


New Albany Planning Commission
November 15, 2021 Minutes

Planning Commission met in regular session in the Council Chambers at Village Hall, 99 W. Main Street and was called to order by Planning Commission Chair Mr. Neil Kirby at 7:04 p.m.

Those answering roll call:

Mr. Neil Kirby, Chair	Present
Mr. David Wallace	Present
Mr. Hans Schell	Present
Ms. Andrea Wiltrout	Present
Ms. Sarah Briggs	Present
Ms. Colleen Briscoe (Council liaison)	Present

Staff members present: Steven Mayer, Development Services Coordinator; Anna van der Zwaag, Planner; Mitch Banchefsky, City Attorney; Jay Herskowitz for Ed Ferris, City Engineer; and Josie Taylor, Clerk.

Moved by Ms. Wiltrout, seconded by Mr. Wallace to approve the October 18, 2021 meeting minutes. Upon roll call: Ms. Wiltrout, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Kirby asked if there were any persons wishing to speak on items not on tonight's Agenda. (No response.)

Mr. Mayer introduced Ms. Anna van der Zwaag.

ZC-105-2021 Zoning Change

Rezoning of 11.751+/-acres from Limited General Employment (L-GE) located at 7270 New Albany-Condit Road for an area to be known as the “Cornerstone Academy Zoning District” (PID: 222-001945).

Applicant: Cornerstone Academy c/o Aaron Underhill, Esq

Ms. van der Zwaag presented the staff report.

Mr. Kirby asked if the illustration shown on screen included the mounding.

Ms. van der Zwaag stated this was a conceptual drawing and did not show the mounding nor any additional landscaping.

Mr. Aaron Underhill, attorney for the applicant, stated the illustration submitted was conceptual and had been submitted prior to landscaping.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was any engineering on the project.

Mr. Herskowitz stated they concurred with the traffic study's need to determine where full access drives would need to be located. Mr. Herskowitz stated there was a fifty (50) foot right of way currently on New Albany Road East and the applicant had agreed to a fifty (50) foot right-of-way on S.R. 605.

Mr. Kirby asked what the distance between the curb cut on S.R. 605 and the intersection was.

Mr. Herskowitz stated it was at least 300 feet, but he would need to check.

Mr. Kirby stated that was a fifty (50) mile per hour (hereafter, "MPH") zone and he was concerned with the distance to the curb cut. Mr. Kirby stated that due to the easement on this property the curb cut would not be able to be moved much from where it was shown.

Mr. Herskowitz stated that community development north of the creek, and where the curb cut would be, also needed to be considered.

Mr. Kirby stated yes. Mr. Kirby asked staff if this application was only for zoning.

Mr. Mayer stated correct.

Mr. Kirby stated that what was being looked at tonight was only conceptual and was not baked in.

Mr. Mayer stated correct and the curb cut would be subject to the traffic study completion.

Mr. Kirby stated traffic past that curb cut was likely moving at least fifty (50) MPH. Mr. Kirby asked if the applicant wanted to provide comments.

Mr. Underhill, for the applicant, described the project and the use for the site. Mr. Underhill noted easements on the lot made it difficult to use this lot and this project's design was a good fit for this site.

Mr. Kirby asked if there would be a cross access easement on the western drive on New Albany Road East.

Mr. Underhill stated they were showing that on the property line and part of this would have to be done with a recorded instrument, but they did not know what that use would be at this time.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was a commitment in the text for it.

Mr. Underhill stated no, but they would be happy to do so.

Mr. Tom Rubey, New Albany Company, stated they would commit to best efforts to try to do that.

Ms. Wiltrout stated it would be very hard to put another one in.

Mr. Rubey stated he agreed.

Ms. Wiltrout asked if there was a gas line easement on this lot, how could a road be located there.

Mr. Rubey stated the road across the easement had to follow a precise, geometric, ninety (90) degree angle to be allowed to be placed there.

Ms. Wiltrout asked who would bear the risk of the costs if the road were removed because the easement holder needed to get to the gas line.

Mr. Rubey stated that would be Cornerstone.

Mr. Kirby stated that the cross access easement, as drawn at the New Albany Road entrance, was not at a ninety (90) degree angle.

Mr. Rubey stated that was a conceptual drawing and the final development plan (hereafter, "FDP") would come back to the PC when those items were finalized and cleared by the utility company.

Mr. Kirby stated the ability to develop the adjacent parcel rested heavily on the ability to get the easement right.

Mr. Rubey stated he agreed.

Mr. Kirby stated there would not be room for another drive and it had to be done right.

Ms. Wiltrout stated she was concerned about the busy roads around this site. Ms. Wiltrout stated she was concerned about how surrounding areas would respond to a slowdown in traffic during school hours.

Mr. Underhill stated there were some rural residential neighbors nearby but the two closest developments were for empty nesters who normally had less traffic at school peak times. Mr. Underhill stated the City was also looking to modify the offset of Walnut Street at S.R. 605. Mr. Underhill stated the traffic study would better review this issue.

Ms. Wiltrout asked where the decrease in speed would take place.

Mr. Herskowitz stated they had asked that twenty (20) MPH beacon signs be installed.

Ms. Wiltrout asked where those signs would be placed.

Mr. Herskowitz stated they would be in front of the existing school from two (2) parcels in either direction and indicated on the screen where he believed those might be placed.

Ms. Wiltrout asked if they would also be on New Albany Road.

Mr. Herskowitz stated he thought it would only have signage on S.R. 605.

Mr. Underhill stated the intent for circulation was there would be an entry off of S.R. 605 and New Albany Road.

Mr. Rubey stated both S.R. 605 and New Albany Road would have signage.

Mr. Underhill stated state law would dictate signage.

Ms. Wiltrout stated she was concerned this would not be a congruent use. Ms. Wiltrout stated she wondered how a traffic study or a City would assess how residents would respond to a reduction of speed in this area. Ms. Wiltrout asked if there would be any crosswalks affected.

Mr. Rubey stated there was a crosswalk today across S.R. 605 on the north side of New Albany Road and they did not expect more.

Ms. Wiltrout stated the FDP should show that crosswalk being very well protected, such as with flashing lights, etc.

Mr. Rubey stated yes. Mr. Rubey stated the leisure trail over the creek would have a bridge.

Ms. Wiltrout stated she was not sure that would be used.

Mr. Rubey stated the leisure trails were heavily traveled.

Ms. Wiltrout asked if the school could access those leisure trails without having to cross a road.

Mr. Rubey stated yes, exactly.

Mr. Kirby asked if Mr. Mayer had a comment regarding the crosswalks.

Mr. Mayer stated there were currently no leisure trails on the Discover site and they did not anticipate putting in any additional crossings at this time. Mr. Mayer stated those would be evaluated as part of FDP's engineering review.

Mr. Kirby stated it was one of those lesson learned things.

Mr. Mayer stated that site predated the requirement for leisure trails.

Mr. Kirby asked about security and horse fencing on the site.

Mr. Underhill stated he believed it existed already along New Albany Road and would be installed along S.R. 605.

Mr. Kirby asked if that would be sufficient for the purposes here.

Mr. Underhill stated yes.

Mr. Kirby asked if there would be any pedestrian gaps there.

Mr. Rubey stated that would be determined later.

Mr. Kirby asked if there would be a sidewalk or something like a sidewalk to the leisure trail.

Mr. Underhill stated that would be part of the FDP.

Mr. Kirby stated it would be to keep kids off of the drive path the school buses would use.

Mr. Underhill stated yes, that was a great point.

Mr. Kirby stated that at this point it was easy to get it right on the paper.

Ms. Wiltrout stated that, in addition, if it was a soccer field, then maybe they would want a fence that would keep balls from going into the road.

Mr. Underhill stated they would have mounding there.

Mr. Mayer stated staff looked at this with the applicant. Mr. Mayer stated they felt mounding and landscaping would be sufficient. Mr. Mayer stated it would be part of the FDP.

Ms. Briscoe asked how high the mounding would be.

Mr. Underhill stated from between three (3) to twelve (12) feet.

Ms. Briscoe stated it would not stop a soccer ball at three (3) feet tall.

Mr. Mayer stated he agreed, there would be areas where the mounding would taper off, but at approximately six (6) feet it would be consistent with the other three corners.

Mr. Underhill stated they carried over language from the other zoning district to use here so it would be the same. Mr. Underhill stated they also had a requirement in the plan to plant ten (10) trees per 100 linear feet, so that would be in addition to the mounding.

Ms. Briscoe stated the field was very close to S.R. 605

Ms. Wiltrout stated they would need to see more.

Mr. Schell asked how many students.

Mr. Underhill stated 600.

Mr. Schell asked if they would be mostly high school students.

Mr. Underhill stated middle and high school.

Mr. Schell asked if the busing for those students would be part of the traffic study.

Mr. Underhill stated yes.

Mr. Schell stated this was a twelve (12) acre parcel but would only bring 81 jobs to the City.

Mr. Underhill stated there were lots of constraints on the parcel, perhaps without those constraints there could be more economic output.

Mr. Schell asked if there had been little interest in office use for this parcel.

Mr. Underhill stated yes, there was a lot of unusable space on the site and parking was also an issue.

Mr. Schell asked if this had been the first thing that had been able to be placed on this site in a number of years.

Mr. Rubey stated that there had been interest, but once the restrictions were identified they made this less than eleven (11) acres and the parking was difficult to fit in. Mr. Rubey stated the math did not work.

Mr. Wallace asked if there were any substantial deviations from the standard text here.

Mr. Underhill stated no, it was consistent.

Mr. Wallace asked if the text allowed permanent lighting and what would it look like.

Mr. Underhill stated they had allowed for lighting up to eighteen (18) feet tall. Mr. Underhill stated they could get into when the lights would be on as part of the FDP and noted that during early evening games, perhaps from 7:30 pm to 9:00 pm or so, the lights could be on.

Mr. Wallace asked if there would be bleachers there.

Mr. Underhill stated he could see bleachers there but he thought they would be screened. Mr. Underhill stated they could commit that the bleachers would not be visible.

Ms. Briggs asked if the bleachers would be on just one side. Ms. Briggs asked if so, then they could be on the non-road side. Ms. Briggs stated she was concerned with how close the field was to S.R. 605 and New Albany Road.

Mr. Underhill stated he did not believe there would be room on the eastern or southern sides due to mounding and planting requirements. Mr. Underhill stated if that were going to happen they could commit to it being on the western side.

Ms. Briggs asked if they could have spectators and play on the same side.

Mr. Underhill stated true.

Mr. Kirby noted that if they turned the field 75 degrees they could be in that easement a lot with bleachers on the corner and already mounded.

Mr. Rubey stated he was on the same page with the safety issues and they would take a closer look in the FDP and would coordinate.

Mr. Underhill stated this was more of a capacity study and while it could move, the question was how much could it move.

Mr. Kirby stated it could be that the field was the same width as the easement and could be lit from both edges and they would be okay.

Mr. Wallace stated the text language said permanent lighting was allowed and asked Mr. Banchevsky if this were approved, then how much control would the PC have at the time of the FDP to dictate what that would look like or to make other changes to the lighting.

Mr. Banchevsky stated he did not think they were locking the lighting location at this point.

Mr. Kirby stated no.

Mr. Banchevsky stated they could look at that at the FDP.

Mr. Kirby stated the text indicated it would be presented at the FDP.

Mr. Wallace stated yes, but it said that permanent lighting was allowed, once permission had been given, then how much control did the PC have to modify it if it was permitted.

Mr. Banchevsky stated the City had photometric standards that addressed lighting.

Ms. Wiltrout stated she was less concerned about lighting due to the commercial properties around this site.

Mr. Underhill stated there was an intent to give the PC review of the location, fixture types, etc., and they had made a commitment to no light spillage offsite. Mr. Underhill stated they wanted to leave it open for possibilities.

Mr. Schell asked where most of the students in the school were coming from.

Mr. Underhill stated New Albany, Columbus, Westerville, and he believed this quadrant of Franklin County was where its students came from.

Mr. Schell stated the students could come from anywhere.

Mr. Underhill stated that was right.

Ms. Briggs asked if the current school was K through twelve (12).

Mr. Rubey stated yes.

Ms. Wiltrout asked if this would increase the number of students.

Mr. Underhill stated they would have more capacity for students in the other facility.

Mr. Kirby stated the stream corridor language called for fifty (50) feet, measured southward from the center line of the stream. Mr. Kirby asked if the centerline of the stream was above the property line or did the stream's center line come partway through.

Mr. Rubey stated it meandered on both sides.

Mr. Underhill stated it had been difficult to write.

Mr. Kirby asked if this could be restricted to the property line going north.

Mr. Underhill stated yes.

Mr. Kirby stated the northern chunk of this, as he read it, was not protected.

Mr. Underhill stated he thought they would not be doing anything to the north of the parking lot.

Mr. Kirby asked if this would be natural or a park.

Mr. Underhill stated that was to be determined.

Mr. Rubey stated they would have an extension of the park at the eastern edge but there was not yet any planning about its look or feel. Mr. Rubey stated they would be open to staff recommendations.

Mr. Mayer stated he agreed, it should be part of the park behind it and they would be working on this.

Mr. Kirby stated they needed to choose if it would be a natural setting or a park without understory.

Mr. Rubey asked if Rose Run had no understory.

Mr. Kirby stated they had taken all but the trees from Rose Run, which made sense for an urban park. Mr. Kirby stated they should pick in this case because the language would change.

Mr. Mayer stated he agreed and said it could be a hybrid and they wanted to keep that flexibility in the text.

Mr. Underhill stated they would be happy to work with staff on that.

Mr. Kirby asked about connections to leisure public streets in the text.

Mr. Underhill stated the word 'leisure' should not be there.

Mr. Kirby stated it was a typo.

Ms. Wiltrout asked if the materials used in a contemporary suburban design had been defined.

Mr. Mayer stated he believed it was the same language in their design guidelines.

Ms. van der Zwaag read the list of materials.

Mr. Underhill stated that was a long list of materials

Ms. Wiltrout stated it had just struck her as being vague.

Mr. Kirby noted the permitted uses did not talk about religious uses and asked. Mr. Kirby asked Mr. Banchefsky if this was not mentioned because religious uses were available to all properties.

Mr. Banchefsky stated that was correct.

Mr. Kirby asked if a church wanted to rent the school on a weekend there would not be a zoning issue.

Mr. Banchefsky stated that was correct.

Mr. Kirby asked if members of the public had any comments or questions.

Mr. Craig Srba, 6837 East Walnut Street, asked how many students would attend.

Mr. Rubey stated 600.

Mr. Srba noted it would have a soccer field and asked how many people would be there during a soccer game.

Mr. Rubey stated the soccer field shown was conceptual.

Mr. Srba asked if 600 students would be okay with the parking available.

Mr. Rubey stated yes, there would be sufficient parking for students and for meets and games.

Mr. Srba stated there was a lot of traffic at the intersection of Walnut Street and S.R. 605 in the morning and evening. Mr. Srba stated he believe it would be difficult to slow down. Mr. Srba asked if there might be a roundabout at Walnut Street and S.R. 605 as traffic at 20 MPH would otherwise lead to a traffic back up.

Mr. Kirby stated he understood.

Mr. Srba asked how the school was funded.

Mr. Underhill stated it was a charter school funded through state vouchers.

Mr. Srba asked if there would be a public tax increase so he would pay more.

Mr. Underhill stated no.

Mr. Srba stated okay.

Moved by Mr. Kirby to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record for ZC-105-2021, seconded by Ms. Wiltrout. Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby, yea; Ms. Wiltrout, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

Moved by Mr. Kirby to approve ZC-105-2021 based on the findings in the staff report, with the conditions listed in the staff report and also the following conditions:

1. Best efforts to provide cross access easement to the property to the west;
 2. Bleachers, if present, will be screened;
 3. The stream corridor is fifty (50) feet on each side, limited to the lot line;
- seconded by Ms. Briggs. Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Ms. Wiltrout, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

Other Business

Mr. Kirby asked if there were any Other Business.

Mr. Mayer stated none from staff.

Poll Members for Comment

None.

Mr. Kirby adjourned the meeting at 8:04 p.m.

Submitted by Josie Taylor.

APPENDIX



Planning Commission Staff Report November 15, 2021 Meeting

CORNERSTONE ACADEMY ZONING AMENDMENT

LOCATION: 7270 New Albany-Condit Road (PID: 222-001945)
APPLICANT: Cornerstone Academy c/o Aaron Underhill, Esq.
REQUEST: Zoning Amendment
ZONING: Limited General Employment (L-GE) to Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD)
STRATEGIC PLAN: Employment Center
APPLICATION: ZC-105-2021

Review based on: Application materials received on September 21, 2021, October 14, 2021, and November 2, 2021.

Staff report completed by Anna van der Zwaag, Planner

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests review and recommendation to City Council to rezone 11.751+/- acres from Limited General Employment (L-GE) to Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) at 7270 New Albany-Condit Road. This application proposes to create a new zoning district to be known as the Cornerstone Academy Zoning District to permit the development and operation of a public charter school facility and related improvements.

The proposed use outlined in the zoning text is limited and will permit the development of primary, intermediate, and secondary schools, with supporting ancillary uses. The site is located in the Engage New Albany 2020 strategic plan Employment Center future land use district.

This application is solely for rezoning the site. A preliminary site plan and architectural renderings were submitted with this application but are subject to final review and approval as part of a final development plan application that will be evaluated by the Planning Commission at a later date.

The Rocky Fork-Blacklick Accord reviewed this application on October 21, 2021 and the motion to approve the application passed by a 9-0 vote.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The site is located at 7270 Central College Road and consists of one parcel. The site is currently undeveloped. Neighboring uses and zoning districts include Office Campus District, Limited General Employment, Agriculture, and Infill Planned Unit Development. The site does not directly abut any residential parcels; however, there is a home located in the agricultural zoned property located immediately to the northeast of the site across New Albany-Condit Road. Subarea "B" of the

Nottingham Trace subdivision is located on the north side of the property. This subarea is slated for commercial development at a later date. Reserve “C” of the Nottingham Trace subdivision is located diagonally to the northwest of the site and includes 23.7 acres of parkland.

III. PLAN REVIEW

Planning Commission’s review authority of the zoning amendment application is found under C.O. Sections 1107.02. Upon review of the proposed amendment to the zoning map, the Commission is to make recommendation to City Council. Staff’s review is based on City plans and studies, zoning text, and zoning regulations. Primary concerns and issues have been indicated below, with needed action or recommended action in underlined text.

A. New Albany Strategic Plan

The Engage New Albany 2020 Strategic Plan lists the following development standards for the Employment Center:

1. No freeway/pole signs are allowed.
2. Heavy landscaping is necessary to buffer these uses from adjacent residential areas [a landscaping plan can be submitted at a later date].
3. Plan office buildings within context of the area, not just the site, including building heights within development parcels.
4. All office developments are encouraged to employ shared parking or be designed to accommodate it.
5. All office developments should plan for regional stormwater management.
6. All associated mechanical operations should be concealed from the public right-of-way and screened architecturally or with landscape in an appealing manner.
7. Any periphery security should integrate with the existing landscape and maintain and enhance the character of the road corridor.
8. Combined curb cuts and cross-access easements are encouraged.
9. The use of materials, colors, and texture to break up large-scale facades is required.
10. Maximum building height is 80’.
11. Streetscape Roadway Character Classification is Business Park for New Albany Road East and Business Park Transitional for New Albany-Condit Road (see Table 1, below).
12. Parking should be located in rear of building and shared parking.

B. Use, Site, and Layout

1. *The proposed text rezones 11.751+/- acres that is currently zoned as Limited General Employment (L-GE). There is one parcel within the proposed zoning district which is currently undeveloped. Additionally, PUD texts allow for flexibility in design and uses.*
2. A school impact statement has been submitted. The applicant states that the school will benefit the NAPLSD by providing an alternative school to attend for students who live within the NAPSLD. Therefore, it has potential to reduce the pressure on the district’s capacity and have a positive financial impact on the NAPLSD.
3. While the school operates as an institutional use rather than an employment center/office use, the school is estimated to generate 81 jobs. As a school, the facility will also likely generate different traffic peaks in the afternoon than the adjacent office uses thereby lessening its impacts on the public streets.
4. The zoning text allows primary, intermediate, and secondary schools, along with ancillary uses such as auditoriums, cafeterias, administrative offices, outdoor recreational fields, open space, and playgrounds.
5. A stream is located along the northern boundary of this property. As such, the zoning text establishes a Stream Corridor Protection Zone a minimum of 50 feet in width extending southward from the centerline of the stream matching the city codified ordinance requirements.

6. The zoning text prohibits permanent sports field netting.
7. The applicant is proposing the following setbacks.

Zoning Boundary	Required Setbacks Proposed in the Text	Notes
New Albany-Condit Road/State Route 605 (Eastern Boundary)	125 foot building and pavement from the right-of-way	The New Albany Strategic Plan recommends at least 100' of setbacks beyond the right-of-way. The city's Design Guidelines & Requirements require that a new building's site shall take account of precedent set by adjacent buildings. This setback is consistent with neighboring properties.
New Albany Road East (Southern Boundary)	125 foot building and pavement from the right-of-way	The New Albany Strategic Plan recommends at least a 50' setback beyond the right-of-way. The 125' setback is consistent with the Research and Innovation Campus Design & Landscape Standards, and is also consistent with neighboring properties.
Northern Boundary	25 foot building and pavement setback and 50 foot Stream Corridor Protection Zone	Exceeds C.O. 1153.04 (c) for the General Employment district which requires at least 25 foot rear yard.
Western Boundary (Not adjacent to right-of-way)	25 foot building and pavement setback	Matches C.O. 1153.04 (c) for the General Employment district which requires at least 25 foot side yard.

C. Access, Loading, Parking

1. The zoning text states that vehicular access to and from this zoning district shall be permitted from New Albany-Condit Road and New Albany Road East. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be completed by the developer and submitted for review, approval, and acceptance by the city traffic engineer no later than the time of filing a final development plan application to determine if full access drives or RI/RO only are permitted. The TIS will also determine if and where right and left turn lanes may be required to minimize traffic back-ups.
2. The city's parking code section C.O. 1167.05(c)(2) states that public or private schools are required to have a minimum of three parking spaces for each classroom or one for each five seats in the main auditorium, whichever is greater. The text states that a minimum of 205 parking spaces will be provided on the site and that, should an expansion of the building occur in the future, additional parking shall be provided at the minimum rate of 3 parking spaces for each additional classroom or 1 parking space for each 5 seats in a new auditorium, whichever is greater. These zoning text requirements are compatible with the city's codified ordinances. Compliance with parking standards shall be reviewed with the final development plan.
3. The text states that a private drive shall be provided in the northern and western portions of the site which generally runs parallel to the northern boundary line and then turns and runs generally parallel to the western boundary. This private drive shall be the primary route used for bus traffic and may also be used by other vehicles. A bus lane shall be provided adjacent to

- the west side of the building to allow for student drop-off and pick-up while not impacting the flow of other traffic interior to the site. Another private drive shall connect to the first one in a loop configuration running along the south and east of the building.
4. The text states that an eight foot wide leisure trail shall be provided along New Albany-Condit Road (leisure trail is already in existence along New Albany Road East). In addition, the applicant is also providing a leisure trail from New Albany-Condit Road along the stream corridor on the north end of the site, providing additional connections to the parkland to the northwest of the property.
 5. The text commits to providing a clear and defined route of pedestrian and bicycle ingress and egress between buildings and the public street network and adjacent leisure trail.

D. Architectural Standards

1. The text states that Architecture for buildings in this zoning district shall be governed by the requirements of the City's Design Guidelines and Requirements for Institutional and Civic Buildings.
2. The text requires a maximum building height of 65 feet for primary structures, and buildings shall be no more than two stories.
3. Service areas and loading docks shall be fully screened from the view of public rights-of-way.
4. The text states that building designs shall not mix architectural elements or ornamentation from different styles, and all building elevations shall be designed to be compatible with each other.
5. The text states that building materials shall be appropriate for contemporary suburban designs and avoid overly reflective surfaces. Permitted materials include brick, brick veneer, stone, stone veneer, concrete, aluminum, metal, glass, stucco, and cementitious fiberboard. Reflective or mirrored glass shall be prohibited. The primary masonry color will be earth tones of light and medium sand and/or gray and other façade materials shall be darker in color to provide design interest and contrast.
6. All roof-mounted equipment shall be screened on all four sides.

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

1. The text states that a landscaping plan shall be submitted with a final development plan application for review by the Planning Commission. Landscaping in this zoning district shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the landscaping plan that is approved by the Planning Commission.
2. The text states that a four-board horse fence shall be installed along New Albany-Condit Road and New Albany Road East.
3. The zoning text states that a landscape treatment consisting of an average of 10 trees per 100 lineal feet of road frontage shall be installed and maintained along State Route 605 and New Albany Road East within a distance of 55 feet from the right-of-way. These trees shall consist of a mix of deciduous and evergreen species that are native to Ohio, with the locations, number, and spacing to be reviewed as part of a final development plan.
4. The zoning text requires mounding along both New Albany Road E and New Albany-Condit Road. The mounding shall have a slope not to exceed 6:1 on the side facing the public street. The mound shall be a minimum of 3 feet and a maximum of 12 feet in height, and its design shall be reviewed as part of a final development plan. 70% of required trees shall be planted on the street side of the mound, and no trees shall be located within the upper quartile crest of the mound.
5. The text states that interior landscaping within paved parking areas shall be a minimum of five percent (5%) of the total area of the parking lot pavement. The landscaped areas shall be arranged in such a manner so as to visually break up large expanses of pavement and provide landscaped walking paths between parking lots and the main buildings. These text requirements are consistent with C.O. 1171.06(a).

F. Lighting & Utilities

1. The text states that a lighting plan shall be submitted with a final development plan application for review by the Planning Commission. Lighting in this zoning district shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the lighting plan that is approved by the Planning Commission.
2. The text states that all parking lot lighting shall be cut-off type fixtures and down cast. No lighting from this site shall spill onto any adjacent property. Parking lot lighting shall be from a controlled source in order to prevent light from spilling beyond the boundaries of the site. All such lighting shall be of the same light source type and style.
3. All parking lot light poles shall be black or New Albany green and constructed of metal. Light poles shall not exceed 18 feet in height.
4. No permanent colored lights or neon lights shall be used on the exterior of any building. Uplighting of buildings shall be prohibited.
5. All security lighting, when used must be a motion-sensor type system.
6. Security lighting, when provided, shall be of a motion-sensor type.
7. The text states that permanent lighting of sports fields shall be permitted, provided that no light spillage shall be permitted onto adjacent properties or rights-of-way. Specifications for light poles and fixtures shall be presented for review and approval as part of a final development plan. Light poles for lighting sports fields shall not exceed 18 feet in height unless otherwise approved as part of a final development plan based on operational needs for the field(s) and a demonstration by the applicant that the increased height will not materially and negatively impact adjacent properties.
8. All new utilities that are installed in this zoning district shall be located underground.

F. Signage

1. The text states that final details for all signs shall be submitted with a final development plan application for review by the Planning Commission.
2. The text states that one wall sign shall be permitted on the southern-facing elevation of the school building, and one wall sign shall be permitted on one of the eastern-facing elevations of the building. These signs shall identify the school and may include the school's logo.
3. The text states that Secondary wall signs shall be permitted to identify uses within the building to promote wayfinding. These signs shall be placed where architecturally appropriate (as determined by the Planning Commission as part of its review of a final development plan). Such signs shall be of a smaller size and installed at a shorter height than other permitted wall signage.
4. A ground sign shall be permitted at the vehicular access point into the site along New Albany-Condit Road and at the vehicular access point along New Albany Road East.
5. Directional and wayfinding signage shall be permitted internally within this zoning district as permitted by the Codified Ordinances. The applicant shall provide a plan for designs and locations of such signs for review by the Planning Commission as part of a final development plan application.

IV. ENGINEER'S COMMENTS

The City Engineer, E.P. Ferris reviewed the proposed rezoning application and provided the following comments. Staff recommends a condition of approval that these comments are addressed, subject to staff approval. .

1. Provide a Traffic Study to evaluate left turns into the site. The study shall determine what roadway striping modifications are required to support the project and how traffic signal operations at the SR 605 intersection may be impacted.
2. Show the Stream Corridor Protection Zone and 100 year flood plain limits on the site plan in accordance with this exhibit. Prohibit encroachments of any kind within these areas.

3. Refer to Exhibit B. Show, dimension and label the Instrument Numbers of the recorded sanitary sewer easements on the site plan. Limit encroachments within these areas.
4. Where not already provided, we recommend that a minimum of 50' of public r/w as measured from roadway centerline be dedicated along all parcel frontages.
5. Add the Instrument Number for the existing gas easement that bisects the site and contact gas company representatives to obtain preliminary approval for the project.
6. Provide a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for review and approval. Determine where proposed full access drives may need to be modified to RI/RO only and where right and left turn lanes may be required to minimize traffic back-ups. The TIS should consider peak period trip characteristics for what's currently being proposed and all future expansions.
7. Provide 20 MPH school zone signage, flashing beacons, etc. along all frontages and provide associated pavement marking improvements.
8. Provide more information regarding internal traffic circulation for busses and parent drop off vehicular traffic.
9. Provide more information regarding traffic and parking associated with special events.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Basis for Approval:

Staff are supportive of the proposed rezoning. The primary challenge of the site is the location of the 110' gas easement which runs diagonally from the northeast to southwest corner of the site and bisects the site. No development can occur in this easement, other than access drives which must cross the easement precisely at 90 degrees. This easement along with the large 125' building and pavement setbacks limit the size and type of development that can occur on this site.

The proposed development pattern is consistent with the surrounding built environment. The standards incorporated into Cornerstone's zoning text are compatible not only with the surrounding area, but also with the limitation text that is currently in place for the site (which will be overridden/replaced with the approval of this application). The proposed development utilizes the space available for development and leaves the remainder open for landscaping and green space. The city's landscape architect has reviewed the site and recommends the same streetscape for this site as is established on the other three corners of the New Albany-Condit Road/New Albany Road E intersection. The applicant accomplishes this by committing to provide landscaping improvements including mounding and additional trees. The applicant proposes to use the easement area and open space for soccer fields.

Additionally, staff considered the Engage New Albany 2020 Strategic Plan, which identifies this site within the Northwest Area focus area. The Plan indicated that the Northwest Area needed to be better connected to natural features and amenities. The plan also identifies the New Albany Road E/New Albany-Condit Road intersection as "an important intersection" and recommends that future development at this site be "designed as a walkable, street facing design with landscaped setbacks." In addition to the landscaping commitments previously mentioned, the applicant also committed to installing additional leisure trail along the stream corridor to the north of the site in order to build connections to natural features within the site. Additionally, the zoning text commits to providing additional pedestrian and bicycle access to the site. While the proposed use is institutional and not commercial as identified in Engage New Albany, the proposed zoning text commits to the above described standards that provide compatible landscaping, setbacks and architectural design with surrounding office development and is an appropriate use of the site.

VI. ACTION

Suggested Motion for ZC-105-2021:

Move to recommend approval to Council of the rezoning application ZC-105-2021, subject to the following conditions:

1. The City Engineer's comments are addressed, subject to staff approval.

Approximate site Location:



Source: Google Maps