



Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 5, 2017

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 7:03 p.m.

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Neil Kirby | Present |
| Brad Shockey | Present |
| David Wallace | Present |
| Kasey Kist | Present |
| Hans Schell | Absent |
| Sloan Spalding (council liaison) | Absent (Matt Shull present) |

Staff members present: Stephen Mayer, Planner; Jackie Russell, Clerk; Mitch Banchefsky, City Attorney and Pam Hickok, Clerk.

Moved by Mr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Kist to approve May 15th minutes, as corrected. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Kist, yea; Mr. Schell, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 4-0

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

Mr. Mayer stated that we will present an update to the pool variances after the landscape and sign standards plan.

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.

Moved by Mr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Kirby to accept into the record the Beech Road South Landscape standards. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Kist, yea; Mr. Schell, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

Beech Road South Landscape & Sign Standards Plan

Mr. Mayer stated that over five years ago, the area in Licking County has various subareas south of SR 161 on both sides of Beech Road. The Beech Road South zoning text was approved and it requires a master landscape and signage plan come to the Planning Commission prior to any development occurring in this subarea. This is the only subarea with this requirement, however, with the goal of looking at things comprehensively, in partnership with MKSK, we have a

landscape plan and master sign plan for the area that includes multiple subareas in the Beech Road South area. The texts have the minimum requirements and this plan builds on the minimum standards.

Mr. Jeff Pongonis, MKSK, presented a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Kirby asked if the photos were indicative.

Mr. Pongonis stated that was the existing condition.

Mr. Kirby stated that understory is one of the concerns I will raise later.

Mr. Pongonis continued with the presentation.

Mr. Shockey asked if this is a goal or is this going to happen.

Mr. Mayer stated that this will be the guidelines for the landscaping and signage in this area. When we receive development plans or landscape plans from the developers we will review against this plan. This builds upon the requirements in the zoning text. The text is more quantity things and this is more qualitative things such as designs.

Mr. Shockey asked if we will need to vote on this tonight.

Mr. Mayer stated yes this board should vote on this tonight to let us know that we have your backing for these standards.

Mr. Shockey asked about the relocated Worthington Road. Is that agreed upon internally between the land owner and the city?

Mr. Mayer stated that this road has not been decided. This location was done on purpose because we believe we want a different treatment on the areas north of the relocated Worthington Road and along Morse Road. These are guidelines and allow some flexibility, if this were to development as one large project that doesn't encompass this area, it doesn't mean that we couldn't enforce these standards. We are doing additional planning studies for this area south of Beech Road & SR 161 that we come back to this board.

Mr. Shockey stated that because of the nature and proximity to the expressway, we may want a different treatment once we know what to expect.

Mr. Mayer stated that we don't know what will occur there. There is a lot of land out here and lots of opportunities for different size users.

Mr. Shockey stated that when we see internal roads come in, this Beech Road expand, this Worthington Road relocation these are likely to happen.

Mr. Kirby stated that they committed to the first half at a public meeting.

Mr. Mayer stated that the alignment is possible, but if we get a mega user it could require the redesign and relocation of the road.

Mr. Shockey stated that if this document is adopted. We won't see a development plan because the zoning is already there.

Mr. Mayer stated that a new road will come to Planning Commission but the development plans will be reviewed by staff.

Mr. Shockey stated that this is a document that would apply to all cases. If they wanted to do a different road design than what is shown here... This is a real thing.

Mr. Mayer stated that it has some teeth but not a variance because these are guidelines. It provides some flexibility of design to accommodate a small or large user. Some of the qualitative design features such as mounding continuously or sections of mounds. Variances would only be city code or text requirements.

Mr. Pongonis stated that these lay on top of the code requirements as a set of guidelines that you prefer are followed. As they negotiate through a site plan review this is what you grade it against.

Mr. Mayer stated correct.

Mr. Kirby asked Worthington Road will be vacated and moved.

Mr. Mayer stated that is yet to be determined.

Mr. Pongonis stated that we can update the plan to call Worthington Road, proposed Worthington Road.

Mr. Wallace asked if the idea is that the guidelines will be for the area south of wherever the road is located.

Mr. Pongonis stated yes.

Mr. Kist verified that it doesn't go to Morse Road.

Mr. Pongonis stated that it's about 50' north of Morse Road.

Mr. Mayer stated that part of these guidelines include the streetscape. We purposely leave out Morse Road because we think it deserves its own look since it is along our border.

Mr. Kirby stated that it should be noted in the plan.

Mr. Pongonis continued with the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Wallace asked what lessons have been learned.

Mr. Pongonis stated that we try to have trees rows between properties. So instead of using a few big trees we used a lot of small trees. The small trees seem to become deer food. We have changed our strategy with specified sizes and plant material. We have a focus when we implement these that they are protected properly.

Mr. Kirby asked if having an understory would help.

Mr. Pongonis stated that it might help. The question is what is going to keep the deer from destroying the small trees. So we want to protect the tree rows that we have. We're working to make sure that what we build doesn't get wasted.

Mr. Shockey stated that we don't see that.

Mr. Mayer stated yes in this area. In some cases you do see the final development plan such as the Personal Care & Beauty campus.

Mr. Shockey stated that staff would not bring an application to this board for these guidelines.

Mr. Mayer stated that we have some flexibility so not ever plan will meet this exactly. Different size users, site constraints can be factors in different designs.

Mr. Kirby stated that in the center of the village they have carefully permitted deer hunting. Can this area be part of the deer hunting program? I don't need an answer but do the future land owners know this could be an option.

Mr. Mayer stated that he doesn't know much about the program but it is at the election of the property owner. Its worth

Mr. Kirby stated that letting people know that they have a choice.

Mr. Pongonis continued with the PowerPoint.

Mr. Kist asked what is defined as a meadow.

Mr. Pongonis stated that it can be just grass that is not mowed or a meadow mix that could be complicated. It generally is acceptable to mow or not mow it. The meadow grass mix doesn't look good up close.

Mr. Kist stated that around the pond is a no-mow seed mix. What is that?

Mr. Pongonis stated that they can choose a meadow mix, or use a fescue tall type. It will take on the character of a meadow and won't die back.

Mr. Kist asked if there is an alternative species that would not need mowed.

Mr. Pongonis stated that would be the tall type fescue. It doesn't need re-seeded and will cut down on watering, maintenance and easier to install.

Mr. Kirby stated that it should be a competitive advantage to have all that acreage that only needs mowed once or twice a year. If the design idea is a prairie we may want to limit how many times they can mow it.

Mr. Pongonis that the other thing that the Personal Care and Beauty plan had was were naturalized clumps of shrubs. Over time the landscape crews mowed them. It was an investment made with no return. Continued with the presentation.

Mr. Shockey asked how wide is the bike lanes.

Mr. Mayer stated that he believes they are 5' wide bike lanes, which is what best practices are. The city adopted a Bike New Albany plan. This reflects the recommendation contained in that plan.

Mr. Shockey asked if that is what we looked at. Is 5' consistent with what the plan says?

Mr. Mayer stated yes, the bike plan. The plan doesn't get into the specifics like width of the bike lanes. There is no actual requirements for bike lanes there is just best practices in manuals that contain recommendations for what bike lanes should be. We purposely left out the engineering and design of the bike lanes so we as a city can have some flexibility to design it to meet the overall design of our city.

Mr. Shockey stated that some the designs, the bike lanes were separated from the traffic.

Mr. Mayer stated that in Village Center, more urban areas, it recommends bike lanes or the divided bike lanes but even the plan doesn't specify what the barrier or widths would be. When you have a road design, many features like right of way, easement, sidewalk; the limiting factors of space and cost of design.

Mr. Shockey stated that the time to implement this is when we are building the roads and this is the planning document to build road so do you think a five foot path with white line is the right thing to do on south Beech Road or should there be some separation. We have an owner here that has. There is no right of way problem.

Mr. Kist stated that 5' is larger than most bike lanes in the city. You are lucky to get three feet. You don't find divided bike lane in the city.

Mr. Shockey stated that this is a major artery.

Mr. Kist stated that he has only seen that in urban areas / downtown.

Mr. Kirby stated that this is what you want so that you have contiguous pavement for trash doesn't get stuck in the bike lanes. The people who use the on street bike lane instead of the leisure trail want to be on the road.

Mr. Shockey stated that I usually see the bikes in packs and is five feet enough.

Mr. Pongonis explained the street typologies.

Mr. Shockey stated that he thinks we should give them as much room as possible. Where there is right of way, not built on, give them at least six feet.

Mr. Kirby stated that if you have a lane like this, the bike pack can lengthen out so cars can pass and then they group back up.

Mr. Mayer stated that it is a range and it's difficult to find the right balance. This area is as large as half of our current business park. We need to look at the cost of adding the additional pavement and maintenance. The underground utilities also would need to be shifted because they can't be under the road. We always want to accommodate the bikes but we our overall goal is to keep the roads as narrow as possible.

Mr. Shockey stated not a major thoroughfare. That's not a goal to keep it narrow.

Mr. Mayer stated that we try to keep every road as narrow as possible. That's why this plan shows medians instead of turn lanes. We want to encourage the extra cost to make the road greener. We also design more roundabouts because they can handle more traffic but they also allow the roads to remain narrower. A traditional intersection you would need to add more lanes to accommodate the same amount of traffic.

Mr. Shockey stated that I would never think to keep Mink and Beech Roads narrow with the amount of traffic that is out there and how much the traffic amount will grow. I think we need to have a bigger bike lane to keep people safe.

Mr. Kist stated that bikes should never be more than two bikes abreast and five feet is adequate to do that. The flip side is the inlets for the storm sewer, they

typically protrude out about two feet, and you can't really ride over those, so you are down to a usable three feet of bike lane.

Mr. Kirby asked if the inlets can be pulled out of the bike lane.

Mr. Pongonis stated that they are changing the grates to run perpendicular to the curb line so that tires can go over those.

Mr. Kirby stated only if they are flush.

Mr. Kist stated that he agrees with that but cyclist still will avoid them.

Mr. Pongonis continued with the presentation.

Mr. Shull asked if that will go all the way to Morse.

Mr. Mayer stated yes with the Morse Road intersection to be determined. He stated that we envision this being a main road.

Mr. Shockey stated that I would propose to give great consideration to the size of the bike lanes.

Mr. Kirby asked if the storm sewers can be changed to not be in the roadway.

Mr. Mayer stated that it's a recommendation that we can put into the plan that when new roadways are designed that

Mr. Kirby stated that the maintenance crews would have an easier time laying blacktop.

Mr. Shockey stated that you can have curb inlet that doesn't have a grate in the road.

Mr. Kist stated that engineering reason or maintenance of the curb inlets which is why they are not used.

Mr. Mayer stated that he is not sure why they are not used. I was part of a staff bike ride to experience riding bikes along the street. We rode Central College Road, Johnstown Road, Dublin Granville and we talked about the grates. One thing she appreciates is when the grates are painted.

Mr. Kirby stated that in Upper Arlington they have large painted stripe to warn of the grates.

Mr. Kist stated that those are the older grates that a bike tire can fall into. I think the ones that we have here can be ridden over.

Mr. Shockey stated don't misunderstand me that bigger roads are better than smaller roads. I think that page 7 roads are wonderful. When we talked about Mink Road I liked the median idea. I love this and think that it is a great standard. Will we get it north on Beech Road or on Mink Road. Is this because we are considering Morse Road a major corridor and not north on Beech to Johnstown Road.

Mr. Mayer stated that we have a mixed history. The Personal Care and Beauty campus we did the strategic plan update in 2012 and completed it in 2014. What we heard was that we need more bike amenities so we did a separate bike plan in 2014-2015. It calls for bikes plans along Beech Road to connect to Morse Road towards Pataskala. This is one of the first major roadways since the adoption of bike plan.

Mr. Shockey asked if this is to accommodate the traffic to the south and the right of way is not difficult to obtain.

Mr. Mayer stated that Dublin Granville Road is one of the favorite bike routes and how do we keep them moving.

Mr. Kirby stated that we don't have this kind of right of way on Mink Road because we only have to the center line.

Mr. Mayer stated that most of the Mink Road improvements are an ODOT project. The design of that project is out of control.

Mr. Shockey stated it could be a great bike loop up to Jug Street and Mink Street.

Mr. Mayer stated that there is always a certain amount of money for capital projects each year.

Mr. Kirby long term planning this should grow north.

Mr. Shockey stated that we all believe that New Albany is a special place. We have seen it grow. Planning has been a big part of that from the beginning. The roads should be just as special and these documents is what does that. We starting talking about this a couple years ago. Beech Road North was compared to Smith's Mill and Walton Parkway. All of the major roads should be that way. The roads mandates should be just as important as the architectural mandates.

Mr. Shull stated that we have much more to develop south and I think that's where a lot of this input will occur.

Mr. Kirby stated that he likes the top lit signs and should be done everywhere. We get a lot of concerns about headlight screening when the trees are not in leaf and they are all trimmed up five feet. Don't trim the trees up.

Mr. Pongonis stated that we don't encourage limbing up in this condition.

Mr. Kirby stated that they should add American Beech and Burr Oak to the tree list. The American Beech will screen well and the Burr Oak gets huge. In the back it calls for herbicides and fertilizer to be regularly applied. No, it should be noted that they can treat only the problem areas.

Mr. Pongonis stated that this was being sensitive to the meadow mix, I think we can consider that.

Mr. Kirby stated that if they are only mowing it once or twice a year then a couple of weeds should not be a problem. A lot of understory things that could be planted to assist with headlight screening such as native black raspberry.

Mr. Pongonis stated that I'm hearing understory trees in the berms specifically and the hedgerows. I think this is a fine idea.

Mr. Kirby stated that the spacing is correct and it would have the perfect location for understory. That means that people will need to understand that this is the rural part of town. This would not be allowed in village center. This is a good way to add an opacity to a hedgerow. Bill Resch may be a good contact to determine the native understory that aren't invasive.

Mr. Pongonis stated that they could use beech, service berry, and red bud

Mr. Kirby stated that the understory should be active decision, should be the default unless you know why you don't want it. Asked for any other comments and asked if they will see the revisions to this come back.

Mr. Mayer stated that he would request for a motion tonight. We can bring back the final copy in the future.

Mr. Kirby stated that there are numerous suggestions that we would like incorporated. If there is not a hurry I would like wait.

Mr. Shockey verified that staff would like a motion tonight.

Mr. Mayer stated that we would like to have a motion with the conditions or as amended.

Mr. Kirby asked what notes Mr. Mayer had.

Mr. Mayer stated that he had modified plant list to add American Beech and Burr Oak, change fertilizer application rate,

Mr. Kirby stated that fertilizer and herbicide should be banned except for spot use.

Mr. Mayer stated that encourage native understory to divide users.

Mr. Pongonis stated that he believes the best way to use the understory trees is to use along the hedgerows and retain the simple quality of the native shade trees along the berm.

Mr. Kirby stated that he had a more general guidance. Not having an understory should be a considered decision anywhere we have trees. What are the reasons why you don't have the understory grow? A variety of native bushes that will fill in. Not too picky about what the understory is.

Mr. Pongonis stated that give the ability to the landowner to maintain the berm at least once a year. Maybe on a big user we can have a formal no mow zone.

Mr. Kirby stated get the bike lanes right.

Mr. Pongonis stated larger bike lane, six foot, or make it clear that the structure for the storm sewer.

Mr. Kist asked if this plan is for the developer.

Mr. Kirby asked if the developer would be putting in the streets.

Mr. Mayer stated that we have city street standards. The Innovation Campus Way is a city project, sometimes they are city project, developer project or a mixture of both. These are guidelines so we note that they consider a larger bike lane or make sure that some kind of safety measure is there. I can't speak to the engineering constraints and can't guarantee we will get these things.

Mr. Kirby stated that I understand if they can't because of engineering issues. But not alright with just not knowing. I want it to be a considered decision.

Mr. Mayer stated that if there is a deviation to the recommendation then it would be a weighed consideration.

Mr. Wallace asked if we can state that we desire state of the art bike lanes

Mr. Mayer stated best practice.

Mr. Kirby stated it should also specify that doesn't include Morse Road.

Mr. Kist stated that notation of grasses - use of low maintenance grasses, mow once a year, in lieu of lawns.

Mr. Kirby stated strongly preferred.

Mr. Kirby moved to approve the Beech Road South landscape plan, as amended, seconded by Mr. Kist. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Kist, yea; Mr. Schell, yea. Yea, 4q; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

Ms. Hickok presented an update to the four pool variances that came to this board. The first was 6958 Lambton Park which had a variance was approved April 19, 2016, after several revision the fence permit was approved on December 8, 2016 and inspection was completed on May 11, 2017 and complies with all PC conditions and the violation is closed.

Mr. Shockey confirmed that was the new built house.

Ms. Hickok stated correct.

Mr. Wallace asked about the mounding issue facing the golf course.

Ms. Hickok stated that they put the fence that was approved. There is not complete mounding in the rear because it was not specifically noted as a condition.

Mr. Wallace asked if the applicant did anything to meet us halfway.

Ms. Hickok stated that they added a few trees in the rear. The second is 7010 Lambton Park which had a variance denied on November 21, 2016 and the contractor had submitted an option of a removable fence that staff determined did not meet the intent of the code. We notified the contractor of that on June 2, 2017 and we have not heard back from them yet but are working with them.

Mr. Shockey asked what a removable fence is.

Ms. Hickok stated that it is just like it sounds. It has holes in the concrete that the post insert into and the fence connects all the way around with clasps that locks and has a lockable gate but you are able to remove it for parties etc.

Mr. Mayer stated that we had our city law director review the options provided. It essentially acts like a pool cover which doesn't meet the code because it is temporary in nature. We determined that it doesn't meet the intent of the code and to use the fence they would need to do a variance to this board.

Mr. Wallace stated that they are not allowed to use the pool.

Ms. Hickok stated that they are still in violation. 10 Highgrove variance was

approved on October 17, 2016, inspection was complete on June 5, 2017 and the pool fencing and landscaping was in compliance. The violation is still open because we are waiting on the PC condition regarding the easement for the fence maintenance.

Mr. Mayer stated that we have received a draft copy of the easement to ensure that it meets the intent of what this board wanted. City legal is reviewing the easement. They have done the important things for the landscaping and fencing.

Mr. Wallace confirmed that the important part of that was the foliage was sufficient to constitute the fencing that prevented access by children.

Ms. Hickok stated that they have shrubs around the entire pool with three opening which the board required gates that have been installed. Last is 11 Highgrove variance was approved on October 17, 2016, inspection was complete on May 30, 2017 and the pool fencing and landscaping was in compliance. The violation is still open because we are waiting on the PC condition regarding the same easement for the fence maintenance.

Mr. Mayer stated that it has quieted down. Word gets around and we had a few people asking. Since we have told people what the outcomes were they have decided not to pursue the variances.

Mr. Wallace asked if there are any other building permits for pools.

Mr. Mayer stated that one that you would be familiar with is along Ogden Woods Blvd, think it was a setback variance. A neighbor from Richmond Square came and said they didn't want to see it. They submitted a pool that meets all of the setback requirements with a brick wall for screening.

Mr. Kirby asked for any other comments.

Mr. Shockey asked how the BZA has been.

Mr. Kist explained the most recent meeting was a Bocchi Labs reconsideration for a setback with a fire lane. Then we had a reconsideration request for a denied variance for a pergola.

Mr. Mayer explained that a board can reconsider within two months. Bocchi Labs came to talk informally to the board to see if the changes they made would be enough to have a reconsideration and the board granted the request and it will be heard this month. The second person has been past two months and based on the testimony we heard it didn't sound like anything changed, sounded more like an appeal matter than a reconsideration matter. That reconsideration was not granted by the board.

With no further business, Mr. Kirby polled members for comment and hearing none, adjourned the meeting at 8:32 p.m.

Submitted by Pam Hickok