Trail connection.
20. Traffic Study to be submitted for review and approved prior to final approval of General Plan/Rezone by planning commission.
21. Right-of-way along North Main Street to be dedicated per city specifications.
22. No construction access permitted from Tamarack Trail or Fox Trail Drive.
23. Engineering design details to be reviewed at the Final Development Plans stage, including but not limited to utility design, storm water management plan including detention/retention design, and roadway design.
24. Road intersections to be at 90 degree angles.
25. HOA documents need to be created for review.
26. All private alleys to have a public access easement description.
27. The Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

City staff has the following comments regarding the proposed design guidelines booklet included in the rezoning/general plan submission:

1. City staff recommends a review with applicants on the intent of the design guidelines. Are they covenants or are these intended to be incorporated into the general plan approval?
2. Remove references to ARC in design guidelines.
3. Change references to occupancies to permitted uses.
4. Beginning on page 7, define personal care services.
5. Page 7, (p) states no upper floor level use restrictions within mixed-use areas. This needs to be defined.
6. Page 9, explain reference to architectural guidelines.
7. Page 10-11, utility easements are to be located outside of the right-of-way in a 10-foot utility easement, and not within the proposed right-of-way. (page 10, (c); page 11 (e)).
8. Page 13, for loading/unloading provisions, cross-reference City code on hours of operation.
9. Page 14, explain proposed open space area requirements. Are these setbacks?
10. Beginning on page 15, there are many references to traditional design. Is this concept tied down to examples?
11. Page 18, (h) tie-down proposed building heights.
12. For landscaping provisions on page 19, provide cross reference to City requirements in Chapter 1280, Landscaping.
13. Page 22, for exterior lighting, provide cross reference to City requirements in Chapter 1273, Exterior Lighting.
14. Page 30, explain accessory structure uses.
15. Page 31, single-family lots table states 4 story permitted – is this correct? In same table, footnote 1 states front porch encroachment up to 5 feet maximum is permitted. This should be removed and the table should reflect actual need/want.
16. Page 31, define where Village Center, Neighborhood Lane, etc., are in this proposal.
17. Page 31-32, state no parking in alleys permitted (on page 31 (b) and Page 32, 9(a)).
18. Page 32, are parking spaces defined as in a garage?
19. Page 33, are antennas permitted? (page 33, 11 (b)).
20. Page 34, explain Residential Typologies beginning on this page. Are these going to be supported by other design metrics?
21. Parking Dimensions to match city code. Change Stall Length on 0 degree parking from 22 feet to 24 feet.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Boron provided some background information for the Planning Commission's approval process for Planned Unit Developments (PUD). He referred to the development plan that was proposed back in 2017 from a different development team. This is a three step process that involves rezoning, final development plan, and then the record plan. Mr. Boron noted that the meeting tonight is for preliminary review and there will be no action taken.

Mr. Boron introduced Ms. Robin Hall who will be reading a statement on behalf of the Easton Family Trust.

Mr. Boron referred to the vicinity map that the area includes the entire property, all 108 acres, which does differ slightly from the proposal in 2017, which was around 85 acres. This is a Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use (PUD-MU) project which would be an amendment to our Planning and Zoning Code. The proposal includes a mixed use area, a multi-family area as well as a single family area.

Mr. Larry Dillin from the applicant team stated that their team has been speaking with the Hall family since late 2017 on the development of this plan and it reflects the wishes of the family. He explained how this site was modeled after two other existing sites in other parts of the state.

Mr. Doug Borrer provided some background information on his company which is a construction management and development company that specializes in mixed-use buildings in Central Ohio. He shared the artist rendering emphasizing the entrance from S.R. 741 and the statement that it creates.

Mr. Dillin reviewed their goal to create an environment that promotes walkability. He explained how the commercial core is connected to the residential sections as well as the central park on the inside of the development. He also shared plans for extending the multiuse trail, connections to both Gardner Park and North Park by way of a linear park.

Mr. Borrer reviewed how they incorporated other concepts from around the world where mixed use and residential can be development together to accomplish the goals of the Hall family. Two similar examples of these developments are Norton Commons in Louisville Kentucky and Baldwin Park in Orlando, Florida.

Mr. Borrer explained how they are creating a unique destination for the Springboro Community by developing prominent and inviting neighborhoods with a blend of urban and suburban neighborhoods. He reviewed how the development will incorporate a variety of heights, materials and textures to create an upscale presence. Mr. Borrer shared plans for the upscale apartments, the two story parking and the amenity packages that are designed to attract young professions to this area. He also reviewed the different types of residential living which include townhouses, urban lots, alley fed lots, edge lots and estate lots. All of these types of homes will follow the strict standards of the PUD.

Mr. Dillin noted that the residential sections are uniquely designed to cover all aspects as well as minimize curb cuts. He also reviewed the plans and amenities for the independent living building which is designed to accommodate the unmet needs of the 75 and older population that is still mobile and active. Mr. Dillin also reviewed the plans and locations of other restaurants and commercial sites within the development, which will include outdoor dining. He explained how the design focuses on connectivity between buildings which will encourage walkability between residential, multi-family and commercial space. Mr. Dillin stated they have worked to design a unique and special development while being respectful of the wishes of the Hall family.

Ms. Iverson thanked them for the presentation. She then welcomed the 3 other speakers who have registered to share their statements.

Justin Weidle of 164 Deer Trail Drive, read his prepared statement which shared his opposition to the development and voiced his concerns about density, greenspace and the insufficient revenue that will be generated. His statement is provided as part of this record.

David Beckman, 168 Deer Trail Drive, read his prepared statement which shared his concerns about overcrowding schools, overcrowding existing parks, increased traffic and the additional burden on police and fire services. His statement is provided as part of this record.

Steve Smith, 30 Jacamar Court, read his prepared statement in opposition of the development voicing concerns about increased traffic, noise, effects on wildlife and the return on investment. His statement is provided as part of this record.

Ms. Iverson thanked these residents for their comments which will be entered into the record.

Mr. Boron provided some background on the land use plan and its relationship to existing zoning on the site, which is currently zoned R-1, Rural Residential District. He explained that in the state of Ohio, and the City, there is no requirement that our land use plan be specifically matched up with the zoning of the property. Around 2015, the City also eliminated the agricultural zoning category since the community was no longer mostly agrarian, and is now a more suburban community with a large industrial base on the west end of town. Mr. Boron noted that the 2017 plan presented by Hills was not rejected, it was withdrawn by Hills Development before the Planning Commission had the opportunity to review it. The staff recommendation was to deny it, but the Planning Commission never had the opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. Harding thanked all the residents for their comments as well as the staff and developer for all of their input. He asked Mr. Dillin to provide some additional information on the school issue, and what the estimated average age of children will be in these type of residential units.

Mr. Borrer explained that this semi-urban design is similar to another development near downtown Columbus. In this development, under half have any children at all, and there are no school age children. In the suburban apartments, there are less than 10% of children. In the unit mixes that are 2 bedrooms, we estimate a minimum amount of school age children. In the single-family townhouses, there are likely to have young couples with no children. Finally, in the single family homes, these tend to attract the urban professionals not likely to have children. Mr. Borrer stated that equals about 45% of the homes that will likely not have many children. He stated that they would expect to see some children within the 95 larger single family lots. Mr. Borrer noted that this will be significantly less children than if they were all standard single family homes and the development was created with sensitivity to the impact on schools.

Mr. Harding noted that the majority of these children would likely go to Dennis Elementary, and he assumes the building would be gradual.

Mr. Borrer stated that the multi-family units would be completed in two phases, beginning in summer, 2022, with an absorption of 50 units annually and completion timeline of 6½ years.

Mr. Thompson asked if this was the same acreage as the proposal submitted in 2017.

Mr. Boron explained that the acreage of the heritage farm was excluded in 2017 so it was roughly 86 acres and the full acreage of the property is 103. It is staff's understanding that it is included, and the family may have plans to change the use to include some commercial use.

Mr. Sillies asked why the proposal was withdrawn in 2017, and what changed on this current proposal that make the City more receptive.



Mr. Boron stated that after 5 meetings, over a 10 month period of time Hills Development withdrew after staff recommendations regarding density relative to Deer Trail and acreage being consistent with Hunter Springs.

Mr. Boron explained that with the current preliminary review, staff has had the opportunity to review at lengthy, and we did not see this level of detail back in 2017. There will like be changes based on comments and feedback from both the public and members of Planning Commission.

Ms. Iverson agreed that Hills Development did not provide this level of detail or take into consideration the input from residents or the Planning Commission. This plan also seems to be taking into consideration the need to stay in line with the existing Deer Trail area.

Mr. Sillies asked if the 3 and 4 story apartment buildings are necessary to make this project cost justifiable for both the developer and land owners.

Mr. Borrer explained that the goal is to create an up-scale experience that is different than anything in Springboro and create a destination where residents can be involved in the neighborhood. He reviewed the details, security and amenities that come with these buildings, which will be located on the lowest point of the property.

Mr. Sillies asked if they were needed to make the project cost justified and would the project move forward without the apartments.

Mr. Dillin explained that all the scenarios, market analysis and estimates include the multi-family apartments which also allows the multi-family use on smaller acreage.

Mr. Harding also asked if the project can move forward without the apartments, or if they could be reduced to 3 story rather than 4.

Mr. Dillin explained that economically, they would not move forward without the apartments and feel they could not reach the quality and character that they proposed.

Ms. Iverson also asked if there could be a consideration to lower the building to 3 stories, and what would that impact be.

Mr. Dillin stated they could review the possibility of changing to a 3 story, but would likely result in less amenities.

Mr. Borrer agreed that it would take away from much of the luxury of the project, the demographics would change and could also eliminate the ability to build the parking garage. They feel the market is there to support the 4 story building and the project would not be as appealing and the end result would not be the same.

Mr. Dillin stated he would likely need to pull the application if it is changed to a more suburban style product.

Mr. Thompson stated the entrance is intended to catch your eye, and he did not feel one story either way will make much of a difference.

Ms. Iverson stated there has been much consideration and surveys, and this seems to be the best location to promote a complex of this size with this level of amenities.

Mr. Pearson also shared concerns about a 4 story building.

There was further discussion on the options and the pros and cons of changing the plans for the multi-family apartment building.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the process, and if the rezoning and the development need to move forward together, or can staff focus on the re-zoning separately.

Mr. Boron explained that the rezoning and the general plan would need to move forward together, and ultimately be forwarded to Council for legislation. There would be an ordinance for the rezoning and a resolution for the general plan.

Mr. Boron thanked everyone for their comments and participation. There will be additional discussion on the months to come, and the next meeting will be April 14, 2021. Staff will be reviewing all the comments and issues that were raised today. The next deadline for submittal is Friday, March 29th, so staff will know then if anything is submitted for further review.

#### IV. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments. Ms. Iverson encouraged citizens to submit comments in advance through e-mail.

#### V. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Mr. Boron noted that the Master Plan Update is still in process and the surveys can be submitted through March 28th.

#### Adjournment

*Ms. Sillies motioned to adjourn the March 10, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting at 8:05 p.m.  
Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Sillies, yes; Dimmitt, yes; Iverson, yes; Pearson, yes; Harding, yes; Thompson, yes; Davis, yes. (7-0)**

  
Becky Iverson, Planning Commission Chairperson

  
Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

  
Ann Burns, Planning Commission Secretary