



Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

September 7, 2016

7:00 p.m.

New Albany Planning Commission met in regular session in the Council Chambers of Village Hall, 99 W Main Street and was called to order by Planning Commission Chair Neil Kirby by at 7:14 p.m.

Neil Kirby	Present
Brad Shockey	Present
David Wallace	Present (arrived 7:15pm)
Bill Steele	Present
Sloan Spalding (council liaison)	Absent

Staff members present: Stephen Mayer, Planner; Adrienne Joly, Deputy Director and Pam Hickok, Clerk.

Mr. Kirby moved to table the August 15, 2016 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Wallace. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Shockey, yea; Mr. Steele, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Kirby asked for any changes or corrections to the agenda.

Mr. Mayer stated no.

Mr. Kirby swore to truth those wishing to speak before the Commission.

Mr. Kirby's invited the public to speak on non-agenda related items and received no response.

Mr. Wallace moved to accept the staff reports and related documents in to the record, seconded by Mr. Kirby. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Kirby, yea; Ms. Brisk, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Steele, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Stephen Mayer presented a brief description of the informal applications.

Mr. Aaron Underhill, representing MBJ Holdings, stated that they have several annexations pending and are currently in the 60 day waiting periods that are getting ready to lapse. Our intent is to follow up with a formal presentation to have the zoning and annexation on the same schedule with Council. Using the map he explained the three locations that will be similar uses as the existing business park. We would like to keep the Zambori property with the same standards as the existing area. The area off of Jug will be the Harrison East

expansion area will be a continuation of Harrison East with similar treatment along the rural road. The area near Winding Hollow will be zoned LGE. North of Worthington Road/ Dublin Granville will be office uses. Mink Road area with the extension on Innovation Campus Way will provide a great opportunity for truck circulation to two interchanges.

Ms. Joly stated that we went out for bid and we received the bids and have 60 days to award.

Mr. Tom Rubey stated that ODOT has Mink Road interchange and it is in process.

Mr. Underhill stated that the Mink Road area, east of the stream, will have retail. This will be an IPUD zoning that will limit where the retail is permitted. We will have a secondary review for the retail uses. This area will have a hybrid of processes in this area. Where the LGE uses can be developed like other areas but the retail uses will have a development plan reviewed by the Planning Commission. The areas near Beech Road and Smith's Mill Road have the retail uses permitted. We are taking away the retail rights on the parcel near AEP and would like to move the rights to the parcel on the east side of Beech Road. We feel like the number of employees in this area warrant the retail uses including gas stations and drive thru restaurants.

Mr. Rubey stated that we will have an aerial photo that shows the features for open space and the riparian corridor.

Mr. Kirby stated that topography of residential neighbors might be helpful when looking at headlight screening and drainage. Are their lessons from Beech Road that we should apply to Mink Road?

Mr. Underhill stated that we have learned some things such as landscaping.

Mr. Rubey stated that our expectation that the retail at Beech Road will be much different than the retail at Mink Road. The Beech Road will be geared toward employees in the area and the Mink Road will be geared towards the truck traffic. Our recommendation is to require secondary review.

Mr. Shockey asked what he means by retail geared towards the truck traffic.

Mr. Rubey stated that at Beech Road will have gas stations, sit down and fast food restaurants. The Mink Road will have restaurants that can be geared for truck traffic. It will not be a place for showers or lodging.

Mr. Shockey asked about overnight parking or repair facility.

Mr. Rubey stated potentially repair facility but not overnight parking. It hard to look at this without knowing the circulation.

Ms. Joly stated that Mink Road interchange is to serve the truck traffic so we would want services for the truck traffic.

Mr. Wallace asked how you transfer that knowledge to the trucks.

Ms. Joly stated that originally the loop road was supposed to be for cars and Innovation Campus was for truck traffic. We will need to work with businesses to make sure they know how they should direct their deliveries.

Mr. Rubey stated that we have had complaints from Beech Road due to the truck traffic. We have a more comprehensive plan. How that is communicated is a good question but we are trying to minimize the truck traffic.

Mr. Wallace stated that the vision is good we just need to make sure we communicate it.

Ms. Joly stated that there is a site design piece, business communication and a signage piece.

Mr. Underhill stated that when the PUD zoning is new for many businesses and they see it as a risk. So one thing we are trying to accomplish is to allow the LGE uses to proceed without a development plan.

Mr. Shockey asked how much does the zoning text requires roadway size. Is this a zoning text made with people in mind or just an idea?

Mr. Rubey stated that it is a well thought out plan for the type of uses that we expect. It is speculative. As we understand and react we may be back to this board.

Mr. Shockey asked if the text includes information about the setbacks, parking, and screening.

Ms. Joly stated that this piece is unique because of the Mink Road interchange. We will make sure that it is included on the next presentation. The right of way for Innovation Campus has already been dedicated. The plat came to this board a few months ago.

Mr. Kirby asked about the right of way on Mink Road.

Mr. Rubey stated that road widening for Mink Road and Innovation Campus interfaces with the Mink Road interchange.

Mr. Kirby stated that we only have one side of Mink so we need to make sure that we have all of the right of way that we may need to widen the road in the future.

Ms. Joly stated that we will have the plans from ODOT for the interchange at the next meeting.

Mr. Shockey stated that anything you can tell me about the Mink Road corner.

Mr. Steele asked how much percentage will be truck going to business park and how much will be from traffic 161.

Mr. Underhill that I think that to the extent that you have traffic coming westward your likely to pick up some traffic the traffic going the other way will have other places to stop.

Mr. Shockey asked about motels.

Mr. Rubey stated that we don't have that at Mink Road but it is at Beech Road for business travelers.

Mr. Shockey stated that conceptually I would love to see ideas of how this will look. I don't know how much the public will enjoy this but depends on setbacks.

Mr. Rubey stated that I think it is the responsible thing to do with the uses that are being development in the business park. I expect this board to tell me a lot about expectations about signage, overhangs for truck and architecture.

Mr. Shockey asked if we have a consultant to review the model for the zoning text related to truck stops. It seems like a specialty.

Mr. Kirby stated like when we did the first roundabout.

Mr. Rubey stated that it needs to go through our typical process. We need to put the framework in place that gives the board the tools to review. Staff may need to get outside consultation for this process.

Mr. Underhill stated that I have done this in other communities. Aesthetics are hard to regulate when you don't know the uses.

Mr. Steele asked if there are working examples that have everything you suggested but don't have overnight parking. That information would be helpful to have.

Mr. Wallace asked if the sign code regulates the signage on the highway. We will need signage going east on SR. 161 because the trucks will pass Beech Road first.

Ms. Joly stated that Mink Road will become a more north /south truck route. The township is working on some road improvements.

Mr. Kirby asked if roads are still good for traffic if we develop north on Mink.

Ms. Joly stated that the information that we will bring to the next meeting will include the assumptions that were made while developing the model.

Mr. Underhill stated that we have been careful in the text. We have general agreement on the need for a future road south of Dublin Granville Road that would require a platting process.

Mr. Kirby asked if the zoning is the place to get the commitment for a road when we don't know where the wishbone road will be located.

Ms. Joly stated that in Winding Hollow we specified a road width based on the strategic plan.

Mr. Kirby stated that I wanted to make sure that we have the commitment for the road in the zoning text. He continued by asking if the other side of the road has a planned development that would hinder the road.

Mr. Rubey stated that we don't have anything pending on either side of the road.

Mr. Underhill stated that NACO is great at the broader plan.

Ms. Joly stated that the City works with NACO for RFI's for properties and we work jointly with NACO and anytime we have marketed a property over there we have included road connections.

Mr. Kirby asked if we are already planning for the properties that are not owned by NACO to fill in some of the gaps. If you were to get this piece can they use Innovation Campus Way?

Mr. Rubey stated that is the objective but difficult to answer because we don't own them. It will be user driven.

Mr. Shockey asked how the neighbors on Beech near Cobb will access Mink Road.

Ms. Joly stated that they will need to go north on Beech because Cobb will be a dead end. ODOT has done a series of meetings with those neighbors.

Mr. Shockey stated that getting the information early would be a good idea. What else is on the agenda?

Mr. Mayer explained the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Underhill stated that if the board has additional questions please forward them to staff ahead of time so we can be efficient.

Mr. Wallace asked if the data center will be near residential.

Mr. Mayer stated that the overall development boundary is adjacent to residential but the first phase is not adjacent to residential.

With no further business, Mr. Kirby polled members for comment and hearing none, adjourned the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

Submitted by Pam Hickok