

  
**New Albany Planning Commission**  
**August 15, 2022 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 7:01 p.m.

Those answering roll call:

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

Staff members present: Chelsea Nichols, Planner; Stephen Mayer, Development Services Coordinator; Jay Herskowitz, City Engineer for Mr. Ferris; Benjamin Albrecht, Interim City Attorney; and Josie Taylor, Clerk.

Mr. Kirby asked if there were any corrections to the April 18, 2022, June 6, 2022, and June 20, 2022 minutes.

Mr. Larsen noted that he was not present for the June 6, 2022 meeting but was mistakenly marked as "Present" on the minutes.

Mr. Wallace noted that on page ten (10) of the June 6, 2022 minutes his comment should only state that he referred to the numeral three.

Mr. Kirby noted that during the June 6, 2022 meeting he had mistakenly dropped a decimal place in a mental calculation and the resulting numbers he had stated of "15 to 16" should be noted on the minutes to be "150 to 160," instead. Mr. Kirby also asked that his arrival time on the June 20, 2022 meeting minutes be indicated in the discussion to clarity when he joined the meeting.

Moved by Mr. Wallace to approve the April 18, 2022 and June 20, 2022 meeting minutes as modified by Mr. Kirby's comments regarding his arrival time for the June 20, 2022 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Kirby. Upon roll call: Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Mr. Larsen, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

Moved by Mr. Wallace to approve the June 6, 2022 meeting minutes, as modified by the comments of Mr. Larsen, Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Kirby, seconded by Mr. Kirby. Upon roll call: Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Mr. Larsen, abstain. Yea, 3; Nay, 0; Abstain, 1. Motion passed by a 3-0-1 vote.

Mr. Kirby asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Agenda.

Mr. Mayer stated none from staff.

Mr. Kirby swore all who would be speaking before the Planning Commission (hereafter, "PC") this evening to tell the truth and nothing but the truth.

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

**FDM-81-2022 Final Development Plan Modification**

**Final development plan modification to allow for a building expansion and site modifications on 2.06 acres located at 5161 Forest Drive (PID: 222-004860).**

**Applicant: Carter Bean Architect LLC, c/o Carter Bean**

Ms. Nichols presented the staff report.

Mr. Kirby asked if there were any Engineering comments on this application.

Mr. Herskowitz stated that due to the right-in/right-out trees would need to be relocated and Engineering requested that the applicant coordinate with the City Arborist on that and to ensure that sight distance is not impeded.

Mr. Kirby asked if the applicant wanted to provide comments on this application.

Mr. Carter Bean, Bean Architects, discussed the application and the site. Mr. Bean noted that parking was an issue at the location, with many parking in the drop off lane, due to enrollment almost tripling. Mr. Bean also noted that the roof screening would almost disappear if a lighter color, rather than a darker color, were used for it. Mr. Bean stated a lighter color would help blend more easily into a gray Ohio sky and not draw attention to itself.

Mr. Kirby asked if that meant he was camouflaging the roof screening against the sky rather than the building.

Mr. Bean stated right.

Mr. Kirby asked what lighting effect was simulated on the presentation because lighting would be important as to whether this worked or not. Mr. Kirby asked if the net lighting effect that was simulated here was for a partly cloudy day or if the building and roof shown were lit in the same way.

Mr. Bean stated the two were lit the same.

Mr. Kirby asked if that reflected a sun which created hard or delineated shadows or a cloudy day with softer shadows.

Mr. Bean stated they were pretty distinct shadows. Mr. Bean stated he felt the question was how much of a direct ray versus ambient lighting was being shown.

Mr. Kirby noted he was an amateur photographer and asked what type of day was being modeled. Mr. Kirby noted that while pictures did not lie, pictures could be used to lie.

Mr. Bean stated he was not sure what the settings had been.

Mr. Kirby stated okay.

Mr. Schell asked if once the screening was up its color could be changed.

Mr. Bean stated it could be changed. Mr. Bean stated everything was based on the original building.

Mr. Schell said he had asked about the screening.

Mr. Bean stated no, the screening was pre-finished and what had been used on the original building was an off white or almond color, not white, to mask the brick. Mr. Bean said the brick could not be seen.

Mr. Kirby stated unless one was in the hotel next door.

Mr. Bean stated, yes, or the hotel.

Mr. Larsen asked if the applicant was proposing using the building color for screening.

Mr. Bean stated yes.

Mr. Larsen stated he agreed with Mr. Bean on the lighter color and asked if he was proposing that the screening be the same, or similar, color to the existing building.

Mr. Bean said yes.

Mr. Larsen said that made more sense as it would disappear more.

Mr. Bean stated he would hate to see a dark line across the top of the additions.

Mr. Wallace stated he was skeptical that the parents now parking in the drop off lane would use the extra parking spaces and thought the parking issues might be exacerbated. Mr. Wallace asked why the building would have only a second floor in the new additions, why not have both a first and second floor across the entire, larger building and match the characteristics of the existing building.

Mr. Bean stated that was due to the need for parking.

Mr. Wallace asked if it was only for parking.

Mr. Bean stated yes, having a first floor there would block parking spots and drive aisles.

Mr. Larsen asked if the applicant needed the seven (7) spaces as the text said the current parking was adequate.

Mr. Bean stated yes, they would like the additional spaces.

Mr. Larsen asked if there could be two (2) stories on just one (1) side of the building, hold parking flat from where it is today, and also maintain the current architectural style.

Mr. Bean stated the owner wanted the studios to correlate to the ages of students using that side of the building.

Mr. Larsen stated it was then also about the use of the building.

Mr. Bean stated yes. Mr. Bean said the additions were designed to make the whole look like a repurposed, industrial building.

Mr. Kirby asked what the height under the additions would be.

Mr. Bean stated it would be roughly twelve (12) feet, but the grade climbed up toward the northeast corner, which was also why the right-in/right-out was on the southeast corner, to allow for rescue vehicles if needed. Mr. Carter noted the fire department had been okay with this.

Mr. Kirby stated okay, that was where he was going with his question, as at twelve (12) feet there was a truck hazard. Mr. Kirby asked if it went over the drive aisles.

Mr. Bean yes.

Mr. Kirby asked if clearance markers would be placed anywhere.

Mr. Bean stated they would have signage where vehicles would be inbound from the shared curb cut with the hotel.

Mr. Kirby asked if they would have narrow posts so as to have less intrusion into the parking spaces.

Mr. Bean stated they would have a two (2) foot by two (2) foot concrete base to protect the columns.

Mr. Kirby asked how high up the concrete base went.

Mr. Bean stated thirty (30) inches.

Mr. Wallace asked if the current pictures did not show the wider support structures that were talked about.

Mr. Bean asked if he referred to that recommended by the City Architect.

Mr. Wallace asked if the width was only at the base, not all the way up.

Mr. Bean stated right.

Mr. Wallace asked if originally the columns had been narrow all the way down.

Mr. Bean stated no.

Mr. Kirby asked if staff wanted a post that was wider where it met the floor of the addition.

Mr. Mayer stated it was the steel column itself, not the concrete base or foundation.

Mr. Wallace asked Mr. Mayer to show him.

Mr. Mayer stated that the City Architect had wanted the columns to be doubled or wider and illustrated this on the presentation.

Mr. Wallace asked if the presentation showed what was wanted or what was originally proposed.

Mr. Mayer stated it showed what had been originally proposed.

Mr. Wallace asked what it would look like if this was approved and the applicant agreed with the staff conditions.

Mr. Bean stated it would either have a double column, meaning two (2) columns, or, as an alternative, they could use the two (2) foot by two (2) foot concrete and take it all the way up to support the columns. Mr. Bean stated he did not think that would look as good.

Mr. Wallace stated that a couple of approaches could be taken to satisfy staff's concern.

Mr. Bean stated yes.

Mr. Wallace stated he assumed Mr. Bean would accept staff's condition.

Mr. Bean stated yes, if enforced.

Mr. Kirby stated the larger columns might change the aesthetic and make it look less inviting and more like a parking garage.

Mr. Wallace stated he was not a fan of this.

Mr. Kirby asked if the applicant was going for an open area that would allow better sight and be safe to park.

Mr. Bean stated yes.

Mr. Wallace stated he meant no disrespect, but he felt this was something he had been seeing for a couple of years, people trying to put more stuff on less property. Mr. Wallace stated this was an issue, although he did want to support a successful business.

Mr. Bean stated he understood and noted he had spoken with the owner regarding other properties, but the owner loved this building.

Mr. Wallace stated it was a beautiful building but he was not sure about this.

Mr. Schell stated his daughter had been a student at the school prior to the pandemic and even then, parking was difficult. Mr. Schell said that two (2) stories on both sides would not work well and people would have trouble getting around or parking. Mr. Schell said he also felt that seven (7) more spaces might not be enough going forward and additional parking solutions would be needed.

Mr. Larsen stated there might be other options, such as adding another column that would then be more symmetrical and look more stable or if they did a two (2) story addition on only one side.

Mr. Kirby stated that would intrude into the drive aisle.

Mr. Larsen stated it would not with the additional entrance.

Mr. Bean stated they would lose all of the parking on the eastern end of the building.

Mr. Larsen stated they would lose that area, but could then build it into the treed area shown on the presentation.

Mr. Kirby stated the footprint of the new additions appeared to be eating into part of the drive aisle and a two (2) story design would not permit drivers to get under it.

Mr. Larsen stated he believed his suggestion would create a separate parking area rather than having to drive through the same space.

Mr. Bean stated they would lose eleven (11) spaces.

Mr. Larsen stated they would lose eleven (11) spaces but showed on the presentation screen where twelve (12) spaces could be added and then an additional spot also, so they would still be plus two (2) spaces.

Mr. Bean stated no, there were now proposed an additional seven (7) spaces and that option would lose all of those spaces

Mr. Larsen stated he believed that would lose three (3) spaces, perhaps.

Mr. Bean stated that would be a net loss of five (5) spaces he thought.

Mr. Larsen stated it was hard to get those in there, going to Mr. Wallace's point on this issue.

Mr. Shull stated the report indicated that the two (2) columns looked spindly in comparison to the building and defied the laws of physics. Mr. Shull asked if the building was structurally sound or was it just due to the look of the design.

Mr. Mayer stated it was more of a look and the City Architect felt there should be more columns.

Mr. Kirby asked how far apart the columns were.

Mr. Bean stated roughly 24 feet.

Mr. Kirby stated it was close then to the thirty (30) feet on center industrial buildings normally used.

Mr. Shull asked if the columns, with some type of connection, such as those used on elevated railways in Chicago, could be an alternative that was more substantial while keeping to only one (1) column.

Mr. Bean stated also the door swings for cars.

Mr. Shull stated yes, exactly.

Mr. Mayer stated there were many designs that could be used to address the cantilever.

Mr. Wallace asked if they could add a third floor.

Mr. Bean stated they had discussed that but the footing and columns were not there for a third floor.

Mr. Wallace asked if it could be retrofitted.

Mr. Bean stated it would not be cost effective.

Mr. Wallace stated it was cost prohibitive.

Mr. Carter stated it would also shut down the business.

Mr. Wallace asked what the square footage of the original building was.

Mr. Bean stated 18,756 square feet and then each addition added another 3,000 square feet, so an additional 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Wallace asked what was the square footage of the top floor.

Mr. Bean stated 9,000 square feet.

Mr. Wallace stated okay.

Mr. Kirby stated one could look at the building and divide it into thirds with each floor then having 3,000 square feet and then two (2) more 3,000 square foot areas on the ends. Mr. Kirby noted he did not have a problem with the architecture.

Mr. Larsen stated he also liked the architecture.

Mr. Bean asked if the PC had seen the architectural justifications.

Ms. Nichols stated that had been included in the packet.

Mr. Larsen stated he struggled with the floating feeling of it.

Mr. Kirby stated that if the column that was near to the existing building could be further out ...

Mr. Larsen stated they might take one column here but added a second here

Mr. Bean asked it that was three (3) columns.

Mr. Kirby asked if three (3) columns were even needed if the existing column on the building line would be pulled and then cantilevered it the same way Mr. Bean was already doing it.

Mr. Bean stated interesting.

Mr. Kirby stated Mr. Bean could then have windows hanging over the edge with two columns in the middle.

Mr. Bean stated that was a good thought.

Mr. Kirby stated they would be symmetric and load bearing.

Mr. Bean stated he liked it.

Mr. Wallace asked which column he was discussing.

Mr. Kirby stated that if one of the columns, which was currently hidden was moved, it would remove the floating feeling.

Mr. Wallace stated he was bothered by there not being a column toward the edge of the building due to the need for the drive aisles.

Mr. Bean stated the columns were the same size, twelve by fourteen (12x14), and they could cantilever in both directions.

Mr. Kirby stated if it were a freestanding building it would be symmetric.



Mr. Larsen stated that would work.

Mr. Kirby asked if the columns did not change in size, but changed in visibility, such as if they were not all gray, could they use color alone for visual impact so the columns would be noticeable.

Mr. Mayer stated he would need to defer to the City Architect to determine if color met with the spirit and intent of what he wanted.

Mr. Kirby stated only just a bit of color difference might work. Mr. Kirby asked if the outer columns were flush with the outer edge.

Mr. Bean stated yes.

Mr. Kirby asked if they were not in the shadow of the building and were lit.

Mr. Bean stated yes.

Mr. Kirby stated they were then in full sunlight and only the inner columns would go away.

Ms. Nichols stated that the condition in the staff report was not only to use double columns but also for another design to lessen the building floating and had been left open ended for another solution. Ms. Nichols stated that if the PC wanted another solution it was open to work with the City Architect.

Mr. Larsen stated he was concerned if might be too open ended the way it was worded and he would not be comfortable. Mr. Larsen stated he preferred Mr. Kirby's suggestion.

Mr. Wallace stated he felt the approval should have fairly specific guidelines for where the PC thought the design should go.

Mr. Kirby asked Mr. Schell how he felt about moving the columns out.

Mr. Schell stated he was okay with that. Mr. Schell stated he felt this was a good way to help keep a successful business in New Albany.

Mr. Kirby asked PC members their opinions on the building screening colors.

Mr. Larsen stated he preferred a lighter color, such as the applicant had suggested, a light gray.

Mr. Kirby asked if others had comments on the color of the screening for the rooftop mechanicals.

Mr. Wallace stated none, only to make sure to add that the approval of staff or City Architect is added to any condition.

Mr. Kirby asked the applicant if he would prefer the PC vote or table this matter.

Mr. Bean asked if he could hear what the conditions were being revised to be.

Mr. Kirby stated the screening would be a lighter color subject to staff approval, the two (2) story design would bring out the inner columns to make a balanced pair of columns that were visible and would be subject to the approval of the City's Architect. Mr. Kirby asked what would happen if the City and the applicant could not agree.

Mr. Mayer stated it would go back before the PC.

Mr. Kirby stated okay.

Mr. Shell asked if there were two (2) other conditions.

Mr. Kirby noted those were part of the engineering comments, which was then the third condition. Mr. Kirby asked if the applicant had any problems with the Engineering comments.

Moved by Mr. Kirby to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record for FDM-81-2022, seconded by Mr. Larsen. Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Larsen, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

Moved by Mr. Kirby to approve FDM-81-2022 based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions listed in the staff report as modified by the following three conditions:

1. Screening of the roof top mechanicals will be in a lighter color subject to staff approval (which includes the approval of the City Architect);
  2. The inner columns under the additions would be brought out to be even so there would be a balance of the columns that were roughly one window in on each side, subject to staff approval (which includes the approval of the City Architect);
  3. Applicant shall comply with engineering comments in the staff report,
- seconded by Mr. Wallace. Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Wallace, no; Mr. Schell, yea; Mr. Larsen, yea. Yea, 3; Nay, 1; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 3-1 vote.

Mr. Wallace stated he voted no because this was another case where too much was being done on a property which required the PC to sacrifice good design for functional purposes.

Mr. Bean stated the applicant that was listed on the staff report was wrong and he wanted to note that.

Ms. Nichols stated thank you.

### **Other Business**

Mr. Kirby asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Mayer stated no. Mr. Mayer introduced Ms. Nichols as a new City Planner to the PC.

**Poll Members for Comment**

(No response.)

Mr. Kirby adjourned the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

Submitted by Josie Taylor.

# APPENDIX



## Planning Commission Staff Report August 15, 2022 Meeting

---

### NEW ALBANY BALLET FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN MODIFICATION

---

LOCATION: 5161 Forest Drive (PID: 222-000347).  
APPLICANT: J. Carter Bean Architect LLC  
REQUEST: Final development plan modification to allow for a building expansion and site modifications on 2.06 acres.  
ZONING: Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) Canini Trust Corp subarea 8a  
STRATEGIC PLAN: Neighborhood Retail District  
APPLICATION: FDM-81-2022

Review based on: Application materials received on July 18, 2022 and August 1, 2022

*Staff report prepared by Chelsea Nichols, Planner*

---

#### I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests review and approval of a final development plan modification to allow for a 6,636 square foot expansion to the New Albany Ballet Company. The site is located within Subarea 8a of the Canini-Trust Corp I-PUD. The Planning Commission reviewed and approved the final development plan for this site at their July 20, 2015 meeting (FDP-43-2015).

#### II. SITE DESCRIPTION

The site encompasses approximately 2.06 acres located south of the Marriott Hotel, and generally east of Dairy Queen. The land also includes an existing retention basin for stormwater which was improved as part of the Woodcrest Way extension construction.

#### 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.*

### **Engage New Albany Strategic Plan Recommendations**

The Engage New Albany Strategic Plan lists the following development standards for the Neighborhood Retail future land use category:

1. Parking areas should promote pedestrians by including walkways and landscaping to enhance visual aspects of the development.

2. Combined curb cuts and cross access easements are encouraged.
3. Curb cuts on primary streets should be minimized and well-organized connections should be created within and between all retail establishments.
4. Retail building entrances should connect with the pedestrian network and promote connectivity through the site.
5. Integrate outdoor spaces for food related businesses.

**A. Use, Site and Layout**

1. The site contains an existing 18,256 square foot ballet studio. Access to the site is from Forest Drive and Woodcrest Way. The building's primary façade faces south to a private drive.
2. The proposal includes an approximate 6,000 square foot expansion to the building, installation of 7 new parking spaces, and the creation of one new right-in curb-cut.
3. The proposed setbacks on the site plan are what exists today and they will remain unchanged with the exception of the pavement being added for the new curb-cut.

**B. Access, Loading, Parking**

*Parking*

1. A ballet dance studio is not included in the city's parking code schedule of uses. Therefore, per C.O. 1167.05(f) the Planning Commission shall determine the number of parking spaces required for any use not mentioned in this section for properties located outside of the Village Center area.
2. The existing site includes 58 parking spaces (56 total with 2 loading spaces). The Planning Commission previously approved this based upon the studio owner's experience in her previous facility and the operational aspect of this use.
3. At the time of the original final development plan approval, there had been around 600 students. At the height of operation, there had been less than 18 employees. The number of students had been expected to grow by 150-200 students.
4. Over the past two years, enrollment for the facility has more than doubled. Even with the larger numbers, the amount of existing parking spaces has been sufficient, according to the applicant. However, the applicant stated that due to vehicles queuing in the drop-off area rather than utilizing parking spaces, backups sometimes occur, which disrupts circulation.
5. To resolve this circulation issue, the applicant is proposing to remove the drop-off area and replace it with 12 new, head-in parking spaces. This, in conjunction with the reconfiguring of parking fields on the east and west ends of the building, will result in a net gain of 7 parking spaces. Staff is supportive of the request to add parking as the facility will need additional spaces once the drop-off area is removed since patrons of the site utilized the existing drop-off area as parking rather than for its original intent.

*Circulation*

1. The building is centered on the north side of the site and surrounded by the parking lot, followed by the retention pond to the south. The parking area to the west of the building, along Forest Drive, currently has a dead end.
2. The site is currently accessed from two entry drives; a shared curb-cut with the Marriott off of Forest Drive and a curb-cut off of Woodcrest Way. The current request includes the installation of an additional curb cut. The applicant proposes a new right-out curb-cut on Forest Drive to create a more direct path of circulation through the site from west to east. The (two) existing curb-cuts shall remain unchanged. The City's traffic engineer reviewed site circulation and has no issues. However, they have asked that the applicant provide site distance triangles at the proposed curb cut to ensure motorist view is not obstructed.

**C. Architectural Standards**

1. The original intent of the building design is to appear as a repurposed warehouse. The existing structure incorporates white brick as the primary material, with a cast stone base. The overall

- height of the building is 32.5 feet. The existing building features four-sided architecture to provide visual interest to all sides of the building. The existing building uses a variety of techniques to break up the overall mass of the building and provide visual interest to the façade via decorative pilasters and traditional brick corbeling.
2. The proposed additions, one on each end, are approximately 39.5' x 88' for a total of 3,318 square feet apiece. This would add approximately 6,636 square feet to the existing 18,256 square foot building.
  3. As required by the zoning text, the architect has submitted a letter explaining the significant architectural features of the proposed additions to the building. For the additions, the applicant is proposing to expand upon the detailing of the modern entry element of the building. To be consistent with the original building, the proposed roofs would be flat with straight parapets. The material is to be steel and fiber cement panel with trim details. Most of the addition is solid due to the interior use of the space. The applicant intends to pattern the end walls using fiber cement paneling and trim, which are the primary finish materials for the additions. For the window, fenestration, the applicant proposes to use an aluminum storefront system with muntins to match the existing.
  4. As proposed, the application meets the Architectural Standards in section 8a.03 of the zoning text, with the exception of 8a.03(1) (Architectural Style) which requires styles to be based on traditional American styles including Georgian, Colonial, Federal and Classical Revival, Barn, or Vernacular forms that reinforce a common historic architectural vocabulary, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission.
    - a) The city architect states Industrial architecture is an American style of architecture, but one that is not specifically noted in the guidelines due to its nearly inclusive urban locations. The city architect is supportive of the industrial design. He notes that if an addition cannot be indistinguishable from the original, then creating a completely different (but complementary) aesthetic is the proper move. A more rigid industrial aesthetic is definitely complementary to a warehouse type of structure, and suits the addition well.
  5. Each wing addition is held up by 8 steel columns. The applicant states the narrow columns are purposefully designed in such a way that it would allow for the additions to look like they are “floating”.
    - a) The city architect states that the columns holding up the second story additions look spindly relative to the big mass of the floating second floor. The visual mass of a second-floor industrial addition appearing as if it defines the laws of physics is something that seems untraditional.
    - b) The city architect recommends that the steel columns be enlarged or the use of double columns be incorporated to offset the floating appearance. He suggests the new columns align with the existing columns and be placed 16” center-to-center to create a comfortable distance and visual separation between the two. He believes this would still allow the intended concept of a second story repurposed industrial warehouse design.
  6. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the use of double columns or another design to lessen the appearance of the building “floating” subject to the city architect approval.
  7. New rooftop mechanical equipment on the additions will be screened by louvered metal panels painted to match the color of the brick on the existing building and attached to the rooftop units so there are no roof penetrations. Should the Planning Commission approve the application, staff recommends a condition of approval that the screening for the new rooftop mechanical equipment on the additions be painted to match the color used for the building additions as opposed to the color of the brick on the existing building.

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

1. Per zoning text 8c.04(4)(a) parking lots shall be screened from rights-of-way within a minimum 36-inch-high evergreen landscape hedge or wall. The landscape plan shows a 36” shrub to screen

- the parking lot from all the public and private roads adjacent to the site. While the installation of the new curb-cut will require an adjustment of the existing junipers, this standard will still be met with the new landscape plan.
2. Codified Ordinance 1171.06(a)(3) requires one tree per 10 parking spaces. There are 58 parking spaces provided, thereby requiring six trees. The PUD zoning text 8c.04(6) requires these trees be at least 2.5 inches in caliper at installation. The originally approved plan included 6 parking lot trees. While 3 existing trees are proposed to be relocated as part of this proposal, this does not change the number of parking lot trees on the plan. This standard will still be met with the new landscape plan.
  3. With the exception of the removal of one street tree, which will not cause the landscape plan to be deficient, all other areas of the landscape plan remain unchanged and all aspects of Codified Ordinance 1171.05 are to be met.

#### **E. Lighting & Signage**

1. The proposal does not include new signage.
2. The existing site includes standard gooseneck light fixtures within the parking area. As required by the zoning text, the light fixtures do not exceed 20 feet in height. The light fixtures are a cutoff light fixture and consistent with neighboring properties.
3. The applicant proposes light fixtures on the new additions and has submitted a photometric plan which shows lighting levels are at or near zero at the property lines. The new light fixtures are cans beneath the additions, which shine directly down and do not trespass.

#### **G. Other Considerations**

### **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. Provide site distance triangles at the proposed RI/RO curb cut. Please ensure that motorist view is not obstructed.
2. Coordinate tree removal and relocations with the City Arborist.
3. The City's Traffic Engineer reviewed site circulation and has no issues.
4. We will evaluate construction details related to the proposed RI/RO curb cut and ADA requirements once detailed construction plans become available.

The engineering comments can also be found under a separate cover from the consulting City Engineer, E.P. Ferris & Associates.

### **VI. RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application as proposed. The development plan modification is consistent with the purpose, intent and standards of the zoning code and applicable I-PUD development text (Subarea 8a of the Canini-Trust Corp). The use is not changing and is appropriate for the site. While industrial architecture is not specifically noted in the guidelines due to its nearly inclusive urban locations, it is an American style of architecture. The existing building is very successfully designed warehouse and incorporates white brick as the primary material, with a cast stone base. The use of steel and glass for this expansion is complementary and appropriate given the architectural style. While this design is a clear departure from the norm, the city architect comments that the final design respects the existing structure while creating a unique vocabulary, and this should be a very positive thing for New Albany. Architectural Standards in section 8a.03 of the zoning text calls out the importance of historically accurate design. Based on the comments of the city architect, staff recommends lessening the visual weight of the entire second floor floating in space by adding or modifying the columns supporting the addition to ensure



the repurposed industrial warehouse design intent is accomplished.

## VII. ACTION

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

Move to approve final development plan application **FDM-81-2022** with the following conditions:

1. That the screening for the new rooftop mechanical equipment on the additions be painted to match the color to be used for the building additions as opposed to the color of the brick on the existing building.
2. The use of double columns or another design to lessen the appearance of the building “floating” is required, subject to the city architect approval.

### Approximate Site Location:



Source: Google Earth