

# Minutes

## Central CEDA Regional Planning Commission

Regular Meeting ~ 4:00 pm.  
Thursday, February 6, 2014

Springview Government Center  
3130 East Main Street  
Springfield, OH 45505

Mr. Michael Hanlon, Vice-Chairperson of the Central CEDA Regional Planning Commission of Clark County Ohio, calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

Present: Mr. Michael Hanlon, Mrs. Charlene Roberge, Mr. Dan Kelly, Mr. James Smith  
Mr. Mike Spradlin, and Mrs. Kim Marshall.

Absent: Mr. Gene Barnett

### Minutes

Vice Chairperson Hanlon asks if there are any comments regarding the minutes. Hearing none, he asks for a motion to approve the minutes.

#### RPC: 2-4-2014: Minutes ~ January 9, 2014

Motion by Mrs. Roberge, seconded by Mr. Spradlin, to approve the minutes as presented.

**VOTE: Yes: Mrs. Roberge, Mr. Spradlin, Mr. Hanlon, Mrs. Marshall, Mr. Kelly, and Mr. Smith.**

**No: None**

**Motion carries.**

#### S-2014-02: Rezoning Case ~ Tom Owens; Pat's Properties LTD ~ 7.17 acres ~ Located at 925 Upper Valley Pike ~ Rezone 7.17 acres from R-1(Single family Residential District) to B-3 (General Business District)

Mr. Neimayer, Senior Planner, presents the case and states that the proposed uses would be automobile and RV sales.

As noted in the staff report, as part of the original zoning map for the Springfield Township, adopted in December 1964 the subject property and surrounding area have been zoned R-1 (Single family Residential District). The Applicant would like to split and rezone 7.17 acres of the subject property from R-1 to B-3 (General Business District).

The B-3 development standards are:

Min. Lot Size	Min. Frontage	Min. Setbacks (in ft.)		
		Front	Side	Rear
15,000 sq. ft.	90 ft.	25	(E)	(G)

(E) None required unless adjoining a Residential District, then shall not less than 15 ft. on each side, or ¼ the sum of the height and depth of the structure, whichever is greater.

- (G) None required unless adjoining a Residential District, then shall not be less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  the sum of the height and width of the structure, but in no case shall be less than 20 ft. If use is to be serviced from the rear, a yard shall be provided not less than 4 ft. deep.

Mr. Neimayer stated that this area of Springfield Township, west of Upper Valley Pike, is identified as Low Density Residential in the CROSSROADS Land Use Plan.

“Low density residential development (2 to 4 dwellings per acre – gross density) should be supported in portions of German, Moorefield and Springfield townships surrounding the City of Springfield where such development can be serviced by central water and sewer service. Neighborhoods should be designed to connect with existing adjacent residential areas through stub street extensions. Clustering techniques should be considered to provide a transition to rural areas. Supporting commercial uses are not appropriate given the low density.”

Mr. Neimayer also stated that the property on the other side of Upper Valley Pike is located in the City of Springfield and identified on the CROSSROADS Plan as Community Commercial, which is described as commercial development directed to existing business districts and major highway interchanges. A low-density, sprawled commercial pattern is not supported along the county’s major arterials. Where adjacent to existing or planned neighborhoods, commercial development should provide pedestrian connections to reduce auto congestion and should be well buffered to reduce negative impacts on such neighborhoods.

As Staff has previously suggested, perhaps a small commercial area could be split from the 14+ acre parcel and rezoned to B-3. Although varying from the CROSSROADS Plan, this would follow the existing commercial development pattern along this section of Upper Valley Pike (businesses established prior to adopting the land use plan) maintaining the dense tree area as a buffer from the residential neighborhood to the west and south.

Mr. Neimayer also stated that about half of the 14.39 acre parcel is located in the floodplain. Based on aerial photo, the existing parking area and driveway off Upper Valley Pike are located in the floodplain. Although floodplain regulations do not prohibit the parking of vehicles in the floodplain, any permanent development would require a Floodplain Development Permit. See December 3, 2013 letter from Tom Hale, County Floodplain Administrator.

Mr. Neimayer presented the Board with an updated letter from the Soil & Water Conservation District. He then showed a slide identifying the soils on the subject property and referenced the January 30, 2014 letter from the Soil & Water Conservation District. The soils on the property have characteristics that are unfavorable for development. In addition, the SWCD letter points out the property has two natural springs “that will flow continuously throughout the year”. These springs will need to be addressed in the future development of the property. Development of the property can be achieved, however considering the soil types, the drainage for this property and the property’s location within the flood plain, drainage infrastructure and site-development will be expensive. If anything over one acre on the property is being disturbed, that would require compliance with the county’s Stormwater and Erosion control requirements.

Mr. Neimayer stated that in the County Engineer’s original letter (August 23, 2013) they commented on the slope of the property. The back of the property going west has some steep slopes. Per the County Engineer’s December 3, 2013 letter, they have no objection to the request as presented.

Mr. Neimayer stated that the business zoned properties to the north, previously in Springfield and German townships then annexed into the City of Springfield, were rezoned in the early 1980's prior to the adoption of the CROSSROADS Land Use Plan. The existing building (on the subject property) was used in a business capacity with the property's prior land use intensity. Therefore, Staff recommends the Applicant's request to split and rezone 7.17 acre site from R-1 to B-3 as presented be approved.

Mr. Neimayer asks if there are any questions for Staff. There were none.

Vice-Chairperson Hanlon asks if the Applicant was present and would like to speak.

Mr. Jim Peifer, whose address is 20 S. Limestone Street, stated he is the agent for the Applicant in this case. He did not have a lot to add to the Staff Report, but wanted to make a few comments. They would like to reconfirm what Mr. Neimayer already stated that there is no planned development of this site. It is simply a use of the existing building and the parking area for the use that is proposed. Any development that would take place in the future, whether it would be outside or within the floodplain area, would have to satisfy both the drainage requirements of the County Engineer's office and also the floodplain regulations.

Mr. Peifer also wanted to point out, as Mr. Neimayer already stated, the back portion of this property that backs up to the single-family residential properties forms a natural barrier or buffer for the area. The said property is not appropriate for development anyway. The property to the west is also further buffered by the fact that more than half of the property that was originally brought before you for rezoning is now not included and a lot split would be required.

Mr. Peifer stated that the last thing he would like to say is this particular property, actually the whole 14+ acres, but in particular what we are talking about has been used for commercial purposes since before the Springfield Township adopted their zoning in 1964. It should also be noted that the township's position with regards to zoning of this particular area as far as residential has not really changed since zoning was adopted. But you have to recognize that in zoning really the classification is based on what the appropriate uses are. To me, this request provides the most appropriate use for the property. The use and the intensity of the use will remain the same. The night time use might will be considerably less. As you know with the operation of the golf course they had bright lights that would be used in the evening. If the Board has any questions I will be happy to answer them at this time.

Mrs. Roberge asks Mr. Peifer if this zoning is approved how fast will the signs currently on the property be coming down that blame zoning for going out of business.

Mr. Peifer stated that he would say they would be coming down immediately. The signs were simply stating that they did not have the zoning out there. As you know I was not here for the meeting for the original rezoning application. Mr. Owens, for whatever reason, was not aware of the zoning restriction out there. He thought that it had business use when he leased the property.

Vice Chairperson Hanlon asks if there were any more questions.

Mrs. Roberge asks if there was anyone else present that would like to speak.

Jeff Briner, Springfield Township Administrator/Zoning Officer, stated that this was pretty much in line with what the township originally suggested to Mr. Owens.

Vice-Chairperson Hanlon asks if there are any further questions.

Hearing no further questions, Vice-Chairperson Hanlon asks for a motion.

**RPC: 2-5-2014: S-2014-012 Rezoning Case ~ Tom Owens; Pat's Properties LTD ~ Located at 925 Upper Valley Pike ~ Rezone 7.17 acres from R-1 (Single family Residential District) to B-3 (General Business District)**

Motion by Mr. Kelly, seconded by Mr. Smith, to recommend **Approval** of rezoning case #S-2014-02 as presented.

**VOTE: Yes: Mr. Kelly and Mr. Smith, Mr. Hanlon, Mrs. Marshall, Mrs. Roberge, and Mr. Spradlin.**

**No: None**

***Motion carries.***

**RPC: 2-6-2014: Minutes ~ December 5, 2013**

Mr. Neimayer explained that the December 5, 2013 minutes could not be acted upon at the January 2014 meeting due to lack of a quorum of those members who were present at the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Motion by Mrs. Roberge, seconded by Mr. Spradlin to approve the minutes as presented.

**VOTE: Yes: Mrs. Roberge, Mr. Spradlin, Mr. Hanlon and Mr. Smith.**

**No: None**

**Abstain: Mr. Kelly and Mrs. Marshall**

***Motion carries.***

**RPC: 2-7-2014: Motion for Mr. Michael Hanlon to remain Vice-Chairperson for 2014 until any further decisions have been made.**

Motion by Mrs. Roberge, seconded by Mr. Smith, to approve Mr. Michael Hanlon to remain Vice Chairperson for 2014 until any further decisions have been made.

**VOTE: Yes: Mrs. Roberge, Mr. Smith, Mr. Spradlin, Mr. Hanlon, Mrs. Marshall, and Mr. Kelly.**

**No: None**

***Motion carries.***

### Staff Comments

Mr. Neimayer states that next month's meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 6, 2014. The City of Springfield had filed a zoning text amendment case that was tabled by the CEDA Board on September 5, 2013 at the request of the city. They are now ready to proceed with this case.

Vice-Chairperson Hanlon asks for a motion for adjournment.

### Adjournment

#### RPC: 2-8-2014: Adjournment

Motion by Mrs. Roberge, seconded by Mr. Smith, to adjourn the meeting.

**VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

---

Mr. Michael Hanlon, Vice-Chairperson

---

Mr. Thomas A. Hale, Secretary