



Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 19, 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 7:02 p.m.

Neil Kirby	Present
Brad Shockey	Absent
David Wallace	Present
Kasey Kist	Present
Hans Schell	Present
Sloan Spalding (council liaison)	Present

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

Moved by Mr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Kist to approve May 24th 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 stated that he has an example of the no grate storm inlet that was discussed in the June 5th meeting on page. There is one on the west side of Reynoldsburg New Albany Road in front of 4653 Reynoldsburg New Albany Road. It provides an example of something we already do that is bicycle safe and is easy for them to re-pave.

Moved by Mr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Schell to approve June 5th 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 none.

Mr. Kirby's invited the public to speak on non-agenda related items.

Mr. Craig Srba, 6837 E. Walnut Street, stated that he believes that the ordinance concerning the property owner development notifications should be amended to say that all property owners that were notified of the initial zoning change in an area will subsequently be notified on any development meetings in the original area until complete build out of the area has occurred. The meeting tonight on Canine Companions is a perfect example for the ordinance change request. At the May 18, 2015 Planning Commission meeting; we were notified of the meeting because it was in

subarea 4 which was adjacent to our property. But now that it was rezoned, even though 11 acres has been extracted from subarea 4 for development. The rezoned property is now more than 200 feet from our property so we were not notified per the requirements, even though it concerns the same development. We just found out about it. Through discussion with Mr. Underhill at the first meeting we were informed that we would be notified of any subsequent meetings on this application. We were not notified. Under the proposed amended ordinance all property owners that were notified in the Souder East rezoning of 127 acres would be notified of all new and continuing development until all of the area is developed. Is Canine Companions in Souder East subarea 4?

Mr. Mayer stated that it is in a piece of subarea 4. So the areas that are rezoned and the areas for final development plans are not always the same geographic area. You can split the rezoned area into multiple development plans and that is what has occurred with this site.

Mr. Srba asked why they were not notified.

Mr. Mayer stated that the property must be within 200 feet away.

Mr. Kirby stated that if it is an ordinance change it needs to go to Council.

Mr. Aaron Underhill stated that he was not hired to do the Final Development Plan for Canine Companions and is not involved with tonight's application.

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

Moved by Mr. Kist, seconded by Mr. Kirby to accept into the record the staff reports and related documents. 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.

FDM-28-2017 Final Development Plan Modification
Final Development Plan modification to the Dairy Queen drive-thru at 9940
Johnstown Road within the Canini Trust Corp subarea 8a (PID: 222-000347)
Applicant: Ice Queens of Smiths Mill LLC

Ms. Jackie Russell presented the staff report.

Mr. Ed Ferris presented the engineering comments.

Mr. Todd Parker, F5 Design, stated that the we have traffic issues in the drive thru at peak times. Studies that have been completed say that Dairy Queen is losing money because of this. The goal here is to obtain an easement from the adjacent parcel which we have received from the developer/property owner to allow for a second exit from the drive thru. We would agree to the staff conditions. It doesn't increase our site development area because it is mostly on

the other lot. We would modify the landscaping accordingly. We want to keep the original exit is for cost and preserving the ability to exit the other way.

Mr. Kirby stated that we asked about the traffic pattern the first time it came to this board.

Mr. Parker stated that we had several options that were presented to staff before we came to the commission two years ago.

Mr. Kirby asked if we have lessons learned.

Mr. Mayer stated that Dairy Queen has very high peak hours. For an overall site design perspective to ensure we can handle the peak hours for drive thru is a lesson learned.

Mr. Kist stated that he has never seen a drive thru exit as convoluted as the existing, so I'm glad your back. Most drive thru have an escape lane and this won't relieve that issue. Operationally do they pull cars thru?

Mr. Parker stated that they don't do that currently but they do have a large order parking space.

Mr. Kist stated that this is necessary but will this eliminate the problem of stacking. Have you explored the easement starting further back?

Mr. Parker stated no. We provided multiple options to staff and MKSK liked this option. The property to the north is still vacant and we don't know what it will be. In the future, if we have an agreeable neighbor maybe we can add a bypass lane. We are land locked.

Mr. Kist stated he likes the option to make the right turn but I don't think it will eliminate the hardship on the restaurant. Can we get a dimension between the two options of proposed and staff proposed.

Mr. Parker stated that our proposal width was at 35 feet and I think our civil engineer recommended that for large pickups.

Mr. Kist stated that is his concern is the large vehicles may not be able to make the turn. I don't want to create a problem with people running over curbs.

Mr. Mayer stated that I don't know the exact dimension. The landscape architect recommended for additional green space and so we presented this to the city engineer and they responded with what is in the staff report. We can work with the applicant to make sure we get the correct turn radius to accommodate all vehicles.

Mr. Schell asked if there is a plan B if this doesn't work.

Mr. Parker stated no. We studied this site and this is where we landed after working with staff and Dairy Queen during the original submittals. But being opened for a year it has come to a head.

Mr. Wallace asked if Mr. Parker agrees with the staff change.

Mr. Parker stated yes we will work with staff on the revised radius per Mr. Kist recommendation.

Mr. Kist moved to approve FDP-28-2017, based on staff report, subject to the following conditions:

1. A copy of the recorded easement is submitted between the property owner and the applicant.
2. The final exit design can be worked with staff to make sure it accommodates the intended use, seconded by Mr. Schell. 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.

Mr. Spalding thanked Dairy Queen for being strong supporters of the city and our police department. As we are trying to educate our young people about wearing bike helmets. It is always good to have partners like that for some positive reinforcement.

V-29-2017 Variance

Variance to Ealy Crossing Subarea A section VI(c)(1) zoning text to allow a garage door to project beyond the front face of the primary dwelling at 17 Ealy Crossing within the Ealy Crossing subdivision (PID: 220-004144).

Applicant: Brian Kent Jones Architects

Mr. Stephen Mayer presented the staff report.

Mr. Kirby asked if the zoning text requires asphalt driveway.

Mr. Mayer stated that it allows for a wide array including pavers.

Mr. Marc Tornichio, Brian Jones Architects, stated that he is available for questions.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that these are single bay garages.

Mr. Tornichio stated that to keep the scale down we decided to do two single garages.

Mr. Kirby verified that they will only have two garages.

Mr. Tornichio states yes, only two cars total.

Mr. Schell asked if any other homes have a similar doors or setup.

Mr. Mayer stated that they have similar doors but they are not functional doors (showed the house on the map). This neighborhood has a wide array of garages doors. Code requires that the garage is setback 10 feet but has been mitigated in this neighborhood by adding an accessory structure. This subdivision allows for accessory structures in front of the main house. This is the first variance for a garage to project like this.

Mr. Kirby asked how many lots left to be built in Ealy.

Mr. Mayer stated that not very many, maybe six.

Mr. Spalding stated that appreciating the lessened architectural requirements to allow for greater creativity. Part of the reason we don't like front loaded garages is because they are hard to screen. The person right across the street will have headlights shining on their home every time someone enters or leaves the drive. How will you mitigate that?

Mr. Mayer stated that I don't think you can mitigate that based on the layout.

Mr. Kirby stated that the alternative is to have 2 two-car side loaded garages that would be easily seen.

Mr. Tornichio stated yes.

Mr. Wallace stated that it is not any more than other garages in that neighborhood.

Mr. Tornichio stated that we would just have a two garage to the right.

Mr. Spalding stated that what we don't see is where the driveway is located. It doesn't matter which way the garages faces the headlights will not be mitigated either way.

Mr. Kirby stated that he is torn, good idea but not a good variance. The variance doesn't meet the Duncan Standards. Completely self-inflicted. I'm amazed that a new house will only have two garage spaces.

Mr. Wallace asked if alternates have been discussed with the client.

Mr. Torichio stated that he thinks so but not sure how detailed.

Mr. Jeffrey Angart, 12 Ealy Crossing, stated that I'm the homeowner across from this house. I do appreciate the description provided during discussion. He

is concerned about the headlights. My bedroom is in line with the garage on the right. The homes in Ealy typically have the homes towards the street and moved the garages to the rear to have a more urban feel. My concern is that this homeowner may enjoy this but I plan on living here for a while and I don't know who will be living there. Whether they will be noisy, have motorcycles. Having it so close to the street is a concern to both my wife and I.

Mr. Schell asked if he would have the same concern with the side loaded two-car garage.

Mr. Angart stated that I think it would impact my next door neighbor more and he is not here tonight. These lots are hard to figure out how to build everything on.

Mr. Kist stated that he is torn, it's a good design but concerned about the precedent it would set; not a fan of the proximity to the road (10' garage setback). The carriage doors would add to the neighborhood.

Mr. Kirby stated that he is reading the Duncan Factors, we have about a dozen things that we need to evaluate for a variance. He asked how many built lots exist.

Mr. Mayer responded.

Mr. Wallace moved to approve V-29-2017 based on the findings in the staff report subject to the following conditions:

1. The garden wall, pavilion and landscape architectural features are required to be constructed, subject to staff approval.
2. The custom carriage door design, as submitted with this application, is required to be installed, subject to staff approval, seconded by Mr. Kist. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Kirby, no; Mr. Wallace, no; Mr. Kist, no; Mr. Schell, no. Yea, 0; Nay, 4; Abstain, 0. Motion failed by a 0-4 vote.

Mr. Wallace explained that the standard for approving variances as set forth by Ohio law. One standard is whether the property will yield a reasonable return or beneficial use without variance, which I think it is the case here. Also, if the problem can be solved by same manner, I don't think there is a problem; the lot is buildable as is and the lot was this way when purchased. Any issues are self-inflicted. I don't think it meets the standards for a variance under Ohio law which is why I voted no.

Mr. Spalding stated that as usual Mr. Jones did a great job with the architectural renderings and I have great confidence that he will find a very nicely designed work around for this problem.

Mr. Kist stated same reasons as discussed.

Mr. Schell stated that he is worried about the precedent.

Mr. Kirby stated that it doesn't meet the twelve criteria.

FDP-30-2017 Final Development Plan

Final Development Plan for a 240 lot age-restricted residential housing development on 89.6 +/- acres for the subdivision known as Nottingham Trace located west of State Route 605, south of Walnut Street, and east of the Upper Albany subdivision (PID: 220-004443, 222-004445, 222-004444 and 220-004445).

Applicant: Pulte Homes c/o Aaron L Underhill, Esq.

Mr. Mayer presented the staff report.

Mr. Kirby asked if the PowerPoint is part of the record.

Mr. Mayer responded yes.

Mr. Ferris presented the engineering report.

Mr. Aaron Underhill, representing Pulte Homes, introduced all present for Pulte Homes. He stated that the applicant agrees with all conditions as amended. One clarification on condition 12, we will probably have multiple plats as part of this project. So when measuring the time, 20 years from recording of the plat, it should be tied to the plat that creates the parkland. What you see here tonight is the result of a lot of upfront work during the zoning stage. We have the architecture to a place where we are showing you what you will get, with different elevations. The City Architect has reviewed the plan and made recommendations. In regards to the parkland maintenance, we consider this a regional park, we think the master association and neighborhood HOA can share the maintenance responsibilities and cost. No garage projections are proposed but I would like to reserve the opportunity to come back for garage projections, if needed. The only other item was mentioned in the engineering report with Canine Companions also having road improvement obligations as well as us. We work like to work with Canine Companion on the State Route 605 improvements to ensure that they are cost and construction efficient manor. We would like to work with Canine Companions and are willing to put up a bond to get the timing correct with them.

Mr. Schell asked if they are alright with the 20 year maintenance plan.

Mr. Underhill stated yes.

Mr. Kirby asked if they are alright with landscape architect comments.

Mr. Underhill stated that we agree with Steve's assessment. We are concerned with leisure trail (10) in front of the homes along the east/west road.

Mr. Kist asked if all of the landscape conditions listed in the staff report.

Mr. Mayer stated that condition 15 is the catch all. They don't comment on the parking lot. We are asking Planning Commission to let staff decide the final design of the leisure trail / road near the cell tower. Final design just needs clarified.

Mr. Wallace asked when they will be finalized.

Mr. Mayer stated that if it's subject to staffs' approval, it will be determined during engineering phase of the site plan improvements.

Mr. Kirby stated that this involves a second curb cut along SR 605. Asked what the spacing is between the curb cuts.

Mr. Underhill stated that the access point to the cell tower exists currently. We don't know if a third curb cut will be requested or if we will try to modify the cell tower access drive to connect to the parking lot.

Mr. Wallace asked if they are required to use the one on the south, how that affects this.

Mr. Underhill stated that we may integrate this into a larger solution when we come back with the commercial section.

Mr. Kirby stated that it is 50 mph.

Mr. Tom Rubey, NACO, stated that we will come back to this commission when the development plan is ready for the commercial section including access, driveway and parking. We need to look at this holistically, I think, will be the key.

Mr. Kirby stated that we are still a while away from a traffic light at SR 605 & New Albany Road East. So people are doing a minimum of 50 mph.

Mr. Rubey stated that it is clear by the traffic analysis if we can reduce the speed limit but a lot of layers for that approval.

Mr. Kirby stated that we need to look at it early. Why the double row of trees.

Mr. Rubey stated that when we starting the process for this project, lots of discussion about the architecture, the front elevations and the layering. What can we do to strengthen the certain areas? There are several areas in New Albany that we have used the double row of trees, some staggered some not. It started with a recommendation from staff but now we need to figure out the details with sidewalk, leisure trail, mailboxes, etc.

Mr. Kirby asked if they were seeding or sod on the SR 605 park.

Mr. Matt Callahan, Pulte Homes, stated that they would sod around entry points and features and seed the other areas.

Mr. Kirby asked if it will be mowed.

Mr. Callahan stated that it will be a maintained regularly like a lawn area.

Mr. Kirby stated that it will look like a lawn area with trees. Is that what we want? We have a lovely park down the road. Are we making an enticing park along a state highway?

Mr. Rubey stated that it is important that it has a manicured finish appearance. What happens in the regional park? I think there will be sections that are manicured and sections that are not.

Mr. Kist asked about the orientation between the leisure trail and fence.

Mr. Rubey stated that the order will be road, landscape, leisure trail, and fence.

Mr. Kirby verified that that fence is between the manicured grass and SR 605.

Mr. Wallace stated that we had two conditions from the zoning change that we are now trying to amend through the final development plan. Is that procedural correct?

Mr. Kirby verified that they are conditions of the development plan.

Mr. Mayer stated correct

Mr. Banchefsky stated no problem.

Mr. Kirby stated that the massing of the side elevations are big. A lot of mass and not much detail compared to the front or rear elevations. It appears we will have a handful of exposed side elevations.

Mr. Pete Marino, Pulte Homes, stated that we would add architectural features to the some of the side elevations where they would be seen. Most elements would be windows, some louvers or other features.

Mr. Spalding asked if the packet has an enhanced side elevation.

Mr. Marino stated architectural conditions. Would require two elements on the non-high impact lots and three elements on the high impact lots.

Mr. Mayer stated that the zoning text also requires additional architectural treatments on the side. It states that elevations that face a public street on a corner or side elevation adjacent to open space or parkland shall include two or more window and has menu of items, where at least one feature must be included, in addition to the windows.

Mr. Underhill stated that we will adhere to the text where those conditions exist.

Mr. Kirby stated that I have a potential condition that side elevations will have more detail, in particular visible side elevation, to break up the massing. See sheet 19 for typical candidates.

Mr. Mayer stated that it will probably be all of those and more.

Mr. Kist stated that a lot of these plans have optional second story windows are optional and not required. So for those homes with visible side elevations those windows will be required.

Mr. Mayer stated yes.

Mr. Kirby asked about the garage doors.

Mr. Mayer stated that three different garage door options are in your packet. Staff believes that they meet the intent of the zoning text.

Mr. Kirby asked if the page 3 was a double door overhead door.

Mr. Mayer stated that it is used in other subdivisions. It is a double overhead garage door.

Mr. Kirby asked for opinions on the garage doors. He stated that the other two need a post or something down the middle.

Mr. Kist stated that a little underwhelming.

Mr. Kirby asked if they were able to contact whoever came up with the garage door from last meeting. I'm guessing they would be interested in the price point of that door.

Mr. Mayer stated that it was a custom design.

Mr. Wallace stated that he is not a fan of any of the garage doors.

Mr. Kirby stated that he would like staff to work with the applicant on finding a less double looking garage door design that still meets the economic need.

Mr. Mayer stated yes and any direction from the commission would be helpful.

Mr. Wallace stated that on the page 3, if you put the handles on each side instead of the center, to make it look like two doors it would be a step in the right direction and some architectural design in the center would also be helpful.

Mr. Kirby stated that it's headed in the right direction but not quite there.

Mr. Marino agreed to work with staff on the garage doors.

Mr. Dave Roudebush, 7564 New Albany Condit Road, stated that Aaron and the Pulte team did a good job. He appreciates bringing up the traffic concerns, no one has gone 50 mph there in decades. My other concerns include drainage, with any new zoning, our neighborhood is potentially impacted by this.

Mr. Kirby stated document your current conditions so you can reliably say what your conditions were including well conditions. The rule is that you can't change the neighbor's drainage when you develop. If it changes after construction talk to the developer and then the city if it is not fixed. If you have a current drainage problem, be proactive with the developer.

Mr. Roudebush stated that he wanted to restate it. We don't want our well or drainage to be negatively impacted. If it is, we don't have the funds to make it right.

Mr. Joe Butsko, 7534 New Albany Condit Road, stated that he wanted to make sure there is no misunderstanding. We did meet at the library about 3 weeks ago. I turned in the pictures of the water problems I had in the back yard, I showed the 10 acres behind me with arrows of the water flow. They received the information. You mentioned storm drains. I'm a little confused. We have always been told ODOT and now we are being told to work with the developer.

Mr. Kirby stated that if you have direct border with this development then it may be easy to talk to the developer.

Mr. Butsko stated that I'm across the street. I have the ditch that is going to be erased. I wanted to hear again, the ditch will be erased There is a culvert between my property and my mother's property (using the map) to show where the culvert goes into the ditch. That was erased and filled because there will be houses there. In the last meeting here, it was discussed that the water will still go through the culvert and drain both ways on SR 605 and then down Schleppe Road. Where is the water going to go? What is the water flow when the ditch is removed?

Mr. Kirby stated that he would ask the engineer to respond and he may not have any answer right now.

Mr. Ferris stated that we will look at the drainage area map and keep the same pattern in the future. It may be enclosed through the Pulte property but will still be in the same drainage area.

Mr. Butsko asked if they will use tile under the homes or open space between the homes for drainage. I'm still confused.

Mr. Kirby stated that the water that is going under SR 605 will still go under SR 605 and have the same flow rate.

Mr. Butsko stated that he has no doubt about the water going under SR 605 but then the water will need to make a really sharp left or right turn.

Mr. Kirby stated yes.

Mr. Butsko stated then I guess there is no study needed.

Mr. Kirby suggested that he provides the flow data to the city staff.

Mr. Butsko asked when the street is widened. Currently near Discover Card the road was widened and a lot of smokers park along the side of the road. I assume that is not state highway.

Mr. Kirby stated that SR 605 is all the way to Dublin Granville Road.

Mr. Butsko stated that I assume that there are permitted to park there. I assume that the police force is following the written rules which means I assume it is legal.

Mr. Kirby stated he is not sure.

Mr. Butsko asked when we widened more of the road will we allow parking along SR 605 to go to the park.

Mr. Banchefsky stated that it sounds like they may be parking illegally and it is not being enforced. That can be changed simply.

Mr. Mayer stated that this road section will not match what is near Discover. We are working with ODOT to install bike lanes on both sides. Near Discover there is a wide 8' shoulder, which will not be the case up here. It will be two travel lanes, center turn lane, bike lanes on each side with a small shoulder.

Mr. Butsko asked if they will have curbs.

Mr. Mayer stated that he was not sure.

Ms. Darlene Toney, 7550 New Albany Condit Road, stated that we did have a meeting at the library and I thought we were going to discuss the drainage and wells. We are very concerned about the wells. We want to know when they start digging for water and sewer, if that affects the aquifer, what they are going to do about it.

Mr. Kirby stated that they have to make you whole. They either own you a new well that works or provide you with water in some way that you are agreeable to.

Mr. Mitch Banchefsky stated that documenting what you have now is important. There will be an obligation to correct that.

Ms. Toney stated that you will make it right.

Mr. Banchefsky stated that we will facilitate that it is made right.

Ms. Toney stated that the plan is lovely. I'm also concerned with the curb cuts because it will also effect what we can do on our property, if we sell.

Mr. Spalding asked if we will curb that section of SR 605.

Mr. Mayer stated probably not.

Mr. Spalding stated that he doesn't think that SR 605 has curb cuts until you reach the school. He stated that there are percentage requirements for the entire final development plan or per plat.

Mr. Mayer stated that it is for the overall development. They will phase it. They also need to give us an architectural matrix so that two homes that look alike aren't next to each other. We know that additional tracking by staff will be required.

Mr. Spalding stated that I would want to remind them of the current position and percentages at least at each phase.

Mr. Kirby stated that he is showing condition 5 and 12 have been modified to the conditions on the PowerPoint. An additional three conditions including flexibility on the SR 605 improvement timing by bond or other means for efficient construction; side elevations, more detail on particularly visible side elevations to break up massing and see sheet 19 for typical candidates, subject to staff approval; and garage doors subject to staff approval.

Mr. Mayer asked for the condition regarding flexible timeframe for road improvements be subject to staff approval.

Mr. Kirby stated yes. He verified with city attorney that bond or other means is sufficient.

Mr. Banchefsky stated yes.

Mr. Wallace stated that the MKSK submission is really easy to read because the comments were number on the back. Anytime you can simplify is appreciated.

Mr. Kirby cross checked the conditions.

Mr. Kirby moved to approve FDP-30-2017 subject to the following conditions

1. The typical street section is revised to remove gutters and have 26 feet of pavement from face of curb to face of curb so matches the requirements in the city's subdivision regulations and zoning text requirements.
2. All of the comments from the city architect are compiled with. The revisions include: correct column alignment, removing the roof railings, using pilaster at the wall, using correct cornice, eaves, rakes, and eave returns where visible from the public right-of-way (front of all houses and on the front and back of homes located on corners or parkland), correct brick turns and terminations (if used), delete modillions, and having all windows on a home follow the same grid proportional system.
3. The applicant provides open space as required by the zoning ordinance, pay a fee, or submits an updated parkland dedication chart, subject to staff approval.
4. The design of the cell tower access drive, curb cut, leisure trail, and parking lot are subject to staff approval.
5. If brick is used on the front elevation of a home, it be included throughout the entire front elevation or not used at all, provided, however, that when brick is used on the front elevation of a home a permitted material other than brick may be used on a minor architectural element if architecturally appropriate, as determined by the city's architect in his or her sole discretion.
6. Final the shutter hardware design is subject to staff approval.
7. Homes with projecting garages shall not be located on the primary east/west street through the subdivision or along the street that fronts State Route 605.
8. The amenity area is not included as part of this final development plan and the applicant must submit a separate final development plan for this area.
9. The minimum number of corridor trees along Walnut Street be installed, totaling 23, subject to staff approval.
10. The applicant randomize street tree plantings along west side of Schlepfi Road park frontage.
11. The applicant provide additional shade trees along south side of Parkside Drive park frontage since there are no street trees.
12. The HOA maintain all aspects of Reserve "C" for a period ending 20 years after the date of recordation of plat. After 20 year period a HOA will maintain the storm water ponds in perpetuity and the city shall maintain the remaining features as shown on the Planning Commission's approved final development plan approved.
13. The traffic control signs, street name signs, and traffic warning signs are subject to staff approval.
14. Address the comments of the City Engineer, subject to staff approval.
15. Address the comments of the City Landscape Architect, subject to staff approval.

16. Flexibility on the SR 605 improvement timing by bond or other means for efficient construction, subject to staff approval
17. Side elevations, more detail on particularly visible side elevations to break up massing and see sheet 19 for typical candidates
18. Garage doors subject to staff approval, seconded by Mr. Wallace. 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.

FDP-31-2017 Final Development Plan

Final Development Plan for the Canine Companions for Independence regional headquarters campus on 16.8+/- acres generally located west of Souder Road, east of State Route 605 and north of New Albany Road East (PID: 222-004861 and 222-001944).

Applicant: Moody Nolan, Inc.

Ms. Russell presented the staff report.

Mr. Ferris presented the engineering comments.

Mr. Keith DeVoe, Moody Nolan Architects, stated that Megan Koester will present first.

Ms. Megan Koester, Canine Companions, stated that with her tonight is Kobie, 2 year old in training. I spoke with many of you but wanted to share our mission so there is a good understanding of our organization. (PowerPoint presentation) We are a national organization that provides highly trained assistant dogs to people with disabilities. We have been around for 41 years and have six locations across the country. We have over 200 employees; 100,000 supporters and 18,000 dogs. In our history we have placed over 5,200 teams across the country. We have over 3,000 volunteers across the country. This north central region covers a 14 state area. Individuals from all of these 14 states will be coming to this location. At this regional center we are training four types of assistance dogs including service dogs - that provide assistance with daily tasks; skilled companion dogs - typically paired with children; facility dogs - paired with a professionals such as physical therapy, prosecutors and hospice care to help clients and finally hearing dogs - that alert people to sounds. Also in the facility is professional training in the kennel, training building, and outside. We will be able to host puppy classes for the puppy raisers, graduation ceremonies and follow up meetings or training.

Mr. DeVoe stated that they have an updated landscape plan and architectural elevations based on some of the comments.

Mr. Kirby asked if there is any conflict with conditions in the staff report.

Mr. DeVoe stated that I would like to have more discussions regarding the landscape conditions.

Mr. Tim Skinner, Landscape Architect, stated that the buffer treatment and State Route 605 treatment. We want to continue discussions with staff on the appropriate treatments is and honor the rural. There may be some overlap between the two texts that this project is located in. We want to make sure that we are clear on the requirements. We also want to understand the existing conditions so that we don't double up the landscaping.

Mr. Kirby asked if the existing trees are counted towards the requirement.

Mr. Mayer stated that was correct.

Mr. Skinner stated that all of the existing trees are not shown around the perimeter. (showed some pictures of the area, existing conditions).

Mr. DeVoe stated that we would like to propose a shared mound on the east property line.

Mr. Curtis Prill, EMH&T, stated that we would like to coordinate with staff and neighboring property to the east for mounding and additional landscaping.

Mr. Kirby asked if it will change drainage.

Mr. Prill stated that the drainage pattern will be maintained.

Mr. Mayer stated that staff supports the shared mounding. The storm water can be worked out during the engineering process. The site to the east is the Green Harbor site and is currently in the engineering process.

Mr. Wallace asked if that was two options depending on the discussions with the adjoining property owner.

Mr. Prill stated correct.

Mr. Kirby stated that we will add the same condition as previous applicant regarding roadway improvement timeframe. He continued by asking about lighting comments in staff report.

Mr. Mayer stated that we have spoken to the applicant about and spoke with the lighting engineer today and are working on reaching a solution.

Mr. DeVoe stated that we have a revised photometric plan that I will share with staff.

Mr. Kirby stated that he likes zero light pollution on neighboring properties.

Mr. Kist asked about the parking requirements noted on page 3-4 of the staff report states that Planning Commission shall determine the number of parking spaces. What direction, is 30 what is required for the main office building?

Mr. Mayer stated that our parking code has recommended parking for office uses but not for kennel or training facilities. We recommend that Planning Commission determine the required parking which is typically determined by number of employees and visitors to the site.

Mr. Kist stated that between the kennel building and guest house we have 19 parking spaces provided.

Mr. Mayer stated 49 spaces for the training facility and 4 spaces for the kennel building.

Mr. Kirby asked how many employees at the kennel.

Ms. Koester stated 2-3 employees at all times. Administration building has about 15 designated staff plus it is our entry into the campus so everyone on campus should stop at this building. Training and guest housing has 8-10 trainers on a daily basis and 16 guest rooms. We need to plan for one accessible space for each room. We should have more than adequate parking for what we need.

Mr. Wallace verified the parking numbers with Mr. DeVoe. He continued and asked if they have any thoughts about expansion.

Mr. DeVoe stated that part of the expansion of the training and graduation classes can be managed by adjusting the schedule. There is room on the site to expand the buildings but no immediate plan to realize that growth at this point.

Mr. Wallace stated that if there is building expansion you will need parking expansion as well.

Mr. DeVoe stated that we have ample room for parking if need to expand.

Ms. Koester stated that we will not have larger classes. If we expand it will be in training space so we different places and ways to train dogs in abilities or potentially kennel space. We have built this to meet our needs for the next 10-20 years.

Mr. Spalding stated that the staff report has a couple of conditions that I think we already acknowledged that extending the sidewalk is not preferred and leisure trail on State Route 605. Would we want a fee-in-lieu because who knows if that will be developed?

Mr. Mayer stated that is worth considering since they are on the east side and the lot has small frontage.

Mr. Kirby stated that we have had good luck with the patch work and filling in the holes later.

Mr. Spalding stated that we are having on the other side of State Route 605 all the way to Walnut. To extend the east side north with multiple property owners and drainage issues that would be difficult in that area.

Mr. Mayer stated that we have applied for grants along this section of State Route 605 and the studies have always pointed to the path on the west side of State Route 605. But code requires sidewalks be installed for all new development but if deemed not appropriate they can request fee-in-lieu.

Mr. Wallace stated that right now the leisure trails are to be installed.

Mr. Mayer stated that they are required but not shown. The condition requires them to revise the plan and add the leisure trail and it is constructed or applicant requests a fee-in-lieu from City Council.

Ms. Darlene Toney, 7550 New Albany Condit Road, stated that she wants to be clear about the landscaping and screening along her property line and Mr. Srba property line. Is it a singular mound or will it have breaks.

Mr. Spalding stated that mounding is only on the east side of the property.

Ms. Toney stated that she asked for the mound on the north side at the last meeting. Continued that the agreement was that the mound along Srba's property would be extended all the way to State Route 605 along the north property line.

Mr. Skinner stated that the screening guidelines along the north property line hedgerows as described by the research & information district master plan. Asked for staff assistance on mounding requirements.

Mr. Mayer stated that no mounding requirement along the north side of this property. He explained that this site is within two subareas so this is subarea 6 rezoned by Canine Companions about a year ago and the rest of the site is subarea 4 of the research and information district which was rezoned around 2010. At that time the text was written for the mounding requirements along Mr. Srba's property. The text states 75% opacity screening with landscaping anywhere there is residential adjacent to this site.

Ms. Toney stated that is not what was discussed. Mounding all the way. I want this on the record because I wanted the mounding and it doesn't seem like that's what you put in. So what are you going to do about it?

Applicant representative stated that with the water line improvements would make it problematic to add the mounding.

Mr. Wallace asked if you would not have committed to mounding because it is not feasible.

Applicant representative stated that it is no longer feasible but not aware of the prior discussions.

Mr. Wallace stated that we were not in that other meeting and we need to follow what is in the zoning text and the zoning text does not call for mounding in that area. The applicant representative is stating that they would most likely not have committed to mounding there because of these other issues.

Mr. Kirby stated that 30' water line easement is near the northern border.

Mr. Spalding asked staff if Compass Data had a mounding requirement.

Mr. Mayer stated that when Green Harbor, which used to be Compass Data, went in to the east of this site we know that mounding was already installed along Mr. Srba's property when Souder Road improvement occurred. That matches what the text requires for mounding and landscaping along that section of subarea 4. We as staff are not aware of any commitments for mounding along this section of the site.

Ms. Toney stated that Mr. Underhill agreed to it but I guess I don't get it.

Mr. Srba stated that in support of Darlene on the mounding, I was at the original Souder East rezoning meeting and the mounding was one of the last things stated in the meeting. Mayor Ferguson agreed to let anyone along that northern boundary of subarea 2 or 3 that wanted mounding to have mounding. They may not have made it all the way through the text, and may not be in the text now but it was agreed to in the meeting and will be on the recording.

Mr. Kirby asked which meeting, Planning Commission or Council.

Mr. Srba stated I believe it was City Council in 2008. The water line exists on the south side of the mound along my property. If they ran the line the same way, then they would have room to put a mound. (Provided handouts to board members). What's interesting in these meetings is that things seem to change from one meeting to the next. Specifically, speaking to staff report item 9, for the continuation of Souder Road North. In the staff report on September 19, 2016 concerning the mounding, it says in part that we contacted the New Albany Company and they want to come to an agreement to extend the road in the future. It states that whichever development starts first, they will have 120 days to start the road construction. Then I look in today's staff report, on the same subject, and it states that while the city has a memorandum of

understanding with New Albany Company requiring the future construction of Souder Road that begins 120 days after the building permit has been issued to the undeveloped site north of the Green Harbor Data center in order to allow additional time to determine the final alignment. It's morphed from the last meeting. You, Mr. Kirby, even asked if I understood and I did, but now it has changed into something else, that it will now be developed with the development north of Green Harbor.

Mr. Kirby asked Mr. Banchefsky about the Souder Road extension timetable.

Mr. Banchefsky stated that it sounds like there are conflicting statements in the staff report and we will need to look at that. I can't speak to that directly right now, I need to see in what context, type of meeting. The issue as I understand is the timing of the road.

Mr. Kirby stated that the right of way is existing.

Mr. Srba stated that it is all the way to my property.

Mr. Spalding asked why you care when the road is built.

Mr. Srba stated that this was always part of the Rocky Fork Blacklick Accord and the Strategic Plan for New Albany. I have been coming to these meetings since 2006. The whole purpose was connectivity in the community. It was a forward looking plan with connectivity so we don't have the same kind of development as Columbus, which is haphazard with no planning. Souder Road would be developed as soon as development first occurred in subarea 3 or 4 is when the it would be extended. Now it is being delayed again. The original subarea 4 was 26 acres. Of the 21 acres that are actually there, 5 acres disappeared. Canine Companions is developing 55% of that and it leaves only 9.4 acres in subarea 4. It was agreed that when any development started the road would be extended to the northern border, so now 54% of the area is being developed and the road is not being extended.

Mr. Spalding stated that most property owners don't want a road connecting to nowhere including the back of their property. So why?

Mr. Srba stated that we are interested in joining the community and adding into New Albany's growth and development. We want the growth and development but we can't do anything until the road is extended.

Mr. Mayer stated that city staff and the property owners to the north and the east of Souder Road, which is the New Albany Company, executed a memo of understanding per the condition that when development occurs for the area north of the Green Harbor Data center, because this is the area that this road will be serving not Canine Companions. The reason we put this memorandum of understanding into place and asked for additional time to give us additional

flexibility in the road because we don't know what else will be developed on either side of Souder Road. We want to finalize the road location. The 120 day timer will start when the area east of Souder Road, subarea 3 and the area next to Souder Road north of the Green Harbor Data center.

Mr. Kirby clarified that neither of those two triggers has happened yet.

Mr. Mayer stated correct.

Mr. Kirby asked if the current right of way touches Mr. Srba's property.

Mr. Mayer stated correct.

Mr. Kirby verified that the right of way could not be moved from touching their property.

Mr. Mayer stated that it could through a re-platting process.

Mr. Kirby stated that they have legal rights to the right of way because they touch it. Don't they?

Mr. Banchefsky stated that the right of way can be relocated as long as access is maintained.

Mr. Kirby verified that it can't be taken away but it can be moved.

Mr. Srba stated that the water line is already existing.

Mr. Banchefsky stated that having the water line there would make it more costly for it to be moved.

Mr. Kirby stated that I don't know that we have separable issues on the trigger language or the road based on the original zoning and the memorandum of agreement.

Mr. Srba stated that we have two memorandums of agreement.

Mr. Kirby stated that the original is in the zoning text.

Mr. Banchefsky stated that he doesn't know. He has the memorandum of understanding that is unsigned and undated but I'm told that staff has a fully executed one. I have not read this in depth and would like time to review.

Mr. Srba asked if he sees what he's saying. We had an understanding and now it has been changed and if we have another meeting it may change again. I'm all for Canine Companions, I like the development. It was the trigger for the road.

Mr. Kirby stated that you maintain that this triggers the original agreement.

Mr. Srba stated that the September 19th meeting stated that the engineering plans would trigger the road extension. Don't you think that if the original text states that when development occurs the road will be extended? 54% is developed, at what point development has occurred.

Mr. Kirby stated that Planning Commission doesn't have the tools to enforce this. City council, administrator or the city law director are who you should start with. We have an understanding of the issue but I don't think we can do anything tonight with enforcement to help you other than the Council liaison and city law director has heard. It looks like an issue and needs to be heard in the public forum.

Mr. Srba stated that everything sold and Canine blocked the east west connector road.

Mr. Kirby stated that talking to Tom Rubey or Aaron Underhill may be beneficial. Let the law director familize himself with the agreement so the village can be clear on its position.

Mr. Spalding asked when the sewer tap requirement occurs.

Mr. Kirby stated he's in the township so not until he annexed and within 200' from sewer line to foundation.

Mr. Srba stated that once the road is there we will annex into the village. We have been coming to the meetings to help develop this is a reasonable way and it seems like it keeps changing. He asked what the timeframe was for Canine Companions.

Ms. Koester responded.

Mr. Kirby stated that he didn't hear her response.

Mr. Srba repeated her comment - by the end of the year.

Mr. Kirby stated that we have a mounding issue.

Mr. Mayer stated that there is not a mounding requirement in the zoning text.

Mr. Kirby stated we have the 75% opacity.

Mr. Mayer stated that code recommends that it is within 25' of the residential property.

Mr. Schell asked what is the timeline for all buildings.

Mr. Don McCarthy stated that they will break ground in late fall with site prep and then about 14 months to start of foundations for all buildings.

Mr. Kirby stated that he has condition one amended for timing of the road improvements, condition three amended to strike item four of the landscape plan review to remove the sidewalk coming out due to security issues and clarification of condition thirteen that the screening includes noise as well as view. An issue on whether mounding was promised.

Mr. Wallace stated that the applicant stated that it wasn't promised and the neighbor states that is was. What kind of issue does it create?

Mr. Kirby stated that if it's not in the zoning then the owner can say sorry.

Mr. Wallace stated that we don't have a commitment from the owner to put it in. We have a disagreement with the neighbors. Is that enough to delay the approval. We can't resolve the issue tonight because the person that allegedly made the promise is not here to confirm.

Mr. Wallace moved to approve FDP-31-2017, based on the findings sent forth in the staff report and subject to the following conditions:

1. Canine Companion's curb-cut must align with Pulte's Schleppi road entrance. Canine Companion must coordinate State Route 605 street improvements with Pulte so efficient construction can occur. Curb-cut and street improvements are subject to staff approval.
2. Address the comments of the City Engineer to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
3. Revise the landscape plan to address the comments of the City Landscape Architect and to show the interior parking lot landscaping calculations. The final landscape plan shall be subject to staff approval.
4. Revise the landscape plan to address the comments of the City Landscape Architect and to show the interior parking lot landscaping calculations. Item four from the MKSK comments has been scratched from the list of comments which need addressed. The final landscape plan shall be subject to staff approval.
5. Bicycle parking is added to the site plan.
6. Security gate design is subject to staff approval.
7. All future signage is subject to staff approval.
8. Final location of horse fence is subject to staff approval.
9. Leisure trail and street trees are provided along State Route 605.
10. The areas of this site adjacent to residentially zoned land are revised to meet the code requirements for screening.
11. The landscape plan is revised to include the required number of trees and shrubs along State Route 605 setback.
12. A revised photometric plan with lower maximum lighting levels is submitted and site lighting is subject to staff approval.
13. All roof projections (including HVAC units) are fully screened on all four sides of the building to block noise and views., seconded by Mr. Kist. 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.

With no further business, Mr. Kirby polled members for comment and hearing none,
adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.

Submitted by Pam Hickok

APPENDIX



Planning Commission Staff Report June 19, 2017 Meeting

DAIRY QUEEN FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN MODIFICATION

LOCATION: Generally northeast of the Smith's Mill Road and Johnstown Road intersection (PID: 222-004746)
APPLICANT: F5 Design
REQUEST: Final Development Plan Modification
ZONING: Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) Canini Trust Corp subarea 8A
STRATEGIC PLAN: Neighborhood Retail District
APPLICATION: FDM-28-2017

Review based on: Application materials received May 18, 2017.

Staff Report completed by Jackie Russell, Community Development Planner.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests review of a modification to the final development plan for the Dairy Queen Restaurant located within the Canini Trust Corp. The modification proposes to add an additional exit from the drive-through to improve the traffic flow. Currently, the drive-thru line snakes around the building consequently blocking the drive-through exit.

The original final development plan for this business was approved in December 2015. In addition, a conditional use application for the original drive-through was heard in December 2015.

Neighbors within 200 feet of the subject parcel have been notified.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The site encompasses approximately 0.884 acres adjacent and to the east of U.S. 62. It is located generally at the northeast corner of the Smith's Mill Road and U.S. 62 road intersection, which is in the Canini Trust Corp subarea 8A. The Canini Trust Corp currently is home to the COTA park-n-ride facility, Hampton Inn and Suites, Marriott Hotel, and Tutor Time. Residential is located across Johnstown road.

III.EVALUATION

Staff's review is based on New Albany plans and studies, zoning text, zoning regulations. Primary concerns and issues have been indicated below, with needed action or recommended action in underlined text. Planning Commission's review authority is found under Chapter 1159.

The Commission should consider, at a minimum, the following (per Section 1159.08):

- a. *That the proposed development is consistent in all respects with the purpose, intent and applicable standards of the Zoning Code;*
- b. *That the proposed development is in general conformity with the Strategic Plan/Rocky Fork-Blacklick Accord or portion thereof as it may apply;*
- c. *That the proposed development advances the general welfare of the Municipality;*
- d. *That the benefits, improved arrangement and design of the proposed development justify the deviation from standard development requirements included in the Zoning Ordinance;*
- e. *Various types of land or building proposed in the project;*
- f. *Where applicable, the relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to such other facilities as are appropriate with regard to land area; proposed density may not violate any contractual agreement contained in any utility contract then in effect;*
- g. *Traffic and circulation systems within the proposed project as well as its appropriateness to existing facilities in the surrounding area;*
- h. *Building heights of all structures with regard to their visual impact on adjacent facilities;*
- i. *Front, side and rear yard definitions and uses where they occur at the development periphery;*
- j. *Gross commercial building area;*
- k. *Area ratios and designation of the land surfaces to which they apply;*
- l. *Spaces between buildings and open areas;*
- m. *Width of streets in the project;*
- n. *Setbacks from streets;*
- o. *Off-street parking and loading standards;*
- p. *The order in which development will likely proceed in complex, multi-use, multi-phase developments;*
- q. *The potential impact of the proposed plan on the student population of the local school district(s);*
- r. *The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's 401 permit, and/or isolated wetland permit (if required);*
- s. *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit, or nationwide permit (if required).*

It is also important to evaluate the PUD portion based on the purpose and intent. Per Section 1159.02, PUD's are intended to:

- a. *Ensure that future growth and development occurs in general accordance with the Strategic Plan;*

- b. *Minimize adverse impacts of development on the environment by preserving native vegetation, wetlands and protected animal species to the greatest extent possible*
- c. *Increase and promote the use of pedestrian paths, bicycle routes and other non-vehicular modes of transportation;*
- d. *Result in a desirable environment with more amenities than would be possible through the strict application of the minimum commitment to standards of a standard zoning district;*
- e. *Provide for an efficient use of land, and public resources, resulting in co-location of harmonious uses to share facilities and services and a logical network of utilities and streets, thereby lowering public and private development costs;*
- f. *Foster the safe, efficient and economic use of land, transportation, public facilities and services;*
- g. *Encourage concentrated land use patterns which decrease the length of automobile travel, encourage public transportation, allow trip consolidation and encourage pedestrian circulation between land uses;*
- h. *Enhance the appearance of the land through preservation of natural features, the provision of underground utilities, where possible, and the provision of recreation areas and open space in excess of existing standards;*
- i. *Avoid the inappropriate development of lands and provide for adequate drainage and reduction of flood damage;*
- j. *Ensure a more rational and compatible relationship between residential and non-residential uses for the mutual benefit of all;*
- k. *Provide an environment of stable character compatible with surrounding areas; and*
- l. *Provide for innovations in land development, especially for affordable housing and infill development.*

A. New Albany Strategic Plan

1. This site is located in the Neighborhood Retail district of the 2014 New Albany Strategic Plan. The development standards for this type of use include (but are not limited to):
 - Retail users should have footprints no larger than 80,000 square feet, individual users should be no greater than 60,000 square feet.
 - Landscaping should be high quality, enhance the site and contribute to the natural, pastoral setting of New Albany. Heavy, but appropriate landscaping is necessary to buffer these uses from any adjacent residential uses.
 - Parking should be located to the rear of the building.
 - Sidewalks or leisure trails should be included along primary roadways as well as internal to the developments.
 - Structures must use high quality building materials and incorporate detailed, four sided architecture.

B. Use, Site and Layout

1. Currently during peak business hours the drive-through lane gets so long it backs up to the drive-through exit. Cars who are in line for the drive-through typically sit in the middle of the drive lane which prevents cars from exiting through the existing drive through. This final development plan modification proposes to create a second exit which aligns with the right out lane onto Johnstown Road, while the current drive-through exit lane will remain.

2. The applicant and property owner have agreed upon an easement to allow access for the second exit. An unexecuted copy has been submitted. Staff recommends a copy of the recorded easement is submitted to staff for city records.
3. The total lot coverage, which includes all areas of pavement and building coverage, shall not exceed 80% of the total lot area per subarea 8a.01(7). The lot coverage equals 62.9% per the Dairy Queen per the revised site plan.

C. Access, Loading, Parking

1. Currently the site design has 37 parking spaces.
2. Parking will not be altered by this modification.
3. The new drive-through lane will add another means of exit from the site, which increases the amount of access from the site and improves the functionality of the drive-through.
4. The City Engineer commented that the design provided by the applicant allows enough space for passenger cars to have no issues maneuvering through the drive lane.

D. Architectural Standards

1. No proposed changes

E. Parkland, Buffering, Landscaping, Open Space, Screening

1. The submitted plans show additional trees will be planted in the island of the new drive-through exit.

F. Lighting & Signage

1. No proposed signage.

G. Other Considerations

1. None.

IV. ENGINEER'S COMMENTS

The City Engineer and City's Landscape Architect have reviewed the referenced plan in accordance with the engineering related requirements of Code Section 1159.07 and provided the following comment(s):

The City's Landscape Architect comments the applicant should "reduce the width and total pavement area of the proposed drive connection." Their design is located on the right.

The City's Engineer agrees with this concept and designed the drawing on the left to assure that the suggested path will provide adequate maneuverability for cars.



Source: Franklin County Auditor



**Planning Commission Staff Report
June 19, 2017 Meeting**

**NEW ALBANY COUNTRY CLUB SECTION 22- EALY CROSSING
GARAGE DOOR SETBACK VARIANCE**

LOCATION: 17 Ealy Crossing (PID: 220-004144).
APPLICANT: Brian Kent Jones Architects
REQUEST: Variance
ZONING: I-PUD (Ealy Crossing Subarea A)
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center
APPLICATION: V-29-2017

Review based on: Application materials received May 19 and June 5, 2017.

Staff Report completed by Stephen Mayer, Community Development Planner.

III. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant has applied for a variance for a residential structure at 17 Ealy Crossing South within the Ealy Crossing subdivision.

The variance requested is as follows:

- A. Variance to Ealy Crossing Subarea A section VI(c)(1) zoning text to allow a garage door to project beyond the front face of the primary dwelling

Per the PUD zoning text variances shall be heard by the Planning Commission.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The property is located at 17 Ealy Crossing South within the Ealy Crossing subdivision of the New Albany Country Club. The lot is 0.46 acres and is located on the south side of Ealy Crossing South, south of Hays Town Drive, and west of Keswick Drive. The lot is currently undeveloped. The surrounding uses include single family residential.

III. EVALUATION

The application complies with application submittal requirements in C.O. 1113.03, and is considered complete. The Property owners within 200 feet of the property in question have been notified.

Criteria

The standard for granting of an area variance is set forth in the case of *Duncan v. Village of Middlefield*, 23 Ohio St.3d 83 (1986). The Board must examine the following factors when deciding whether to grant a landowner an area variance:

All of the factors should be considered and no single factor is dispositive. The key to whether an area variance should be granted to a property owner under the “practical difficulties” standard is whether the area zoning requirement, as applied to the property owner in question, is reasonable and practical.

1. *Whether the property will yield a reasonable return or whether there can be a beneficial use of the property without the variance.*
2. *Whether the variance is substantial.*
3. *Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or adjoining properties suffer a “substantial detriment.”*
4. *Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of government services.*
5. *Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.*
6. *Whether the problem can be solved by some manner other than the granting of a variance.*
7. *Whether the variance preserves the “spirit and intent” of the zoning requirement and whether “substantial justice” would be done by granting the variance.*

Plus, the following criteria as established in the zoning code (*Section 1113.06*):

8. *That special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the same zoning district.*
9. *That a literal interpretation of the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of the Zoning Ordinance.*
10. *That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the action of the applicant.*
11. *That granting the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the Zoning Ordinance to other lands or structures in the same zoning district.*
12. *That granting the variance will not adversely affect the health and safety of persons residing or working in the vicinity of the proposed development, be materially detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to private property or public improvements in the vicinity.*

IV. RECOMMENDATION

Considerations and Basis for Decision

Variance to Ealy Crossing Subarea A section VI(c)(1) zoning text to allow a garage door to project beyond the front face of the primary dwelling.

The following should be considered in the Commission’s decision:

1. The PUD zoning text states “The scale of the garage shall be minimized by utilizing low, one-story rooflines and low fascia lines. Windows are encouraged in the walls of garages. All front loaded garages shall be placed a minimum of ten (10) feet behind the front face of the primary dwelling. This requirement does not apply if garage doors are not visible from the public right-of-way.”
2. The applicant proposes to project two, single bay garage doors beyond the front

elevation of the home. The garage doors project 19 feet from the front façade of the primary dwelling.

3. The garage doors are designed to be minimized by utilizing low, one-story rooflines and low fascia lines per the zoning requirements.
4. The applicant has submitted a letter of support from the New Albany Country Club Communities HOA Architectural Review Committee (ARC).
5. The variance appears to preserve the “spirit and intent” of the zoning requirement by adding a garden wall, pavilion and landscape architectural features to meet the text’s intent of maintaining a ten foot setback for front facing garage doors. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring these items are constructed at the residence.
6. The request does not seem to be substantial since the applicant has custom designed garage doors that swing out and are not typical roll-up garage doors and whose design is utilized on existing homes within the subdivision. The city architect has reviewed the proposal and states he “is in favor of the unique garage orientation of this Ealy Crossing design. The justification statement makes complete sense given the urban nature of Ealy Crossing itself.”
7. The submitted narrative states the homeowner has committed to utilize a custom door assembly. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the custom carriage door design, as submitted with this application, is required to be installed.
8. It does not appear the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or adjoining properties would suffer a “substantial detriment” since this is a very dense, urban neighborhood with very minimal setbacks. The PUD text allows for more flexibility in design than other sections of the community. Any home within the subdivision can be five foot setback. The garages are setback 11 and 23 feet from the front property line.
9. The applicant states there are special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to this lot and structure which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the same zoning district due to the unique configuration of the street bend. The applicant states they realized a conventional “front-court” loaded garage would expose doors to the street in a more drastic way as one approaches the residence. The applicant believes utilizing the conventional configuration would be conflict with the intent of the zoning text to “downplay” the garages.
10. It appears that granting the variance will not adversely affect the health and safety of persons residing in the vicinity.
11. It appears granting the variance will not adversely affect the delivery of government services.

Staff recommends approval of the requested variance should the Planning Commission find that the application has sufficient basis for approval. Ealy Crossing is intended to be an urban neighborhood and allows for small setbacks and greater flexibility and creativity in design than most other neighborhoods. Although the garage doors project beyond the front elevation, they appear to be very well designed through its unique, customized garage doors and do not appear to be typical garage doors. The intent of the garage door setback is to keep the main house the focal point which typically contains more architectural articulation than garage doors. However, these carriage style garage doors are custom designed to add interest to the streetscape.

Furthermore, the neighborhood contains a home with similar, non-functional carriage style doors that are located past the front face of the primary dwelling. Therefore, the variance does not appear to be substantial or the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or adjoining properties would suffer a “substantial detriment.”

V. ACTION

Should the Planning Commission find that the application has sufficient basis for approval, the following motion would be appropriate:

Move to approve application V-29-2017 based on the findings in the staff report, with the following conditions of approval:

1. The garden wall, pavilion and landscape architectural features are required to be constructed, subject to staff approval.
2. The custom carriage door design, as submitted with this application, is required to be installed, subject to staff approval.

Approximate Site Location:



Source: Google Maps



**Planning Commission Staff Report
June 19, 2017 Meeting**

**NOTTINGHAM TRACE
FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

LOCATION: Generally west of State Route 605/New Albany-Condit Road, south of Walnut Street, east and west of Schleppe Road, and east of the Upper Albany subdivision (PID: 222-004443, 222-004445, 222-004444, and 222-004446)

APPLICANT: Pulte Homes c/o Aaron L Underhill, Esq.

REQUEST: Final Development Plan

ZONING: I-PUD Infill Planned Unit Development (New Albany North PUD Text)

STRATEGIC PLAN: Office District

APPLICATION: FDP-31-2017

Review based on: Application materials received May 19, 2017.

Staff report completed by Stephen Mayer, Community Development Planner.

IV. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests review of a final development plan for a 240 lot age-restricted residential housing development on 89.6 +/- acres for the subdivision known as Nottingham Trace. The zoning permits a maximum of 240 single family homes within the residential subdivision.

The New Albany Parks and Trails Advisory Board reviewed and recommended approval at their June 5, 2017 meeting.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The neighboring uses and zoning districts include L-GE to the south, unincorporated /residential to the north, the Upper Albany subdivision in the City of Columbus to the west, and to the east is a mixture of unincorporated residential and a portion of the city's business park. The site is currently comprised of two homes, some wooded areas, and farm fields.

III. EVALUATION

Staff's review is based on New Albany plans and studies, zoning text, zoning regulations. Primary concerns and issues have been indicated below, with needed action or recommended action in underlined text. Planning Commission's review authority is found under Chapter 1159.

The Commission should consider, at a minimum, the following (per Section 1159.08):

- a. *That the proposed development is consistent in all respects with the purpose, intent and applicable standards of the Zoning Code;*
- b. *That the proposed development is in general conformity with the Strategic Plan/Rocky Fork-Blacklick Accord or portion thereof as it may apply;*
- c. *That the proposed development advances the general welfare of the Municipality;*
- d. *That the benefits, improved arrangement and design of the proposed development justify the deviation from standard development requirements included in the Zoning Ordinance;*
- e. *Various types of land or building proposed in the project;*
- f. *Where applicable, the relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to such other facilities as are appropriate with regard to land area; proposed density may not violate any contractual agreement contained in any utility contract then in effect;*
- g. *Traffic and circulation systems within the proposed project as well as its appropriateness to existing facilities in the surrounding area;*
- h. *Building heights of all structures with regard to their visual impact on adjacent facilities;*
- i. *Front, side and rear yard definitions and uses where they occur at the development periphery;*
- j. *Gross commercial building area;*
- k. *Area ratios and designation of the land surfaces to which they apply;*
- l. *Spaces between buildings and open areas;*
- m. *Width of streets in the project;*
- n. *Setbacks from streets;*
- o. *Off-street parking and loading standards;*
- p. *The order in which development will likely proceed in complex, multi-use, multi-phase developments;*
- q. *The potential impact of the proposed plan on the student population of the local school district(s);*
- r. *The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's 401 permit, and/or isolated wetland permit (if required);*
- s. *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit, or nationwide permit (if required).*

It is also important to evaluate the PUD portion based on the purpose and intent. Per Section 1159.02, PUD's are intended to:

- m. *Ensure that future growth and development occurs in general accordance with the Strategic Plan;*
- n. *Minimize adverse impacts of development on the environment by preserving native vegetation, wetlands and protected animal species to the greatest extent possible*
- o. *Increase and promote the use of pedestrian paths, bicycle routes and other non-vehicular modes of transportation;*
- p. *Result in a desirable environment with more amenities than would be possible through the strict application of the minimum commitment to standards of a standard zoning district;*
- q. *Provide for an efficient use of land, and public resources, resulting in co-location of harmonious uses to share facilities and services and a logical network of utilities and streets, thereby lowering public and private development costs;*
- r. *Foster the safe, efficient and economic use of land, transportation, public facilities and services;*

- s. *Encourage concentrated land use patterns which decrease the length of automobile travel, encourage public transportation, allow trip consolidation and encourage pedestrian circulation between land uses;*
- t. *Enhance the appearance of the land through preservation of natural features, the provision of underground utilities, where possible, and the provision of recreation areas and open space in excess of existing standards;*
- u. *Avoid the inappropriate development of lands and provide for adequate drainage and reduction of flood damage;*
- v. *Ensure a more rational and compatible relationship between residential and non-residential uses for the mutual benefit of all;*
- w. *Provide an environment of stable character compatible with surrounding areas; and*
- x. *Provide for innovations in land development, especially for affordable housing and infill development.*

New Albany Strategic Plan

The majority of the site is located in the 2014 New Albany Strategic Plan's Office Campus future land use district, with a small portion in the Rural Residential future land use district. However given the proposed use, staff has evaluated this proposal against the Town Residential District standards. The 2014 New Albany Strategic Plan lists the following development standards for the Town Residential District:

1. Houses should front onto public open spaces and not back onto public parks or roads.
2. House should be a minimum of 1.5 stories in appearance and a maximum of three stories.
3. Rear and side loaded garages are encouraged. When a garage faces the street, the front façade of the garage must be setback from the front façade of the house.
4. The maximum width of a garage door facing the street is ten feet.
5. Open space should be sited to protect and enhance existing natural features and environmentally sensitive habitats.
6. Neighborhood open spaces and parks should be located within 1,200 feet of all houses. They should vary in size and be easily accessible to pedestrians.
7. Streets should have five-foot wide sidewalks on both sides of the street, other than in locations approved for eight-foot leisure trails.
8. Leisure trail connections must be established throughout.
9. The district should include a hierarchy of streets.
10. The maximum lot width should not exceed 90 feet. For areas where density exceeds 1.5 dwelling units per acre the maximum average lot width should be no larger than 80 feet.
11. The average single-family lot area should not exceed 12,500 square feet.
12. Stormwater management ponds and areas should be incorporated into the overall design as natural features and assets to the community. Shapes of ponds should not appear engineered, but should appear as if the naturally occurred in the location.
13. A hierarchy of open spaces is encourages. Each development should have at least one open space located near the center of development. Typically,

- neighborhood parks range from a half to 5 acres. Multiple greens may be necessary in large developments to provide centrally located greens.
14. Deciduous trees should be planted 30 feet on center.
 15. Cul-de-sacs are discouraged in all developments and a multiplicity of connections should be made.

A. Use, Site and Layout

1. The property is zoned I-PUD under the New Albany North PUD text. Age-restricted dwellings are a permitted use within this subarea.
2. The text requires prior to receiving approval of a final plat for each phase of development within this subarea, the applicant/developer shall provide evidence to the City that it has recorded, with the Office of the Recorder of Franklin County, Ohio and against all portions of this subarea, a written restriction (a "Recorded Restriction") requiring that the real property that is the subject of the final plat may only be developed and operated in accordance with the Act and the HOPA Exemption as described in the immediately preceding paragraph.
3. The development contains 240 lots on 89.6 acres for a density of 2.7 units per acre. The zoning text allows a maximum of 240 lots. The New Albany Company has used their unit bank to offset the additional density.
4. Section E(4) of the zoning text requires the minimum building lot width at the building line shall be 50 feet unless otherwise approved as part of the final development plan. There are several lots that have less than 50 feet but appear to meet the minimum lot size requirements of 6,000 square feet and can be sufficiently accessed from the public street.
5. The minimum front yard setback required by the zoning text is 20 feet for all of the homes.
6. The final development plan meets the zoning text's requirements to provide larger rear yard setbacks for the lots along the northern boundary of the subarea that is adjacent to existing residential.

B. Access, Loading, Parking

1. The residential subdivision has four connections.
2. The primary access to the site will be from State Route 605. Additional access to the site will be provided from Schleppi Road and two existing stub streets located to the west of the property (Upper Albany Drive and Winterbek Drive). The developer is required to submit a final plat for all or a portion of the subdivision prior to any road improvements.
3. The subdivision realigns and redesigns Schleppi Road so it is a neighborhood street.
4. The PUD text requires all streets within the development are public and shall be constructed to required public specifications. The right-of-way for internal streets within the development shall be 50 feet in width. The final development plan shows 50 feet of dedication.
5. Pavement for all internal is shown as 28 feet in width on the final development plan with curbs and gutters. The city's subdivision regulations recommends subdivision streets have 26 feet of pavement from face of curb to face of curb and the applicant has committed to this standard in their zoning text. The

- standard street specification for public streets do not include gutters. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the typical street section is revised to remove gutters and have 26 feet of pavement from face of curb to face of curb so matches the requirements in the city's subdivision regulations and zoning text requirements.
6. The PUD text requires prior to the issuance of the first building permit for any structure to be built in this subarea, the applicant/developer shall dedicate right-of-way to the City for a distance that extends 50 feet from the centerline of State Route 605/New Albany-Condit Road and from the centerline of Walnut Street. The City Engineer has commented this amount of right-of-way is acceptable.

C. Architectural Standards

1. The Architectural standards have been approved as part of the PUD rezoning. The PUD text states the community will not be required to strictly adhere to the City's Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs) and its Codified Ordinances. Instead, the intent is to meet the spirit and purpose of the DGRs and the Codified Ordinances by replicating the architectural styles of the DGRs while allowing for deviations that serve the active adult segment of the home buyer market.
2. The applicant has submitted a "residential design guidelines" document that incorporates many of the zoning requirements. It adds some additional requirements but the PUD text sets baseline requirements and the "residential design guidelines" cannot deviate from the PUD text requirements.
3. The text requires at the time of the final development plan additional architectural details including roof plans; garage door design/colors; dormer details; entablature; and shutter specifications; columns, cornice and pediment details; window specifications; louver details, brick mould profile. These details are included in the submitted home elevations and have been reviewed by the city architect.
4. The text also requires more detailed architectural elevations and/or renderings subject to review and approval by the PC to create a baseline set of architectural requirements and guidelines from which each home design will be based. The city architect has reviewed the elevations and recommends revisions to all of the elevations as contained in the attached memo. Community Development staff will review zoning/building permits to enforce the zoning text's architectural standards. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring all of the comments from the city architect are compiled with. The revisions include: correct column alignment, removing the roof railings, using pilaster at the wall, using correct cornice, eaves, rakes, and eave returns where visible from the public right-of-way (front of all houses and on the front and back of homes located on corners or parkland), corner pilasters, correct brick returns, delete modillions, and having all windows on a home follow the same grid proportional system.
5. Details as to the use and application of brick only on the front elevation may be approved as a part of the final development plan for this subarea according to the PUD text requirements. The PUD text was written to meet the intent of the city's DGRs and requires exterior facades of home to utilize one primary

- material per section H(2)(b). The applicant proposes to use brick on portions of the front elevation. The city architect, in addition the comments above, recommends that if brick is used on the front elevation of a home, it be included throughout the entire front elevation or not used at all. The design intent of using brick on the front elevation is to make the entire home appear it is four-sided brick. Putting brick along the entire front, instead of portions, appears more authentic and meets the intent and purpose of the DGRs. The DGRs calls for simplicity in materials and does not allow random mixing of materials. Adding brick to only some portions of the front elevations adds complexity and the appearance of random mixing of materials. Staff recommends a condition requiring that if brick is used on the front elevation of a home, it be included throughout the entire front elevation or not used at all.
6. The final approved specifications for approved vinyl siding in this subarea shall be approved by the Planning Commission as part of the final development for this subarea per the PUD text. The zoning requires vinyl shall be beaded with a thickness of at least 0.44 inches, and have a reveal of at least six inches. The “residential design guidelines” document adds additional requirements including having low gloss brush pattern, 5/8” panel projection, and must be applied on 7/16” strand board or plywood, and that the vinyl must be equal or better to the Norandex Brushstroke Collection 6-1/2” Cambridge Beaded series of vinyl siding. The applicant has submitted a sample of this vinyl siding and appears to meet code requirements.
 7. Exterior paint colors for siding, doors, shutters, fascias, cornices, soffits and miscellaneous trim have been submitted. Shutters are required to have appropriate shutter hardware (hinges and shutter dogs.) Staff recommends the final the shutter hardware design is subject to staff approval.
 8. A matrix, chart, visual depictions, and/or text to further describe what will constitute different home designs in order to provide an architectural diversity is required has been submitted per the zoning text requirements.
 9. The text states home with projecting garages shall not be located on the primary east/west street through the subdivision or along the street that fronts State Route 605, unless approved by the Planning Commission at the time of the final development plan. Staff recommends a condition of approval prohibiting homes with projecting garages shall not be located on the primary east/west street through the subdivision or along the street that fronts State Route 605. These are most prominent and visible public streets within the subdivision.
 10. The zoning text requires on corner lots, the street on which the front façade of a home is required to be located shall be identified as part of the final development plan submittal. This has been submitted and the proposed orientations all appear to be appropriate.

D. Parkland, Buffering, Landscaping, Open Space, Screening

1. The City Landscape Architect has reviewed the referenced plan in accordance with the landscaping requirements found in the New Albany Codified Ordinances and zoning text. Staff recommends all the City Landscape Architect’s comments are complied with and subject to staff approval. The

landscaping comments can also under separate cover from the consulting City Landscape Architect, MKSK.

2. Section F(9) of the zoning text requires asphalt leisure trails with a width of eight feet to be constructed in the following locations:
 - a. Along State Route 605/New Albany-Condit Road and Walnut Street,
 - b. Along the pocket parks in the northern portion of the subarea,
 - c. Within the southern parkland of the subarea connecting to Winterbek Drive along the western boundary, to the amenity area, and extending to the eastern boundary of the subarea, and
 - d. Around retention ponds in this subarea as identified in an approved final development plan.

The applicant proposes leisure trail in all of the required locations. The city landscape architect has reviewed the plans and recommends several additional connections in the following locations to provide additional connectivity throughout the subdivision. Staff recommends a condition of approval these additional trails connections are installed in addition to the proposed trail network.

- Provide leisure trail connection from proposed sidewalk on west side of Callaway Square West to leisure trail on south side of Walnut Street.
 - Extend leisure trail to the north along Schleppe Road as the primary trail, to accommodate future leisure trail connection.
 - Provide leisure trail connection from the northwest corner of Westcross Drive and Peck Lane to the proposed leisure trail in Reserve 'F'.
3. The city landscape architect also recommends installing leisure trail to the south side of the street typology Nottingham Trace, Nottingham Loop, and Park side Drive to have a continuous connection for New Albany Condit to Winterbek Avenue. This alignment should parallel the road were it is adjacent to homes but could meander through where there is park frontage. Staff recommends this is a condition of approval.
 4. Section F(8) of the zoning text requires a five foot wide concrete public sidewalk shall be located within the right-of-way on each street. Sidewalks are provided along all streets where that have homes fronting them. The public sidewalks connect to the existing residential community to the west to provide pedestrian connectivity between the two neighborhoods.
 5. The zoning text requires the final size and configuration of the amenity area (community clubhouse area) shall be identified in an approved final development plan. The applicant states the amenity area is not included as part of this final development plan and will return with a separate final development plan for this area. Staff recommends this is a condition of approval.
 6. The developer is required to install one street tree per 30 feet and four trees per 100 feet in a natural hedgerow manner along State Route 605 and Walnut Street.
 - (a) The landscaping is meeting code requirements along State Route 605 by providing 47 street trees and 64 rural corridor trees.
 - (b) Along Walnut Street the applicant is providing the minimum number of street trees at 19, but proposes 16 rural corridor trees where the zoning

text requires a minimum of 23 based on the amount of lot frontage. The applicant states the existing tree line supplements and balances the minimum requirements. However, the landscape plan shows the existing tree row to be approximately 30 feet wide which would account for one tree. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the minimum number of corridor trees be installed, totaling 23, subject to staff approval.

- (c) The city Landscape Architect recommends a condition of approval requiring the applicant randomize street tree plantings along west side of Schleppe Road park frontage.
- (d) The text requires proposed buildings or any ancillary or accessory structures that include a foundation or that otherwise require a building permit within parkland and open spaces shall be reviewed approved with the final development plan. The applicant proposes a covered structure along State Route 605 with a shingle roof and white posts.
- 7. The zoning requires one street tree per 30 feet or fraction thereof on average plus an additional deciduous tree in the front yard setback of each lot to create the appearance of a double row of street trees. The applicant is meeting requirements by providing a lot tree for every street tree.
- 8. Street trees are not required along streets that abut parks or reserve areas unless approved as part of the final development plan. The City Landscape architect recommends the applicant provide additional shade trees along south side of Parkside Drive park frontage since there are no street trees. Staff recommends this is a condition of approval.
- 9. Intersection and streetscape treatments on specific lots and at other key focal points and locations are required to be reviewed and approved as part of the final development plan. The applicant has submitted a typical corner treatment at specific intersections. The city landscape architect has reviewed and commented they are comfortable with that treatment.
- 10. The city's subdivision regulations requires 20% of the gross developed land be common open space. Wet and dry storm water basins shall not be considered open space. In addition to the open space requirements, the city's subdivision regulations require a parkland dedication of 2,400 square feet per dwelling unit. The required and proposed parkland and open space is below. The applicant must revise the plan, apply for a variance, pay a fee in-lieu, or use the parkland bank credits to offset the shortage of overall parkland dedication and open space. Staff recommends the 1.48 acre deficiency is corrected by withdrawing credits from the NACO parkland bank.

C.O. Requirement	Shown on FDP as	Required (acres)*	Provided (acres)	Difference	Meets Code?
1187.16 Open Space	Reserves & Cell Tower Lot	17.96	(see total below)		
1187.15 Parkland	Reserves	13.22	(see total below)		

Dedication				
Total	31.18	29.7	-1.48	No

*Calculations based on 89.8 acres and 240 lots.

11. The applicant proposes to dedicate a 1.8 acre cell phone tower access area to be used as open space. Staff is amenable to using this area as open space.
12. A proposed future public parking lot for the park is shown in subarea B and the Open Space plan sheet shows a curb cut for the proposed cell tower access on State Route 605 but says its final location is to be determined. Subarea B permits one curb cut along State Route 605 and this cell tower access would utilize it. Staff supports the general location and provision of parking at this area. The relation and design of the cell tower access drive, curb cut, leisure trail, and parking need to be reviewed and finalized, and staff recommends these are subject to staff approval.
13. Due to the nature of this subdivision being an age restricted community, the zoning text exempts it from the requirement of Section 1185.15(c)(6) that would otherwise require all residences to be located within 1,200 feet of playground equipment. No active park equipment is proposed.
14. A private community clubhouse shall be located within the 1.9+/- acre open space/amenity area that is shown on the final development plan. This area may include outdoor activities and will be reviewed in the future via a separate FDP submittal.
15. The zoning text requires where the park abuts residential lots, wood bollards shall be placed and maintained along the shared property lines between such lots and the parkland in order to provide a clear delineation between public and private spaces. The FDP includes a specification for a 4"x4" wood post and locates them at the corner of every lot.
16. The text states ownership and maintenance of parkland and open space areas shown on the preliminary development plan shall be defined and approved with the final development plan. The text also states the HOA shall be responsible for maintaining the private amenities center/clubhouse and associated improvements, maintaining entry signs and entry features, providing lawn maintenance on each individual lot, and maintaining open space and/or parkland as determined with this final development plan.
17. Sheet 17 of 20 of the final development plan states that all of the reserves except for Reserve "B" which is the clubhouse parcel, is owned by the city of New Albany. The sheet states the HOA will maintain all of the reserves except for the large 23 acre Reserve "C". The applicant proposes to have the city of New Albany maintain this reserve "C" except for the ponds which shall be maintained by the HOA. The New Albany Service Department has reviewed the proposal and recommends the HOA maintain all aspects of Reserve "C" in addition to the other reserves. All of the recent subdivisions in New Albany have committed the HOA to maintaining all of their respective reserve areas in perpetuity.
18. The applicant has submitted an environmental impact letter stating the site contains two streams and eight wetlands. Based upon review of the current site development concept plan, all of the streams and wetlands will be avoided. As a

result, a permit from the USACE or Ohio EPA would not be required for any development activities associated with this project.

E. Lighting & Signage

1. The text requires each home shall provide coach lights on the garage with an opaque top. Sheet 14 of 20 within the final development plan contains a fixture specification that appears to meet this code requirements.
2. The applicant has submitted a yard light and post specification that is consistent with lamp posts used in other subdivisions.
3. Street lighting shall be provided at each street intersection per the PUD text and the fixture, color and spacing to be determined the time of the final development plan. The plan proposes shielded, downcast lights with 12 foot poles colored New Albany Green. The fixture and pole appear to match other New Albany subdivisions and is appropriately designed.
4. The applicant has submitted entry feature signage that is to be located at State Route 605 and Nottingham Boulevard entrance. The sign is designed to be consistent with other New Albany residential subdivisions.
5. The submittal includes traffic control signs, street name signs, and traffic warning signs. Staff recommends a condition of approval that these signs are subject to staff approval.

F. Other Considerations

1. When the site was rezoned, the Planning Commission placed a condition of approval requiring the developer shall work with neighbors on drainage. The applicant submitted a copy of a letter sent to neighbors notifying them of a public meeting at the New Albany public library on June 5th to discuss the current drainage problems or future drainage concerns.

IV. ENGINEER'S COMMENTS

The City Engineer has reviewed the referenced plan in accordance with the engineering related requirements of Code Section 1159.07 and provided the following comment(s):

1. We recommend that a minimum of 50' of public r/w (as measured from the road centerline) be provided on SR 605. This dedication and all other easements, vacations etc. should be shown on the subdivision plat that will eventually be submitted for Planning Commission approval.
2. Widening of SR 605 to create turn lanes, and to provide full depth pavement replacement and resurfacing will be required for this project. We recommend that widening be completed in its entirety during Phase 1 of this project.
3. We will evaluate storm water management, water distribution, sanitary sewer collection and roadway construction related details once construction plans become available

Staff recommends all the City Engineer's comments are complied with and subject to staff approval. The engineering comments can also under separate cover from the consulting City Engineer, E.P. Ferris & Associates.

V. RECOMMENDATION

The overall proposal appears to meet the recommendations of the New Albany Strategic Plan and zoning text requirements. The application includes many of the same amenities such as lighting, bollards, landscaping, and signage that have been successfully implemented in other subdivisions.

The subdivision is well designed through multiple connections with an excellent site design and plan layout. While the street network, landscaping, and layout is desirable from a site planning perspective, and shouldn't be overlooked, departing from the traditional American architectural style is a big consideration. Although applicant has provided additional landscaping to offset the homes' aesthetics and this housing product adds diversity to the city, staff does not take the departure from the city's Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs) lightly. The DGRs recommend simplicity of materials and does not allow random mixing. The PUD text was written to meet the intent of the city's DGRs by requiring exterior facades of home to utilize one primary material. Staff recommends that if brick is used on the front elevation of a home, it be included throughout the entire front elevation or not used at all. Additionally, incorporating all of the city architect's comments will ensure the building designs meet the intent of the city's Design Guidelines and Requirements.

Staff is supportive of this applicant provided the recommended revisions are all addressed. Overall, the proposed development meets:

- 1) The development plan is consistent with the purpose intent and standards of the zoning code and applicable PUD development texts (Section 1159.08(a)).
- 2) The development plan is in conformity with the Strategic Plan (Section 1159.08(b)).
- 3) The development advances and benefits the general welfare of the community (Section 1159.08(c)).
- 4) The relationship of building sites is appropriate with regard to land area (Section 1159.08(f)).

V. ACTION

Suggested Motion for FDP-30-2017:

Move to approve final development plan application FDP-30-2017 based on the finding in the staff report, with the following conditions all subject to staff approval:

1. The typical street section is revised to remove gutters and have 26 feet of pavement from face of curb to face of curb so matches the requirements in the city's subdivision regulations and zoning text requirements.
2. All of the comments from the city architect are compiled with. The revisions include: correct column alignment, removing the roof railings, using pilaster at the wall, using correct cornice, eaves, rakes, and eave returns where visible from the public right-of-way (front of all houses and on the front and back of homes located

on corners or parkland), correct brick turns and terminations (if used), delete modillions, and having all windows on a home follow the same grid proportional system.

3. The applicant provides open space as required by the zoning ordinance, pay a fee, or submits an updated parkland dedication chart, subject to staff approval.
4. The design of the cell tower access drive, curb cut, leisure trail, and parking lot are subject to staff approval.
5. If brick is used on the front elevation of a home, it be included throughout the entire front elevation or not used at all.
6. Final the shutter hardware design is subject to staff approval.
7. Homes with projecting garages shall not be located on the primary east/west street through the subdivision or along the street that fronts State Route 605.
8. The amenity area is not included as part of this final development plan and the applicant must submit a separate final development plan for this area.
9. The minimum number of corridor trees along Walnut Street be installed, totaling 23, subject to staff approval.
10. The applicant randomize street tree plantings along west side of Schleppi Road park frontage.
11. The applicant provide additional shade trees along south side of Parkside Drive park frontage since there are no street trees.
12. The HOA maintain all aspects of Reserve "C" in addition to the other reserves.
13. The traffic control signs, street name signs, and traffic warning signs are subject to staff approval.
14. Address the comments of the City Engineer, subject to staff approval.
15. Address the comments of the City Landscape Architect, subject to staff approval.



**Planning Commission Staff Report
June 19, 2017 Meeting**

**CANINE COMPANION FOR INDEPENDENCE REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS
FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

LOCATION: Southwest corner where Souder Road terminates and generally north of New Albany Road East (PID: 222-004464).
APPLICANT: Moody Nolan
REQUEST: Final Development Plan
ZONING: Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) Souder East Research and Information District subarea 4 and subarea 6
STRATEGIC PLAN: Office District, Research & Information Sub-district
APPLICATION: FDP-31-2017

Review based on: Application materials received May 19 and June 2, 2017.

Staff Report completed by Jackie Russell, Community Development Clerk.

V. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests review of a final development plan for the Canine Companions for Independence regional headquarters generally north of New Albany Road East at the intersection of Schleppe Road and State Route 605. This site is west of the Green Harbor Data Center site and north of the Pharmaforce site.

This final development plan is for three detached-buildings. One building is a 6,338 square foot administration building. The second building is a 14,781 square foot kennel building. The third building is a 33,376 square foot training and guesthouse building. The site totals 16.79 +/- acres.

VI. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The site is currently vacant and is located within the area known as the Souder East Research and Information District subarea 4 and subarea 6. The site will encompass approximately 16 acres located north of New Albany Road East at the intersection of Schleppe Road and State Route 605. The zoning in subarea 4 permits uses included in the OCD (Office Campus District) including administrative, business and professional offices, including operations offices, warehousing, data centers, and manufacturing and production uses. Additionally in subarea 6, a training facility is a permitted use.

The Planning Commission approved a rezoning to expand the Souder East Research and Information District now known as subarea 6 in July 2015 for this specific use. Subarea 4 was rezoned and approved by Planning Commission in the summer of 2008.

III.EVALUATION

Staff's review is based on New Albany plans and studies, zoning text, zoning regulations. Primary concerns and issues have been indicated below, with needed action or recommended action in underlined text. Planning Commission's review authority is found under Chapter 1159.

The Commission should consider, at a minimum, the following (per Section 1159.08):

- a. *That the proposed development is consistent in all respects with the purpose, intent and applicable standards of the Zoning Code;*
- b. *That the proposed development is in general conformity with the Strategic Plan/Rocky Fork-Blacklick Accord or portion thereof as it may apply;*
- c. *That the proposed development advances the general welfare of the Municipality;*
- d. *That the benefits, improved arrangement and design of the proposed development justify the deviation from standard development requirements included in the Zoning Ordinance;*
- e. *Various types of land or building proposed in the project;*
- f. *Where applicable, the relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to such other facilities as are appropriate with regard to land area; proposed density may not violate any contractual agreement contained in any utility contract then in effect;*
- g. *Traffic and circulation systems within the proposed project as well as its appropriateness to existing facilities in the surrounding area;*
- h. *Building heights of all structures with regard to their visual impact on adjacent facilities;*
- i. *Front, side and rear yard definitions and uses where they occur at the development periphery;*
- j. *Gross commercial building area;*
- k. *Area ratios and designation of the land surfaces to which they apply;*
- l. *Spaces between buildings and open areas;*
- m. *Width of streets in the project;*
- n. *Setbacks from streets;*
- o. *Off-street parking and loading standards;*
- p. *The order in which development will likely proceed in complex, multi-use, multi- phase developments;*
- q. *The potential impact of the proposed plan on the student population of the local school district(s);*
- r. *The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's 401 permit, and/or isolated wetland permit (if required);*
- s. *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit, or nationwide permit (if required).*

It is also important to evaluate the PUD portion based on the purpose and intent. Per Section 1159.02, PUD's are intended to:

- y. *Ensure that future growth and development occurs in general accordance with the Strategic Plan;*
- z. *Minimize adverse impacts of development on the environment by preserving native vegetation, wetlands and protected animal species to the greatest extent possible*

- aa. Increase and promote the use of pedestrian paths, bicycle routes and other non-vehicular modes of transportation;*
- bb. Result in a desirable environment with more amenities than would be possible through the strict application of the minimum commitment to standards of a standard zoning district;*
- cc. Provide for an efficient use of land, and public resources, resulting in co-location of harmonious uses to share facilities and services and a logical network of utilities and streets, thereby lowering public and private development costs;*
- dd. Foster the safe, efficient and economic use of land, transportation, public facilities and services;*
- ee. Encourage concentrated land use patterns which decrease the length of automobile travel, encourage public transportation, allow trip consolidation and encourage pedestrian circulation between land uses;*
- ff. Enhance the appearance of the land through preservation of natural features, the provision of underground utilities, where possible, and the provision of recreation areas and open space in excess of existing standards;*
- gg. Avoid the inappropriate development of lands and provide for adequate drainage and reduction of flood damage;*
- hh. Ensure a more rational and compatible relationship between residential and non-residential uses for the mutual benefit of all;*
- ii. Provide an environment of stable character compatible with surrounding areas; and*
- jj. Provide for innovations in land development, especially for affordable housing and infill development.*

G. New Albany Strategic Plan

1. This subdivision is located in the Research & Information Sub-district of the 2014 New Albany Strategic Plan. The development standards for this type of commercial use include (but are not limited to):
 - a) All associated mechanical operations must be concealed from the public rights-of-ways and screened architecturally or with landscape in an appealing manner.
 - b) Combined curb cuts and cross-access easements are encouraged.
 - c) Innovative and iconic architecture is encouraged for office buildings.
 - d) Any periphery security must integrate with the existing landscape and maintain and enhance the character of road corridors.
 - e) Sites with multiple buildings should be well organized and clustered.
 - f) Development sites should strive to retain and incorporate existing natural features into overall designs.

H. Use, Site and Layout

1. Canine Companions for Independence is a non-profit charitable organization which provides highly trained assistance dogs for children, adults, and veterans with disabilities at no cost to the recipient. This site will serve as their regional headquarters and training facility. The site plan shows they are developing a campus with an administration building, kennel and training facility. The final development plan site contains approximately 16.79 acres and will contain three detached structures for a total of 54,495 square feet of building space which includes an administration building, and a kennel building and a training/guest

house building which are part of the organization’s operations. The layout of the campus provides significant amounts of internal connectivity between buildings while centered on a central green space.

2. The Office Campus District permits general offices and general office buildings designed for leased space, including but not limited to, operational, administrative and executive offices for personnel engaged in general administration, operations, purchasing, accounting, telemarketing, credit card processing, bank processing, and other administrative processing. Moreover, Office Campus district C.O. 1144 states that the uses found in Codified Ordinance 1143.02, Office district, are also permitted uses in this zoning. C.O 1143.02 (c)(4) indicates that any charitable organization is a permitted use.
3. The applicant has submitted a narrative stating the proposed administration building will contain office and other administrative duties. The proposed training facility and guesthouse building will provide two-week team training. Lastly, the kennel building will be used for six-to-nine month boarding and training for the professional dogs.
4. The regional headquarters use is consistent with the Strategic Plan which specifically recommends corporate campuses.
5. Storm water retention for the site will be controlled by the proposed ponds on the perimeters of the site.
6. Below is a table listing the required and proposed setbacks for the campus.

Setback from Right-of-Way	Required	Proposed
State Route 605	55 foot pavement & 80 foot building	550 feet to administration building (closest building) 490 foot pavement setback
North Boundary	50 feet for building & pavement	95 feet to closest building 50 foot pavement setback
South Boundary	25 foot pavement & building	25 feet pavement 118 feet to closest building
Eastern Boundary	25 foot pavement & building	41 feet pavement 111 feet to closest building
Lot Coverage	70% max	25%

I. Access, Loading, Parking

1. Per the zoning text Section 4(F)(3) limits one full service curb-cut allowed on State Route 605, if subareas 4 and 6 are developed as part of a comprehensive development plan the locations shall be approved at time of the final development plan. One proposed curb-cut is at the intersection of State Route 605 and Schleppe Road. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the curb cut for Canine Companions aligns with Pulte’s Schleppe Road entrance, subject to staff approval.

2. The city's parking code C.O. Section 1167.05 (d)(17) requires one parking space for each 250 square feet of gross floor area. For the administrative building 25 parking spaces are required. The site plan provides 40 parking spaces for the administration building.
3. The site's operational buildings (training and kennel) are not listed within the table of required off-street parking spaces in the parking and loading chapter of the zoning code. Thus, as required by C.O. Section 1167.05 (f), the Planning Commission shall determine the number of parking spaces required for this facility. Currently the kennel building provides four parking spots and the training facility and guesthouse currently provides 49 parking spaces.
4. The applicant proposes to provide two loading spaces for the kennel building and one loading space for the training/ guest house building. The city parking code does not require a loading space for the administration building since it is less than 50,000 square feet.
5. Per the zoning text Section 4 (G)(5), bicycle parking is required to be located within a reasonable location of the building. Currently no bicycle parking is proposed. Staff recommends that plans be revised to show bicycle parking near buildings.
6. There is a 24 foot wide internal access drive, referenced as the perimeter road in this staff report, circling the entire site. 24 feet is the equivalent to a residential neighborhood street width. Codified Ordinance Chapter 1171.06 states the maneuvering lane width to be 22 feet. The drive aisle is shown as being 24 feet.
7. The applicant proposes a security gate at the front of the property behind a turn-around. Staff recommends that the security gate design be subject to staff approval.
8. Zoning text Section 4(G) (1)(b) requires Souder Road shall be extended to the northern boundary of this subarea when development first occurs in either Subarea 3 or Subarea 4. Souder Road was extended in 2012 to the approximate southern boundary of subarea 4 and a section of subarea 3 when the Nationwide/ Project Noble datacenter was approved. Right-of-way was dedicated all the way to the northern boundary of this subarea at that time.
9. Requiring Souder Road to be extended does not appear to be necessary at this time. The Canine Companions site is not served by Souder Road. Plus, the city has a Memorandum of Understanding with the New Albany Company requiring the future construction of Souder Road begin 120 days after a building permit has been issued for the undeveloped site north of Green Harbor data center in order to allow additional time to determine the ultimate alignment and connection to the existing road network.

J. Architectural Standards

1. The zoning text subarea 4 section (F)(3)(d) and subarea 6 section (E)(3)(d) requires all elevations of a building that are visible from a public right-of-way shall receive similar treatment in terms of style, materials, and design so that such elevations are not of a lesser visual character than any other. The administration building fronts State Route 605 and is appropriately designed to

- address the street. The training and kennel buildings are pushed to the southeast corner of the site where it is adjacent to commercial uses.
2. The buildings have been designed in a barn form and is consistent with the rural characteristic of the area. All of the buildings contain four-sided architecture. The administration building elevations are 30 feet in height. The kennel building elevations are 29 feet in height. The training facility/ guest house building is 26 feet in height. The maximum building height for structures shall not exceed 45 feet. Architectural elements such as monitors, chimneys, parapets and cupolas may exceed this height limitation.
 3. The façade of the building uses a variety of materials and colors to break up the overall mass of the building. The building will be mainly constructed of cement siding with vertical battens and white cement trim board. The buildings will have charcoal gray asphalt shingles. The rooftops all have white cupolas. The front façade contains aluminum storefront system at both the administration building and kennel building.
 4. It appears the building has a comparable use of materials on all elevations. The primary entrances are made prominent through the use of an extensive anodized aluminum storefront and decorative barn doors
 5. The buildings have been designed to incorporate a screen wall on the rooftops. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring all rooftop mechanical equipment be screened on all four sides for views and noise to ensure the screen walls are appropriately sized.

K. Parkland, Buffering, Landscaping, Open Space, Screening

1. The site front State Route 605 at two locations. A four rail horse fence is shown on the landscape plan along the frontage of State Route 605 at the main entrance, but not at a thin strip to the south. Staff recommends the final location of horse fence is subject to staff approval in order to allow the city landscape architect to determine the appropriateness of providing a small section of horse fence.
2. The Research and Information Campus Design Guidelines Plan recommends leisure trail, street trees, additional landscaping, and a mound be provided along State Route 605. Due to the site's size, shape, and limited frontage in relation to State Route 605, mounding along State Route 605 may not be appropriate. Staff recommends that a revised landscape plan showing the leisure trail and street trees be submitted subject to the City's Landscape Architects approval.
3. The City Landscape Architect has reviewed the referenced plan in accordance with the landscaping requirements found in the New Albany Codified Ordinances and zoning text, and the design guidelines found in the 2013 Trust Corp Signage Recommendations plan. Staff recommends all the City Landscape Architect's planting plan comments are complied with and subject to staff approval. The landscaping comments can also be found under separate cover from the consulting City Landscape Architect, MKSK.
 1. Screen existing Residential Properties based on current zoning code requirements. Refer attached markup.

2. Provide hedgerow plantings supplemental to existing trees along all property lines based on current zoning code requirements. Refer attached markup.
3. Provide leisure trail along New Albany - Condit Road / SR. 605. Refer attached markup.
4. Provide a sidewalk extension from New Albany - Condit Road / SR.605 on north side of entry drive to connect to proposed development sidewalks. Refer attached markup.
4. Per the Research and Information Campus Design Guidelines Plan the applicant proposes hedgerow tree plantings along south side purposively for screening from the adjacent of the parcel. Staff recommends the hedgerows on the south and east property lines (adjacent to commercial land uses) are subject to staff approval. The north side of the parcel abuts property outside of the City of New Albany that appear to be owned and/or used for residential purposes. Per Codified Ordinance 1171.05(c) for commercial, industrial, office and institutional uses which abut districts where residences are a permitted use, a buffer zone with a minimum width of 25 feet should be created. Such screening within the buffer zone shall consist of natural vegetation planted no closer than three (3) feet to any property line. Natural vegetation shall have an opaqueness of seventy-five percent (75%) during full foliage and shall be a variety which will attain ten (10) feet in height within five (5) years of planting. Staff recommends the areas of this site adjacent to residentially zoned land are revised to meet this code requirement, subject to the City Landscape Architect's approval. Per the zoning texts Subarea 6 section G(2) and Subarea 4 Section H (3) per 100 linear feet of road frontage on State Route 605 11 trees and 10 deciduous shrubs shall be installed and maintained in the 55 foot setback. The current landscape plan does not show any trees or shrubs within the setback. There is two hundred feet of frontage on State Route 605, toward the north of the property. This area of frontage requires 22 trees and 20 deciduous shrubs to be located in the setback. Additionally, there is sixty feet of frontage in Subarea 6, towards the south of the property, thus approximately 7 trees and 6 deciduous shrubs should be added. Staff recommends that the landscape plan be revised to meet these code requirements subject to the City's landscape architect approval.
5. The zoning code requires a minimum of 5% interior parking lot landscaping on the site. The amount of interior parking lot landscaping is not indicated on the plans. The landscape plan should be revised to show the interior parking lot landscaping calculations.

L. Lighting & Signage

1. Per the Zoning Text Subarea 4 (J)(4) a signage and graphics plan shall be presented for review and approval by the Planning Commission at the time of final development plan. The applicant has not indicated if there will be any proposed signage for the site. Staff recommends any future signage is subject to staff approval. Per Zoning Text Subarea 4 (J)(1) all signage must conform to the standards set forth in Codified Ordinance Chapter 1169.

2. A photometric plan has been submitted. All lights must be cut-off and downcast shoebox style and no more than 30 feet tall to meet the requirements in Zoning Text Subarea 4 (I). It appears there is zero light pollution to neighboring residential properties and minimal lighting levels extending to commercial properties. The current photometric plan shows a maximum lighting level of 98:1. Staff recommends a revised photometric plan be submitted showing a more appropriate maximum be chosen, lighting is subject to staff approval.

G. Other Considerations

None.

IV. ENGINEER'S COMMENTS

The City Engineer has reviewed the referenced plan in accordance with the engineering related requirements of Code Section 1159.07 and provided the following comment(s):

- 1) We recommend that a minimum of 40' of public r/w (as measured from the road centerline) be dedicated on SR 605.
- 2) We recommend that the developer provide a Traffic Access Study to determine turn lane requirements. At a minimum, a southbound turning lane should be provided.
- 3) Roadway improvements for this project should be coordinated with those improvements required for the subdivision project that will occur on the west side of SR 605.
- 4) In accordance with paragraph V. of Code Section 1159.07, please provide space on the FDP title sheet (Sheet C101) for signature of the Planning Commission chair, vice chair or designee, Professional Engineer, Professional Surveyor and the date of commission approval.
- 5) We will evaluate storm water management, water distribution, sanitary sewer collection and roadway construction related details once construction plans become available.

The engineering comments can also under separate cover from the consulting City Engineer, E.P. Ferris & Associates. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the applicant address the comments of the City Engineer to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval since the development plan is consistent with the purpose, intent and standards of the PUD development text. The proposed development integrates with the existing commercial uses and the New Albany Business Park. The proposed development complements the Research and Information District due to the buildings' campus orientation and generous front yard setbacks. The layout of the campus provides large setbacks to residential properties locating the buildings in closer

proximity to other commercial users. The site is well-designed with multiple internal connections between buildings of the campus while providing four-sided barn architecture to maintain the rural aesthetic of the existing area. Canine Companions for Independence will be a great addition to the business park and creates the appearance of a unified campus with rural-agrarian influences.

V. ACTION

Should the Planning Commission find that the application has sufficient basis for approval, the following motions would be appropriate:

Move to approve final development plan application FDP-31-2017, based on the findings in the staff report subject to the following conditions all subject to staff approval:

16. Canine Companion's curb-cut must align with Pulte's Schleppi road entrance, subject to staff approval.
17. Address the comments of the City Engineer to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
18. Revise the landscape plan to address the comments of the City Landscape Architect and to show the interior parking lot landscaping calculations. The final landscape plan shall be subject to staff approval.
19. The final development plan is in accordance with the comments from the City's Landscape Architect.
20. Bicycle parking is added to the site plan.
21. Security gate design is subject to staff approval.
22. All future signage is subject to staff approval.
23. Final location of horse fence is subject to staff approval.
24. Leisure trail and street trees are provided along State Route 605.
25. The areas of this site adjacent to residentially zoned land are revised to meet the code requirements for screening.
26. The landscape plan is revised to include the required number of trees and shrubs along State Route 605 setback.
27. A revised photometric plan with lower maximum lighting levels is submitted and site lighting is subject to staff approval.
28. All roof projections (including HVAC units) are fully screened on all four sides of the building.

Approximate Site Location:



Source: Franklin County Auditor