

  
**New Albany Planning Commission**  
**November 7, 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 7:04 p.m.

Those answering roll call:

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

Staff members present: Stephen Mayer, Development Services Coordinator; Chris Christian, Planner; Chelsea Nichols, Planner; Sierra Cratic-Smith, Planner; Jay Herskowitz, City Engineer for Mr. Ferris; Benjamin Albrecht, Interim City Attorney; Christina Madriguera, Deputy Clerk of Council; and Josie Taylor, Clerk.

Moved by Mr. Wallace to table the October 17, 2022 meeting minutes to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting, seconded by Ms. Briggs. Upon roll call: Mr. Wallace, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea; Mr. Larsen, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Mr. Kirby, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

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

Mr. Christian 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.)

**ZC-104-2022 Rezoning Request to rezone 32.6+/- acres located at the southwest and southeast corners of New Albany Condit Road and Central College Road from Residential Estate District (R-1) to Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) for an area to be known as the Hamlet at Sugar Run Zoning District to permit a mixed use development (PID: 222-000675, 222-000685, 222-000686, 222-000670, 222-000676, 222-000678, 222-000313, 222-000664, 222-000671, 222-000672, 222-000654, 222-000669, 222-000549, 222-000668, 222-001167, 222-000688, 222-000375, 222-000314, 222-000673, and 222-000376).**

**Applicant: Nona Master Development LLC, Attn: Yaromir Steiner and Bryan Stone c/o Aaron Underhill, Esq.**

Mr. Christian presented the staff report.

Mr. Kirby asked for the comments from Engineering.

Mr. Herskowitz stated Sugar Run, a Federal Emergency Management Agency (hereafter "FEMA") floodplain, was within the project area and Code required that a stream corridor protection plan be established. Mr. Herskowitz stated that protection plans were normally wider

than the FEMA floodplain and noted that no fill should be permitted within the stream corridor protection zone. Mr. Herskowitz stated Engineering concurred with the application's recommendations for the fifty (50) foot right of way from the center line of Central College Road and the forty (40) foot right of way from the centerline of SR 605. Mr. Herskowitz stated that if a future turn lane were required off of SR 605 to turn right onto Central College Road, then up to 55 feet of right of way may be needed. Mr. Herskowitz said all comments from the traffic engineer should be addressed.

Members of the public asked if speakers could speak more loudly.

Mr. Herskowitz provided his comments again.

Mr. Kirby asked the applicant to comment.

Mr. Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge for the applicant, discussed the history and design of the hamlet and this project. Mr. Underhill noted they had worked to meet the City's requirements and Strategic Plan. Mr. Underhill stated the applicant had hired the consultant used by school districts for student impact projections and had found this project would yield 28 students to up to 52 students. Mr. Underhill stated the homes in this project would be about \$650,000 which was in line with recent nearby sales.

Mr. Kirby provided a description of the PC and comment process to the public at the meeting. Mr. Kirby asked if the applicant had any issues with the conditions in the staff report.

Mr. Underhill stated no.

Mr. Kirby asked if the communication from Police Chief Jones could be in writing.

Mr. Underhill stated it was written and had been provided to the PC.

Mr. Kirby stated he had not seen it.

Ms. Briggs stated she had not seen it.

Mr. Christian distributed copies of the letter to the PC and the applicant and placed extras at the back of the room for the public.

Mr. Kirby stated thank you.

Mr. Wallace stated the first time this had been reviewed a financial analysis of the benefit to the schools had been provided but that was not provided at this time. Mr. Wallace asked the applicant to comment on that.

Mr. Underhill stated that given the school capacity concerns within the community the developer had focused on the number of students this project would generate. Mr. Underhill stated there might be some more students with this project now but, given the home values and the commercial development in the hamlet, this would more than pay for itself and offer a significant positive.

Mr. Schell asked if there was a letter or communication from the superintendent regarding the project.

Mr. Underhill stated the applicant had met with the school superintendent and treasurer.

Mr. Justin Leyda, Steiner & Associates, stated they had met with the superintendent and treasurer and there had been no objections but a letter had not been submitted this time.

Mr. Schell stated a letter would be preferred.

Mr. Leyda stated he could request one.

Mr. Schell asked if subarea 5 of the hamlet opted for single family homes would that factor into the projected 52 student total.

Mr. Underhill stated yes, that 52 would be if there were single family homes there.

Mr. Leyda stated the information they provided with the 52 students had assumed single family homes would be in that subarea.

Ms. Briggs asked if the addition of single-family homes in that subarea would get them to the 52 students versus the 28 students.

Mr. Leyda stated correct.

Ms. Briggs asked what the 37 number also used in the discussion had referenced.

Mr. Leyda stated they had run different calculations based on varying yield factors. Mr. Leyda stated the new yield factors from the school's consultant found 37 and the old yield factors used in the prior proposal found 52.

Ms. Briggs stated thank you.

Mr. Larsen stated the City's numbers limited themselves to the New Albany City limits but the school district went beyond that. Mr. Larsen asked if the applicant's analysis had focused on the City limits or the school district.

Mr. Leyda stated they had looked at more than just the school district. Mr. Leyda said they had looked at the New Albany school district and portions of Gahanna.

Mr. Larsen stated great and reiterated he would like to have a letter from the school district.

Mr. Leyda stated they would request it.

Mr. Wallace stated there were some typos in the text that needed to be worked out. Mr. Wallace stated that pages 29-33 discussed types of signs and included a discussion of subarea 1. Mr. Wallace stated he believed some verbiage was missing in that area and pointed out the second sentence about multi-tenants seemed to have missing information.

Mr. Underhill stated he believed there was a period there instead of a comma.

Mr. Wallace stated they should note that areas of the text needed to be cleaned up and they could work with staff on that.

Mr. Underhill stated sure, okay.

Mr. Wallace said it also stated "relating to" and he believed it should be "sized in relation to" the architectural design.

Mr. Underhill stated okay.

Mr. Larsen noted the prior development site had a larger civic green space that was central to the community but the current site plan had the green space almost hidden within the development. Mr. Larsen said it did not feel like a part of the community. Mr. Larsen stated the plan with the green was not community friendly and asked that it be looked at again.

Mr. Leyda stated they had mimicked the form and plan created by the City plan which had emphasized terminating views into buildings and having streets lined with buildings.

Mr. Larsen stated the City had said that was just an example and did not need to be followed. Mr. Larsen suggested they think outside the box on this.

Mr. Leyda stated they could work to evolve the design and layout during the final development plan (hereafter, "FDP").

Mr. Larsen stated it could be something to consider in the preliminary plan before going down that far.

(Applause from audience members.)

Mr. Underhill stated okay.

Mr. Kirby stated that pages 20-21 discussed the riparian corridor landscape and asked what would happen to the riparian corridor, particularly to the understory, was there a plan.

Mr. Leyda stated the intent was to clean up any invasive species, leave it native where they could, and then add paths.

Mr. Kirby asked if they would leave the native understory.

Mr. Leyda stated if they could.

Mr. Kirby stated he was pleased to hear it and wanted to make the distinction between a manicured park and a natural area.

Mr. Leyda stated they were looking for more of a natural park setting.

Ms. Briggs asked if subarea 5 would also have park trails there.

Mr. Leyda asked if she meant subarea 4.

Ms. Briggs stated yes, subarea 4, which would go east of SR 605. Ms. Briggs asked if there would be separate trails also on the east side of SR 605.

Mr. Underhill stated correct.

Mr. Kirby stated page 27 talked about mulched paths.

Mr. Leyda stated correct.

Mr. Kirby asked if this was part of the flood plain

Mr. Leyda stated some of it was.

Mr. Kirby asked if was a good idea to have mulch in a flood plain.

Mr. Leyda stated they were open to other options.

Mr. Kirby stated mulch and floods were not a good mix and asked staff if they agreed.

Mr. Mayer stated the leisure trail master plan recommended an eight (8) foot wide asphalt leisure trail along stream corridors. Mr. Mayer stated staff's recommendation would be that the base trail be a paved asphalt trail.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was any problem with a narrower path.

Mr. Mayer stated not necessarily.

Mr. Kirby stated the trail should be effective and preferably not paved. Mr. Kirby asked the applicant to revisit the use of mulch. Mr. Kirby asked if staff was okay with that being subject to staff approval.

Mr. Mayer stated yes.

Mr. Kirby stated that on pages 14 and 18 it did not seem that box trucks were properly discussed. Mr. Kirby asked if by "off-road" vehicles they referred to motorized vehicles that were not highway legal but did not mean box trucks. Mr. Kirby said he believed they specifically wanted to prohibit box trucks being parked in front of units.

Mr. Underhill stated yes.

Mr. Kirby stated they could revisit that here and possible elsewhere. Mr. Kirby stated the language clean up should be subject to staff approval. Mr. Kirby stated page 32 dealing with appeals, spoke of the zoning officers as a "him" and for many years it had not be a male.

Mr. Underhill stated that was fine.

Mr. Wallace stated the gender references needed to be cleaned up.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was 100 feet of width on the riparian corridor.

Mr. Leyda stated the plan showed 185.

Mr. Kirby stated interesting, he thought it had been 100 feet.

Mr. Mayer stated multiple layers of regulations applied to Sugar Run. Mr. Mayer stated the City's base Code has a riparian corridor calling for preservation and a typical 100 feet. Mr. Mayer stated the City also had a flood plain ordinance which limited certain types of development and the applicant had also added a stream corridor protection zone.

Mr. Kirby asked if that was where the 185 came from.

Mr. Mayer stated yes.

Mr. Kirby stated there had been differentiation between the larger and smaller streams with Blacklick and Rocky Fork at 150 with Sugar Run and Rose Run at less.

Mr. Mayer stated he believed it depended on many factors.

Mr. Kirby stated that at 185 it was as large as that for Blacklick and Rocky Fork.

Mr. Mayer stated yes.

Mr. Kirby stated nice job.

Mr. Leyda stated he remembered this concern from the prior proposal.

Mr. Kirby asked about street names for way finding, particularly for the townhomes if they were not facing Central College Road or SR 605, such as those is subarea 2 without a street or road in front of them.

Mr. Mayer stated the City could work with the fire department to create street names for drives to help identify them for visitors and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Kirby stated the City of Savannah was built around squares and this area could have a square as an example.

Mr. Mayer agreed.

Mr. Kirby asked if there would be residential over retail permitted in the transition zone.

Mr. Leyda stated it would be allowed although it was not shown on the plan.

Mr. Kirby asked if this had been part of the unit calculations.

Mr. Leyda said it was not included.

Mr. Kirby stated it was allowed but not accounted for.

Mr. Leyda stated if they did then the forty (40) flats could shift over to a different location.

Ms. Briggs stated page 4 related to alleys and private drives and asked if all streets would be public except for some in subarea 3 that would be private drives.

Mr. Underhill stated it was around the parking lots in the more commercial areas with the drive aisles and the others would be public.

Ms. Briggs stated thank you.

Mr. Underhill stated they would show that on the FDP.

Ms. Briggs asked if the area on subarea 1 was part of the discussion between connections to Taco Bell and the Huntington Bank.

Mr. Underhill stated yes.

Ms. Briggs stated thank you.

Mr. Schell asked if there had been any discussions with the fire department.

Mr. Leyda stated yes.

Mr. Schell asked what the discussion and result had been.

Mr. Leyda stated they had modified the plan to provide a secondary means of egress for emergency vehicles if needed.

Mr. Kirby asked if this was in the text.

Mr. Underhill stated he believed it had been called out in subarea 3.

Mr. Christian stated it was on page 20.

Mr. Kirby asked when they would know to pull the trigger on that.

Mr. Christian stated that would be at the FDP stage.

Mr. Kirby asked if they would be speaking with the police and fire departments to have a determination when at the FDP.

Mr. Underhill stated he believed it would be required, as it usually was.

Mr. Leyda stated it just varied to where it would be located.

Mr. Kirby asked if any of the private drives bordered the edge of the development. Mr. Kirby showed one he was looking at on the presentation and asked if that was public.

Mr. Underhill asked if that was the one east/west or that (pointing to a spot on the presentation).

Mr. Kirby stated the east/west one that went to the private drive on the corner.

Mr. Underhill stated it was intended to be public and stated they would need to get some private owners to agree.

Mr. Kirby stated okay, thank you, and noted that the biggest part of the problem with private drives the PC had seen were those with different ownership where owners disagreed. Mr. Kirby

stated that having it public to the edge meant the onus was on the other side as to whether it would connect.

Mr. Underhill stated right.

Mr. Schell stated that while the applicant had noted the market for senior living had cooled, he noted that, if the market changed, senior living had increased emergency service runs. Mr. Schell asked if that issue had been discussed with the fire department.

Mr. Leyda stated he did not believe it had.

Mr. Schell asked if that could shift at any time.

Mr. Leyda stated it could, but now they were trending toward the residential option.

Mr. Schell stated thank you.

Mr. Mayer stated it would be finalized as part of the FDP.

Mr. Underhill stated they would have another level of engineering, public safety, etc., and would go through it all again at that point.

Mr. Schell stated okay.

Mr. Larsen asked whether SR 605 or Central College Road was the more major artery.

Mr. Herskowitz stated he believed SR 605 was considered more rural and Central College Road was more of a minor arterial.

Mr. Larsen stated it looked like the major entrance to this site was on SR 605 and asked if that was where it would be preferred, as that was more rural.

Mr. Herskowitz stated he believed that was correct.

Mr. Larsen stated the traffic study, on page 4, showed different unit counts than those shown on the proposed plan and stated it would be good to get an updated traffic study that mirrored the proposal.

Mr. Leyda stated yes and said that had assumed a more conservative number of single family to the south.

Mr. Larsen stated it had 32 single family there versus the six (6) shown.

Mr. Leyda stated total units was the same, just the distribution within the 188 differed.

Mr. Larsen asked to be sure the PC looked at the worst case on that. Mr. Larsen stated the prior City Council meetings on this had a lot of comments about the sense of community and scale. Mr. Larsen stated building height on primary streets was forty (40) feet and 250 feet in could be up to fifty (50) feet. Mr. Larsen stated Keswick, which this was said to be similar to, did not have the number of stories specified in the text. Mr. Larsen stated he would like to see a



number in the text, such as once there were two (2) stories the facade would have a break. Mr. Larsen stated that as written now they might be able to get three (3) stories.

Mr. Leyda stated he believed the DGRs restricted that.

Mr. Larsen stated in the text the PC had it showed nothing that restricted it.

Mr. Kirby stated sloped roofs were required in the text.

Mr. Wallace stated the DGRs were incorporated in the text.

Mr. Kirby stated some of the text included sloped roofs for some of the subareas.

Mr. Underhill stated that to the extent they had not called it out they would default to the DGRs.

Mr. Larsen stated okay.

Mr. Kirby asked staff if they wanted to add to this.

Mr. Mayer stated that was accurate, that anything that was silent in the PUD text would fall to the City Code requirements which was the DGRs.

Mr. Larsen stated the DGRs said three (3) stories and he wanted to avoid a three-story vertical surface.

Mr. Mayer stated that would be reviewed with the FDP.

Mr. Larsen stated okay, they would look at that on the FDP.

Mr. Kirby stated on subarea 2E(5), on page fourteen (14) it stated roofs shall be sloped.

Mr. Durik stated page 26 of the traffic study showed traffic increases of 30% to 70% on Central College Road and SR 605 and asked if that was accurate.

Mr. Kirby asked what did the numbers mean.

Mr. Dave Samuelson, City traffic engineer, stated he had not looked at the percentage growth and had looked at a comparison of the prior study. Mr. Samuelson stated that if he were given a few minutes he could calculate a percentage growth of the development to what currently existed.

Mr. Kirby stated that would be welcomed.

Mr. Durik stated he was not concerned with the prior presentation relative to this. Mr. Durik stated he was concerned about what this would be relative to current traffic and what kind of growth could be anticipated.

Mr. Samuelson asked if Mr. Durik wanted that information for the intersection of SR 605 and Central College Road.

Mr. Durik stated in the intersection and across the development. Mr. Durik stated south of there, where the entry points were onto SR 605, and their impact there versus at the intersection.

Mr. Samuelson stated he would get the percentage at Central College Road at the Discover site, SR 605 at Central College Road, and also down at Snider Loop.

Mr. Durik stated that was fine, a good starting point. Mr. Durik stated that the school numbers varied from 28 to 52 depending on what would be done in subarea 5. Mr. Durik asked if there had been any consideration regarding the southern portion of subarea 5 or the eastern portion of SR 605 being a 55 and older community.

Mr. Leyda stated they did not plan for that as a deed restriction of any sort, but were looking at a product type geared toward a 55 plus customer.

Mr. Durik asked if there was a reason not to make it a 55 and older community.

Mr. Underhill stated the administrative costs at this size was difficult to do.

Mr. Durik stated he disagreed, but would not argue it.

Mr. Underhill stated okay.

Mr. Durik stated that regarding the comments of creeks and natural versus manicured, he thought the standard expected would be reminiscent of what Rose Run was at this time.

Mr. Kirby asked which Rose Run.

Mr. Durik stated the Rose Run in the center of town.

Mr. Kirby stated the natural understory had been removed there.

Mr. Durik stated his point of view was that the City would be looking at something more like that.

Mr. Kirby stated it was about the community will regarding how parks were wanted. Mr. Kirby stated whether they wanted an actual natural feature or a park for the people. Mr. Kirby noted that if wildlife was wanted then the understory was critical.

Mr. Durik stated that as they got into architectural and others those things would come to bear. Mr. Durik stated some flats would be sold and others rented and asked what were the flat price points for rental.

Mr. Leyda stated in the \$2500/month range.

Mr. Durik asked about square feet.

Mr. Leyda stated they were probably in the 900 to 1,100 square foot range.

Mr. Durik asked how that compared to the town apartments in terms of rental rate per square foot.

Mr. Mayer stated he did not believe they had that data to compare at this time.

Mr. Leyda stated product of that type was generally at \$2.00 per square foot or higher at this time with some now at \$2.40 per foot.

Mr. Durik stated he was trying to understand what was meant by upscale here.

Mr. Leyda stated that from a quality perspective Market and Main were equal.

Mr. Samuelson stated that in the a.m. and p.m. the percentage increase would be basically the same. Mr. Samuelson stated that at Central College Road at the Discover site the site traffic added roughly 5% to current volumes. Mr. Samuelson said that on Central College Road and SR 605 the site also added roughly 5% or maybe a little less. Mr. Samuelson stated that at SR 605 on Snider Loop it was about a 7% increase in both a.m. and p.m.

Mr. Kirby stated thank you and called for a ten (10) minute break at 8:32 p.m.

(Meeting restarted at 8:42 p.m.)

Ms. Paula Renker stated she had lived in New Albany for seventeen (17) years, initially in the Windsor community and the initial assumption in Windsor was there would not be any children, but it had many now. Ms. Renker stated that over half of homes now had one (1) or two (2) children and noted statistics may not provide full information. Ms. Renker said the number of exits in this community seemed too low for the number of units and it seemed crowded. Ms. Renker asked how the courtyards and trails would be maintained on this site with rentals and such, would there be an HOA.

Mr. Underhill stated yes, there would be an HOA for all owners and on rental properties the owners of the rentals would be required to be in the HOA.

Mr. Kirby asked if trails outside of the right of way would be maintained by the HOA.

Mr. Underhill stated yes.

Mr. Kirby asked if trails in the right of way would be a Village issue.

Mr. Mayer stated no, those were typically maintained by HOAs or the private developer.

Mr. Kirby asked if that was in the text.

Mr. Mayer said it was in the City Code.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was a conflict with that.

Mr. Underhill stated no and noted that most developments were members of the master association of New Albany which took care of the rights of way and likely would do so here while this site's HOA would care for anything internal.

Mr. Doug Burnip, 6969 Doran Drive in Cedar Brook, appreciated the City had designed standards for hamlets, but said if there were two (2) approved hamlets then they needed to be done right.

Mr. Kirby stated only one (1) hamlet area currently existed.

Mr. Burnip stated it was more important then. Mr. Burnip said they had to go beyond just meeting the standards. Mr. Burnip stated this looked very cookie cutter and did not take advantage of the site and the design seemed to be missing. Mr. Burnip stated that current traffic on SR 605 in the morning meant that during school hours drivers got stuck for some time and this development would worsen it.

Ms. Courtney Bloech stated she lived at Wentworth Crossing, and said she had many concerns with this development and it would not benefit New Albany residents. Ms. Bloech stated the new condo development near downtown was near a space that could fit a similar development to this and it made sense to continue filling in the downtown area with similar condos, flats, and retail. Ms. Bloech said lots of downtown areas had not been filled. Ms. Bloech stated she doubted this would ever be self sustaining. Ms. Bloech said a transient community of this size also brought crime, as nearby similar communities have shown. Ms. Bloech stated residents come to New Albany due to schools and safety and this site would remove safety from its nearby residents. Ms. Bloech noted this type of community was not being entertained on the south side of SR 161 and noted the City was not protecting both sides of New Albany equally. Ms. Bloech stated the Main Street condos started at \$1.5 million but these started at half that amount. Ms. Bloech stated this was creating an economic divide in New Albany and asked that the rezoning be declined.

Ms. Caroline Solt, 5430 Snider Loop, stated she was on the Enclave's HOA Board of Trustees and she and her neighbors were vehemently opposed to this development. Ms. Solt stated this development conflicted with their property values and stated they were concerned with subarea 5. Ms. Solt stated subarea 5 was fluid and they did not know what it would be and asked that if something needed to be approved, not to approve subarea 5 until there was a true plan.

Ms. Jennifer Deibel, 5350 Snider Loop, asked about the New Albany letter dated October 25 about the traffic impact summary on page three (3). Ms. Deibel stated the recommendations indicated SR 605 needed to be widened to three (3) lanes to add left hand turn lanes and asked if SR 605 would be widened from Walton to Central College Road.

Mr. Mayer stated yes, Central College to Walton Parkway would be widened to three (3) lanes with a left hand turn into the intersections.

Mr. Kirby asked if that would be all the way down.

Mr. Mayer stated till Walton Parkway.

Mr. Samuelson stated he had recommended the entire length of SR 605 have three (3) lanes.

Ms. Deibel said that earlier it had been mentioned that forty (40) feet from the center line on SR 605 was needed but 55 feet were needed if there was a right turn lane. Ms. Deibel asked if 55 feet would be needed if there were three (3) lanes all the way down.

Mr. Samuelson stated that for three (3) lanes they recommended forty (40) feet from each side of the road. Mr. Samuelson said that at Central College Road, where a future north bound right turn lane may be needed, they thought they would need 55 feet on one side of the road.

Ms. Deibel said thank you and noted page three (3) discussed the need to coordinate with the City and the applicant on the final design of the intersection of SR 605 and Snider Loop for left hand turn concerns. Ms. Deibel asked if at that location a roundabout, a light, or only a left turn lane was being considered.

Mr. Mayer stated a roundabout or light were not warranted so it would be a stop sign going east/west. Mr. Mayer stated that as part of the FDP they would review the lining up of the medians of Snider Loop and the new development for left hand turns.

Ms. Deibel said subarea 5 was still fluid and said the site plat provided showed 24 townhomes in the subarea and it was hard to imagine what 55 units would look like. Ms. Deibel stated more facts regarding subarea 5 were needed before this could be approved. Ms. Deibel stated that subareas 4, A and B, were listed as including restrooms, recreation courts, etc. and asked where the restrooms and courts would be located.

Mr. Underhill stated that might be public park land and not up to the applicant and that would be decided at the time of the FDP.

Mr. Kirby asked if that would be outside the 100-foot zone riparian corridor.

Mr. Underhill stated right, but he said that was intended for a public park.

Mr. Schell asked Mr. Underhill to address the concerns about subarea 5.

Mr. Underhill stated they doubted 55 townhomes would be possible and stated they could reduce the number of units by some degree but wanted to leave options open and events in the City of Columbus nearby would also impact this.

Ms. Deibel stated that in subarea 4 the document listed thru trucks, food trucks, and open markets. Ms. Deibel said there did not seem to be an access road for food trucks and stated it was hard to know how they would be used. Ms. Deibel stated the unknowns with the Ohio Health property provided additional reasons to table subarea 5 until they knew more.

Mr. Underhill stated food trucks would likely be in the central green and would not be there all the time.

Mr. Kirby stated their text restricted them to having ground power there.

Mr. Underhill stated they did not want generators.

Mr. Kirk Smith, 6830 Central College Road, stated he would ask the PC to reject this rezoning. Mr. Smith stated this properly was correctly zoned at this time as an R1 that would allow some 36 units to go in which would have less impact on schools. Mr. Smith stated this asked for an additional 160 "density bomb" units in this area. Mr. Smith stated this development was not supported by Engage New Albany and had too many unknowns, such as Ohio Health, with it. Mr. Smith stated there was too much to be determined in subarea 5 and it should not be approved. Mr. Smith asked why bring this to New Albany when units across the street sat

empty. Mr. Smith stated a recent approval had included a discussion of saving trees and now this was not being discussed. Mr. Smith stated that in a prior meeting with Mr. Steiner he had been adamant about needing 400 units for economic viability and asked why this would survive now with 188 units. Mr. Smith stated he encouraged the PC not to rezone this site.

Mr. Kirby asked Mr. Underhill to speak on the economic impact on the schools of 36 units under R1 compared to this site as proposed.

Mr. Underhill stated they were the same for student generation and financially would be a net positive of hundreds of thousands of dollars from this proposed option

Mr. Wallace asked if more than 36 homes could end up being put in the site.

Mr. Underhill stated it would require rezoning, as zoned today it would be 36 single family homes.

Mr. Wallace stated someone could come in with another rezoning application and get more than 36 homes.

Mr. Underhill stated right.

Mr. Kirby stated that today they could apply for permits for 36 homes, aside from road platting.

Mr. Underhill stated right. Mr. Underhill stated Intel would make a big difference here in terms of commercial viability.

Mr. Kirby said that something like this hamlet had been envisioned for New Albany for about 25 years.

Mr. Matt McFadden, 7073 Maynard Place East, stated this did not meet the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan and he echoed Mr. Smith's views. Mr. McFadden stated New Albany residents wanted dining and parks and leisure but not density. Mr. McFadden said that south of this was the one school in New Albany and SR 605 was the road everyone north of SR 161 must take to get to the school. Mr. McFadden stated that the documents he read said it would add 225 trips per day. Mr. McFadden said there were three (3), at most four (4), exits from this development and most exited onto SR 605. Mr. McFadden stated this would add more traffic on an already busy road on which kids rode their bikes or walked to school and was a major concern. Mr. McFadden asked if Snider Loop met the requirements for a light.

Mr. Kirby asked if that could be checked if it was near having the required warrants.

Mr. Samuelson stated no.

Mr. Kirby stated that on SR 605 they needed to work with the Ohio Department of Transportation (hereafter, "ODOT") and at this time they did not find a signal was needed.

Mr. McFadden stated that during the prior project, in a meeting with Mr. Steiner, profit had been noted as an important factor. Mr. McFadden said he wondered if, given inflation and New Albany standards, could this still be built to New Albany standards and meet Steiner & Associate's profit margins. Mr. McFadden said the City center was still not fully built out. Mr.

McFadden stated he had an issue with 188 or 195 units going up here as that would be 135 students per the average student per dwelling figures, not the 28, 37, or 52 mentioned for this.

Mr. Kirby stated the answer was that most New Albany homes were single family detached homes and those that were not had a different school kid load per unit. Mr. Kirby stated this proposal used that fact to say lots of units here would not mean lots of school kids.

Mr. McFadden stated he agreed they exploited the counts.

Mr. Kirby stated the numbers were from the school.

Mr. McFadden said this was zoned R1 and that zoning was good. Mr. McFadden stated 40% of New Albany lived north of SR 161 and had one road to the school. Mr. McFadden stated this was not a location to experiment with.

Ms. Tricia Segnini, 7267 New Albany Links Drive, asked how large the Civic Green would be.

Mr. Leyda stated they did not know.

Ms. Segnini asked if would be an acre or two (2).

Mr. Leyda stated it would not be an acre and said that a point of reference would be the new park in Easton, in the extension zone, as this would be about the same size.

Ms. Nancy Alexander, 7347 New Albany Links Drive, stated she was concerned about rezoning this land. Ms. Alexander stated the schools and the low density were a draw for New Albany. Ms. Alexander stated this rezoning would change all that. Ms. Alexander stated New Albany was trying to add more congestion in an already busy part of town by adding more homes and apartments that would draw more children regardless of what the study said. Ms. Alexander asked if the applicant guaranteed \$650,000 or higher or was that only projected.

Mr. Kirby stated that they normally undershot on values.

Mr. Wallace stated Ealy Crossing had indicated \$500,000 homes but they were more than that. Mr. Wallace asked if there would be apartments here as he heard there would not be, except for the flats.

Mr. Underhill stated some flats could be sold or rented and forty (40) would be the maximum.

Mr. Wallace asked if flats were considered multi-family.

Mr. Underhill stated some were and would be in a unit together. Mr. Underhill stated townhomes would also be multifamily but units were for sale and their comps would be Keswick and Richmond Square.

Ms. Alexander asked how much of the 25% allocated for green space would be unusable.

Mr. Underhill stated most was in subarea 4 but there were pockets throughout that were hard to quantify.

Mr. Kirby asked if, at a minimum, all would be path accessible.

Mr. Underhill stated right.

Ms. Briggs stated 4.4 acres.

Ms. Alexander stated usable green space was wanted in an area developed like this. Ms. Alexander stated classrooms were full now and an influx of students placed a strain on New Albany students and they would need new schools. Ms. Alexander asked if that would mean students would still be on one campus, would they be in pods as new schools were built, how would this be handled.

Mr. Kirby stated they normally asked developers to talk to the school district on impact and predictions.

Mr. Leyda stated the school had stated they had adequate capacity for this and had supported the earlier proposal which had a higher number of units.

Ms. Alexander asked if that was based on a potential of no more than 55 new students coming in.

Mr. Leyda stated correct.

Ms. Alexander stated that was an unguaranteed projection. Ms. Alexander said that even with the traffic projections of 5% to 7% on SR 605 that would be too much and it was not safe now. Ms. Alexander stated Market Square was still unfilled and noted New Albany did not need more. Ms. Alexander asked that the site not be rezoned as people did not want more congestion or the rezoning.

Ms. Katie Tebbutt, 7353 Dean Farm Road, stated that with 188 units, two (2) cars per unit, that would be about 360 parking spaces and more for visitors and those going to the commercial sites. Ms. Tebbutt asked how they would handle parking.

Mr. Leyda stated there would be two (2) car garages for homes and townhomes, along with driveways, and there would be about 300 spaces on surface lots and should be adequate.

Ms. Tebbutt noted there was a roundabout at the Country Club area which seemed to have less traffic than SR 605 and Central College Road and asked why there would be a roundabout there but not here.

Mr. Kirby asked if they could place a roundabout here without permission from ODOT.

Mr. Mayer stated he believed they could but that was based on the amount of warrants and other applicable factors. Mr. Mayer stated they looked into this and, based on traffic and traffic flow here, it was not warranted.

Ms. Tebbutt asked why the developer was permitted to come in at 29% or so green space when the requirement was 25%.

Mr. Underhill stated they were exceeding the minimum of 25% and were doing between 28% and 30%.



Mr. Kirby stated the applicant was exceeding 2400 square feet per domestic unit.

Mr. Underhill stated there was a different set of rules for the hamlet. Mr. Underhill stated the 25% was a mix of open space and park land.

Mr. Kirby stated in lieu of the per unit.

Mr. Underhill stated that's right.

Mr. Samuelson stated the City now had control of SR 605 as the Village was now a City.

Mr. Kirby stated it was then up to the warrants.

Mr. Samuelson stated yes, and noted there was a design issue with putting a roundabout there due to a commercial drive in the area.

Mr. Kirby asked if the design issue created was for CVG.

Mr. Samuelson stated he believed that was the name.

Ms. Segnini stated they had asked about this before but had been told it was a 'no' due to ODOT, but if there was a chance, please leave room for a roundabout on SR 605 and Central College Road.

Mr. Kirby asked staff if they had the right of way.

Mr. Mayer stated he did not think the City did, but they would monitor these intersections for needed improvements.

Ms. Segnini asked if they should leave room for that regardless of what is built there.

Mr. Mayer stated the right of way today was for a signal at the intersection of SR 605 and Snider Loop but not for a roundabout.

Mr. Wallace asked how much more right of way would be needed for a roundabout.

Mr. Mayer stated a lot of factors were involved, including speed limits and this needed to be studied by an engineer for a radius determination.

Mr. Kirby stated they needed a footprint like what US 62 and Greensward had.

Mr. Leyda stated they were happy to commit the right of way for a roundabout, as long as they got credit for the open space.

Mr. Underhill noted that would cut into their open space somewhat, so they wanted to have that recognized.

Mr. Kirby asked if the right of way would be given, if requested, at a future date.

Mr. Underhill stated correct, but in the meantime, it would count as open space and park land.

Mr. Kirby stated okay and asked staff if they were okay with the amount of right of way they had on the east side of SR 605 at Snider Loop to put a roundabout there.

Mr. Mayer stated he believed so and said the only condition of approval they would recommend would be for additional right of way for a future right lane on SR 605 to turn right onto Central College Road.

Mr. Jim Lipnos, 7019 Dean Farm Road, stated he was excited about this at the other end of 161 as it was within walking distance for him. Mr. Lipnos stated he was happy to see that when the City was bringing in some 3,000 jobs at an average income of \$135,000 the city was also providing homes for them and it would be good if some of the homes hit that target price. Mr. Lipnos said he thought the rentals would be good. Mr. Lipnos stated he was in favor of it.

Mr. Alex Lowry, 7377 Dean Farm Road, asked for an updated drawing showing the turn lane on SR 605 and asked if, when that was pushed out, would it increase the density of the project.

Mr. Kirby stated it would not increase any of the densities as that was already factored in.

Mr. Lowry asked why the drawing was not up to date.

Mr. Mayer stated that would occur at the FDP stage. Mr. Mayer stated density was based on gross acreage of the property as of today.

Mr. Lowry asked which days was the traffic study done and was it done on days with no school.

Mr. Samuelson stated it had been done on September 27th, a Tuesday, and it had been cloudy with temperatures in the forty (40) to low sixties (60s).

Mr. Lowry asked if traffic studies like this were normally done on one day.

Mr. Samuelson stated that for traffic impact studies they typically collected data on days considered to be representative.

Mr. Lowry stated that as Market Square had not flourished and other shopping centers also had empty buildings, this would just make it harder to fill those. Mr. Lowry stated it should stay R1.

Mr. Kirby stated that the New Albany Company owned most of the Market Square land not yet sold and also owned this site and said this would not be a problem for the Village Center. Mr. Kirby stated this was hearsay, but was said in a public meeting and could be on the record.

Mr. Lowry stated he did not doubt that opinion, but the buildings remained empty and school class sizes were very large. Mr. Lowry stated flats or apartments would bring a lot of students.

Ms. Char Steelman, 6840 Cedar Brook Glen, stated she appreciated they had decreased the density but this was not a mini Easton and noted Mr. Steiner had said that was what he was trying to create here. Ms. Steelman said all were concerned about density, building heights that were still not clear, confusion about multi-family, the flats, and apartments. Ms. Steelman said she was not concerned about the quality of tenants but about the density of this area and what it would bring to this intersection. Ms. Steelman stated this was the last area of New Albany,

north of SR 161, that was still R1 and she did not think this project was supported by those in the area and it should not be rezoned.

Mr. Kirby stated R1 was the least protective of that green corridor and, aside from the floodplain, an R1 development could strip all of that.

Ms. Steelman stated she agreed with that and she lived on Sugar Run and was very protective of it. Ms. Steelman asked if they needed to give access to every natural feature in the City. Ms. Steelman stated human impact did not need to occur.

Mr. David Gerhardt, 6908 Central College Road, stated he and his wife were a half mile east of the hamlet. Mr. Gerhardt asked that a larger print of the development be put on the screen. Mr. Gerhardt asked if the area shown on the left of the screen, just above the townhomes, was the park. Mr. Gerhardt pointed out the area on the screen.

Mr. Christian stated yes.

Mr. Gerhardt asked how many acres that was.

Mr. Christian stated that subarea in general was about 4.4 acres.

Mr. Gerhardt asked if that included the road and everything.

Mr. Christian stated that included that subarea which was a boundary drawn, generally, around the creek area, so did not include the road.

Mr. Gerhardt stated that did seem to qualify as a park. Mr. Gerhardt said if this was approved the City would be lowering its standards. Mr. Gerhardt stated that given that SR 161 comes to a stop and cars then take Central College Road now, what did the impact studies say about this increase when Amazon and Intel traffic were added. Mr. Gerhardt stated traffic had now doubled and was a racetrack on Central College Road and it had a lot of bus stops.

Mr. Kirby asked if Mr. Samuelson had a response to that.

Mr. Samuelson stated traffic varied by morning to afternoon and he was focusing on SR 605 south of Walton. Mr. Samuelson stated that in the morning it added 48 cars and 54 cars in the afternoon. Mr. Samuelson stated that on New Albany Road East it added roughly forty (40) cars both morning and afternoon.

Mr. Wallace asked for the hours in those ranges.

Mr. Samuelson stated morning was 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and afternoon was 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Gerhardt stated he was talking east/west, say the traffic coming from Johnstown, for drivers who needed to cut through there when the freeway had slowed down as well as those coming from Mink.

Mr. Samuelson stated that was what he had discussed with the percentage traffic.

Mr. Gerhardt stated that impact studies would not help here because of the problems on SR 161 and Intel. Mr. Gerhardt stated this was lowering New Albany standards. Mr. Gerhardt stated he had heard another would be added on US 62 and Central College Road.

Mr. Kirby stated no, the original plan had two of these types of hamlets but now there was only this one here.

Mr. Gerhardt asked if they could guarantee that this project, which did not fit New Albany, would never happen again.

Mr. Kirby stated that had been one of his questions, how did they know this was the place for it, and staff and City Council said this would be the only one and this was the only location for it.

Mr. Lowry asked what year the traffic study done on September 27th was from.

Mr. Samuelson stated it had been on September 27, 2022, about six (6) weeks ago.

Mr. Lowry stated it would have been nice if that had not been on the day after a three (3) day weekend. Mr. Lowry stated another study needed to be done as that was not truly representative of the traffic.

Ms. Kelley Simpson, Wentworth Crossing, 6850 Wardell Loop, stated she had been in the community for 25 years and seen the changes. Ms. Simpson stated Central College Road was parallel to SR 161 and was used as a back-up highway when SR 161 was jammed. Ms. Simpson said this was a problem she reported five (5) years ago to PC members but had been told the traffic study said it was fine. Ms. Simpson said she had been on that road and it was filled with traffic. Ms. Simpson stated 200 residences, with 1.5 to two (2) cars each, would add 400 cars in an area already crazy busy with many accidents on Central College Road and SR 605. Ms. Simpson noted what would be added at the Discover site would also affect this and she disagreed with the traffic study. Ms. Simpson stated she was also worried about increases in crime due to adding more people and the flats and asked that this not be allowed to be built.

Ms. Maria Nader, 6941 New Albany Condit Road, stated that at Central College Road and SR 605, where her home is near, homes in the area have been hit by traffic. Ms. Nader said traffic was more than forty (40) cars in the morning or night. Ms. Nader stated New Albany was unique and education was a top priority. Ms. Nader stated 35 to 52 students was not accurate and the classrooms were already very dense and that harmed education. Ms. Nader stated this would serve to attract crime and the traffic on SR 605 was heavy now. Ms. Nader said that adding homes meant adding bus stops that would make this a constant mess and it was already a mess. Ms. Nader noted there were also issues with rain and the water table here. Ms. Nader said this could be a great thing but its density, the crime it would attract, and the school impact would change what New Albany was.

Mr. Christian stated those were all the speaker cards he had.

Mr. Smith stated the request was to deny this. Mr. Smith asked staff if, as an R1 stood today, for there to be more than one (1) house per acre there would need to be an economic offset payment made by the developer to the City.

Mr. Mayer stated that for re-zonings, they evaluated the density and at this time, with current zoning, it was one (1) house per 40,000 square feet, so over one (1) unit per acre based on the Zoning Code.

Mr. Smith said that changing it to what was being proposed today would be an economic gift to the developer because, under the hamlet proposal, the developer would not need to pay an economic offset payment to the City.

Mr. Mayer stated that if it met the density recommendations in the Strategic Plan no offset payment would be needed, as with any development.

Mr. Smith stated the City had just had the developer that was developing nine (9) units on Central College Road pay an economic offset of about \$10,000 because the developer was just barely under one (1) per acre. Mr. Smith stated he just wanted this to be sure to be fair and equitable to all developers.

Mr. Schell asked Mr. Samuelson to address the concern with the traffic study done following a three (3) day weekend.

Mr. Samuelson stated he would have to look at it again. Mr. Samuelson said that given it was on a Tuesday and school was in session, issues to consider were the morning peak and the afternoon peak. Mr. Samuelson said they had found the morning peak had less impact on the roadway conditions and the afternoon peak was the more critical time frame, the commuter peak. Mr. Samuelson said that given these factors, he felt the volumes identified accurately reflected current conditions.

Ms. Simpson asked if that would be on just SR 605 and not Central College Road.

Mr. Samuelson stated the mornings when school was in session also had lesser impact and the afternoon school peak of 2:30 pm. to 3:30 p.m. also had 40% less traffic than during the commuter peak. Mr. Samuelson stated as the school afternoon peak was lower than the commuter peak, there was no need to redo the evaluation.

Mr. Kirby stated the commuter traffic was greater than the school traffic at the busiest hour.

Mr. Samuelson stated correct and the development also had less traffic during the school afternoon peak when compared to the commuter afternoon peak.

Mr. Wallace asked if the highest numbers the study generated were used in the afternoon.

Mr. Samuelson stated yes.

Ann Gunzenhaeuser, 5051 Notting Hill, stated there were three (3) schools, each with different start and end times, and asked if the study encompassed all of those times.

Mr. Samuelson stated while there might be an increase in school traffic that was more than offset by the decline in commuter traffic as the morning wore on.

Mr. Gerhardt stated there did not appear to be an impact study for Central College Road and without one this should not be voted on.

Mr. Durik stated the Discover building was essentially empty now but when occupied it would add significantly to the volume of traffic that the study observed.

Mr. Samuelson stated the City had requested an addendum to the study to include an assumption that Discover was in business there. Mr. Samuelson stated they had used the typical density of a call center and added that to the Central College Road and SR 605 intersection traffic and the results showed the same conclusions.

Ms. Bloech stated that once they returned to two (2) different school start times that would add 33% more traffic and this would only get worse.

Mr. Kirby thanked staff for getting the school numbers.

Mr. McFadden stated that when discussing start times this was about SR 605 that went to the primary and intermediate schools. Mr. McFadden said the busy time for that road was not at 7:30 a.m., but at 9:00 a.m. and at 4:00p.m.

Mr. Kirby asked if the study had observed through the whole day.

Mr. Samuelson stated yes, the whole day had been observed.

Mr. Kirby stated so they did look at that.

Mr. Larsen stated he thought they had said the hours were from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Samuelson stated he would have to relook at that. Mr. Samuelson stated the study showed that the afternoon school peak on SR 605 was 40% less than the afternoon commuter peak.

Ms. Nader asked how many in the audience were affected by traffic on SR 605 and said the road was dangerous and congested and had numerous accidents.

Mr. Larson asked if on Central College Road it would be 55 feet from the center line to the curb or the entire width of the road.

Mr. Kirby stated he believed Central College Road had enough room and would only be restriped.

Mr. Mayer stated Central College Road would only be restriped and SR 605 required widening where it was not already three (3) lanes.

Mr. Larsen asked what would be the width of the new road.

Mr. Mayer stated it would follow typical road sections, with travel lanes at eleven (11) to twelve (12) feet and turn lanes of ten (10) to twelve (12) feet. Mr. Mayer stated this would return as part of the FDP and the traffic engineer would then evaluate it to make sure it met standards.

Mr. Larsen asked what the approximate width would be, from curb to curb.

Mr. Mayer stated there would not be a curb to keep a rural feel, but would be about 36 feet of pavement without shoulders.

Mr. Larsen stated thank you.

Mr. Steve Siegel, 7190 Sumption Drive, stated the commercial component here appeared to be very unknown as to what it would be. Mr. Siegel said Market Street was still not a 100% success. Mr. Siegel asked why the rush to approve this with Market Street still not well. Mr. Siegel stated this was a great developer but there was no need to rush through this and more needed to be known.

Mr. Kirby asked about a potential reduction in subarea 5 of the number of townhomes.

Mr. Underhill stated 35 townhomes.

Mr. Kirby stated thank you.

Moved by Mr. Kirby to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record, including the email and documents provided to the PC, such as the police letter, for ZC-104-2022, seconded by Mr. Wallace. Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby, yea; Mr. Wallace, yea; Mr. Schell, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea; Mr. Larsen, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Kirby asked if rooftop screening requirements could exempt solar panels.

Mr. Christian stated yes.

Mr. Kirby stated the developer had nodded yes.

Moved by Mr. Wallace to approve ZC-104-2022 based on the findings in the staff report with the four (4) conditions listed in the staff report and the following additional conditions:

5. There be flexibility with regard to the location, width, and constant makeup of the leisure trails, subject to staff approval;
6. Typographical and other errors in the text, including gender references, shall be corrected, subject to staff approval;
7. A commitment to emergency access in subarea 3 to Central College Road;
8. Understory will be maintained in subarea 4, where possible, subject to staff approval;
9. The number of townhouses located in subarea 5 be limited to 35;
10. The right of way needed for a roundabout on Snider Loop will be provided if requested;
11. Roof top solar panels are exempted from screening requirements to the extent that functionality is not impacted.

Mr. Underhill stated they wanted to be clear they had committed to the right of way for a roundabout as long as it was counted as open space and parkland in the mean time.

Mr. Kirby stated yes.

seconded by Ms. Briggs.

Mr. Larsen noted they had asked for a letter from the school but that had not been added as a condition.

Mr. Underhill stated he could not guarantee for another party, but could provide their prior letter, when they had a lot more density, and Dr. Sawyers had said the development would benefit the district with additional funding and a limited increase in students.

Mr. Wallace stated he believe the applicant would not agree to that condition.

Mr. Underhill stated he could not speak for Dr. Sawyers getting a letter out.

Mr. Wallace stated he was not inclined to amend the motion to include that.

Mr. Albrecht stated nothing was said about requiring a letter from the school.

Mr. Kirby stated it was optional, it would require agreement by the applicant.

Mr. Albrecht stated yes.

Mr. Underhill stated they would try but could not guarantee.

Upon roll call: Mr. Wallace, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea; Mr. Larsen, no; Mr. Schell, no; Mr. Kirby, yea. Yea, 3; Nay, 2; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 3-2 vote.

Mr. Larsen stated this location should be community oriented and he felt the open space here did not invite others to go in and the civic green was too small.

Mr. Schell said he commended the changes that were brought forth but he had concerns with not knowing where the school stood. Mr. Schell said he was concerned with the traffic and the traffic study.

Mr. Kirby said it had been difficult to vote yes, but City Council had handed this to the PC and it was now handed back to City Council.

## **Other Business**

### **Poll Members for Comment**

(No response.)

Mr. Kirby adjourned the meeting at 10:39 p.m.

Submitted by Josie Taylor.



## **APPENDIX**

### **Documents accepted into the record:**

**Staff Report**

**Letter from New Albany Police Department**

**Written Public Responses**

### **Record of action**



**Planning Commission Staff Report  
November 7, 2022 Meeting**

---

**HAMLET AT SUGAR RUN  
ZONING AMENDMENT**

---

**LOCATION:** 32.6+/- acres located at the southwest and southeast corners of New Albany Condit Road and Central College Road from Residential Estate District (R-1) to Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) for an area to be known as the Hamlet at Sugar Run Zoning District to permit a mixed use development (PID: 222-000675, 222-000685, 222-000686, 222-000670, 222-000676, 222-000678, 222-000313, 222-000664, 222-000671, 222-000672, 222-000654, 222-000669, 222-000549, 222-000668, 222-001167, 222-000688, 222-000375, 222-000314, 222-000673, and 222-000376).

**APPLICANT:** NoNA Master Development LLC; Attn: Yaromir Steiner and Bryan Stone c/o Aaron Underhill, Esq.

**REQUEST:** Zoning Amendment

**ZONING:** R-1 to Infill-Planned Unit Development (I-PUD)

**STRATEGIC PLAN:** Employment Center and Hamlet Focus Area

**APPLICATION:** ZC-104-2022

Review based on: Application materials received on October 26, 2022.

---

*Staff report completed by Chris Christian, Planner.*

**I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND**

The applicant requests review and recommendation to City Council to rezone 32.6+/- acres from R-1 to Infill-Planned Unit Development (I-PUD). The zoning area will be known as the “Hamlet at Sugar Run Zoning District”. The applicant’s intent is to create a hamlet development as recommended in the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan, containing a mixture of residential, commercial, retail, parkland and open space land uses on the site.

On September 15, 2022, the Rocky-Fork Blacklick Accord Panel recommended approval of the application. The application met 90% of the Accord Town Mixed Use land use district development standards.

The Engage New Albany Strategic Plan was adopted on March 16, 2021. It included the hamlet development concept which introduced walkable retail and commercial uses that are integrated with residential uses. On April 20, 2021, a rezoning application was submitted for a hamlet development. City council reviewed and denied the application on October 5, 2021 since the codified ordinances only contemplated and contain regulations at that time for traditional single-family residential subdivisions outside of the Village Center. The city council directed the staff to further study the general hamlet concept and update the city codified ordinances for hamlet development standards. In July 2022 the Engage New Albany strategic plan was amended and adopted with these standards that include, but are not limited to density, parkland, open space, and building heights. In order to ensure

22 1107 PC Meeting Minutes as amended and approved on 22 1219

city code requirements were consistent with the updated strategic plan hamlet development standards, the following sections of code were updated:

Chapter 1157 – ARD Architectural Review Overlay District

- This section of code was updated to require the Architectural Review Board to review and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for a hamlet final development plan.

Chapter 1165 – General Development Standards

- Prior to this code update, there were no specific parkland and open space requirements for a hamlet development. The code update requires a hamlet development to include a dedication of 25% of the gross development area to parkland and open space as recommended in the proposed strategic plan hamlet development standards. Based on the desired form of a hamlet development, the code contemplates and allows for different types of parkland amenities that may be provided in a hamlet development including but not limited to plazas and courtyards.

New Albany Design Guidelines and Requirements Section: Residential Outside Village Center

- The section of the Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs) was updated to provide a definition for multi-family development products. The update simply states that the existing multi-family DGR requirements apply to all non-single family detached residential development products.

If the rezoning application is approved by City Council, the application must return to the Planning Commission with a final development plan application due to the Infill-Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) zoning classification.

Chapter 1159 of the city’s Codified Ordinances (Planned Unit Development District) permits the use of more flexible land use regulations and provides flexible design and development standards in order to facilitate the most advantageous land development techniques. Planned Unit Development zoning is often used to establish district designations for uses that are harmonious with the general area and the Strategic Plan. The objective of a Planned Unit Development zoning is to encourage ingenuity, imagination and design efforts to produce development that maintains the overall land use intensity and open space objectives of the city code and the Strategic Plan while departing from the strict application of dimensional standards found in traditional zoning districts.

**II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE**

The 32.6+/- acre zoning area is located in Franklin County and is made up of 20 properties, some of which are vacant land and the others contain single family homes. This section of the Central College Road corridor and specifically this intersection serves as a transition between denser retail, residential and commercial development uses on the west side of 605 to more traditional residential land uses on the east side. Some examples of this include the original sections of the New Albany Business Park with the Discover campus to the north, multi-family residential development and retail development to the west in Columbus and traditional single-family residential development to the east in New Albany.

**III. PLAN REVIEW**

Planning Commission’s review authority of the zoning amendment application is found under C.O. Chapters 1107.02 and 1159.09. 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, proposed zoning text, and the codified ordinances. Primary concerns and issues have been indicated below, with needed action or recommended action in underlined text.

Per Codified Ordinance Chapter 1111.06 in deciding on the change, the Planning Commission shall consider, among other things, the following elements of the case:

- (a) Adjacent land use.
- (b) The relationship of topography to the use intended or to its implications.
- (c) Access, traffic flow.
- (d) Adjacent zoning.
- (e) The correctness of the application for the type of change requested.
- (f) The relationship of the use requested to the public health, safety, or general welfare.
- (g) The relationship of the area requested to the area to be used.
- (h) The impact of the proposed use on the local school district(s).

Per Codified Ordinance Chapter 1159.08 the basis for approval of a Preliminary Development Plan in an I-PUD shall be:

- (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 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 of dwelling units 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).

**A. Engage New Albany Strategic Plan**

The site is located within the Employment Center base future land use district. In addition to providing future land use districts, the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan also includes focus areas to demonstrate how the recommendations outlined in the other sections of the strategic plan can be applied in the built environment. The Hamlet Focus Area identifies this exact site as the ideal location for a hamlet development in the city. The strategic plan is a guiding policy document which contains recommendations for future development, including recommended development standards for a hamlet development. In addition to these recommendations, the codified ordinances contain requirements for hamlet developments.

The planning team prepared and city council adopted recommended development standards to serve as a framework to guide the design of hamlet development and to provide tools for city council and other city boards and commissions to evaluate a hamlet proposal. These development standards build upon the original development standards found in the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan by adding recommendations for residential density, commercial to residential space ratios, and building heights. The plan lists the following recommended development standards for hamlets. Beneath each standard is a summary of how it is being met in the zoning text. These development standards will continue to be evaluated if the zoning change is approved with the final development plan and final plat submittals. If approved, the applicant must return to the Planning Commission for review and approval of a final development plan application.

1. The gross density of a hamlet development is not to exceed six (6) dwelling units per acre.
  - Zoning text section II(B) states that the maximum density is 6 units per gross acre.
2. A hamlet development should be comprised of about 75% developed land to 25% parks and open space.
  - Zoning text section II(B) states that a minimum of 25% of the total area of the zoning district must be set aside as open space or dedicated parkland.
3. A hamlet development should include a civic green space open to the public located near the center of the development.
  - Zoning text section II(B) states that a Central Green shall be provided in Subarea 1 and 2 which to provide a central point for recreation, social gatherings and activity.
4. A hamlet development should include a ratio of approximately 200 square feet of commercial uses for every 1 dwelling unit to ensure a vibrant mixed-use development. Commercial uses include administrative, business, and professional offices; retail stores; restaurants; hotels; and personal services. Drive thru businesses should be limited within the site in order to preserve the pedestrian-oriented character of a hamlet. Any commercial uses located south of the Sugar Run stream corridor may not count toward this ratio.
  - Zoning text section II(A) states that a minimum of 200 sq. ft. of commercial development must be provided for every 1 residential dwelling unit and excludes commercial uses south of Sugar Run. In addition, the zoning text limits drive-thrus to banks, pharmacies or pick up windows for coffee shops.
5. Commercial uses must include some mixed-use commercial located around the civic green.
  - The permitted uses of subarea 1 and 2, located around the civic green, will allow for mixed use commercial development to be developed in this area. More detailed plans for the future uses of the site will be presented during a final development plan application.
6. Ground floor and commercial uses in a hamlet should be complementary in nature with other uses on-site to encourage activity throughout the day, rather than at peak times.
  - The list of permitted uses of subarea 1 and 2, located around the civic green, will allow for mixed use commercial development to be developed in this area. More detailed plans for the future uses of the site will be presented during a final development plan application.
7. Buildings may not be taller than 50 feet in height around the civic green, at least 250 feet from Central College Road and SR 605/New Albany-Condit Road, nor taller than 40 feet at the perimeter.
  - The zoning text commits to meeting this recommendation within each subarea.
8. Public streets within a hamlet should be lined by buildings, with exceptions for limited drives, public spaces, and properly screened parking.
  - The preliminary development plan illustrates the building layout to accomplish this recommendation and C.O. 1171.06(b) requires parking lots to be screened from public streets, residential areas and open space.
9. Garages should face the rear of lots. No garage doors may face primary streets.

- Garages are required to be located at the rear of a unit throughout the zoning district. Additionally, the preliminary development plan demonstrates that no garages face primary streets.
10. Parking must be integrated throughout the site through on-street parking on public streets, surface parking located behind primary buildings, limited surface parking located beside primary buildings, and structured parking. Surface parking lots must be properly screened from the street.
    - The preliminary development plan illustrates the building layout to accomplish this recommendation and C.O. 1171.06(b) requires parking lots to be screened from public streets, residential areas and open space.
    -
  11. Drive locations should be kept to a minimum and the placement of buildings should encourage pedestrian activity.
    - The preliminary development plan illustrates the building layout to accomplish this recommendation and will continue to be evaluated with future final development plan submittals, if the zoning change request is approved.
  12. Anyone seeking to build a hamlet development must submit a parking model to demonstrate sufficient parking is provided for the mix of residents, employees, and visitors to the site; shared parking among complementary uses is strongly encouraged on the site and the installation of excess parking is discouraged. If the tenants of the hamlet significantly change or is the use mix changes, the developer must resubmit the parking model to city zoning staff for review.
    - The zoning text requires a parking model to be submitted with the final development plan for subareas 1, 2 and 4 where a mix of uses are permitted to be developed.
  13. A hamlet development proposal must include an overall master plan for the area showing how it fits together appropriately in terms of connectivity, site layout, uses, and aesthetics.
    - Due to the I-PUD zoning classification, the applicant is required to provide this information as part of this application in the form of a preliminary development plan.
  14. A hamlet development is expected to go through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning process. The city's Architectural Review Board (ARB) should review final development plans.
    - This recommendation is met as the I-PUD zoning classification is what is being proposed. C.O. 1157.06 requires final development plans for this area to be reviewed by the city ARB and PC.
  15. A hamlet development proposal must reference the applicable chapters of the New Albany Design Guidelines & Requirements (DGRs).
    - The zoning text refers to the applicability of the DGRs for the entire zoning district.

## ***B. Use, Site and Layout***

1. The site is located at the southwest and southeast corners of the New Albany Condit Road and Central College Road intersection. These site boundaries match those identified in the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan as an ideal location for a hamlet development. The plan envisions a hamlet to be comprised of a mixture of residential, commercial and residential uses to create a vibrant, pedestrian oriented development.
2. The proposed zoning district is Infill-Planned Unit Development (I-PUD) that permits the construction of a hamlet style of development as envisioned in the strategic plan. The zoning text permits a variety of commercial, retail, assisted senior living facility uses and residential (flats, townhomes and a single family) uses. These permitted uses are broken up into 5 different subareas and illustrated on the preliminary development plan. The epicenter of the zoning district is located within subareas 1 and 2 allowing a diversity of uses centered around a civic

green space at the center of the development, accomplishing one of the Hamlet development standards found in the strategic plan.

3. The table below provides a high-level overview of the uses permitted in each subarea. All non-residential uses proposed in the text are only permitted to be located on the west side of New Albany Condit Road.

<b>Subarea</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Permitted Uses</b>	<b>Conditional Uses</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1	5+/- acres	General Business Commercial District Uses found in the C-3 General Business District (C.O. 1147.02) which permits office, general retail stores, personal service uses such as restaurants, banks, and beauty shops.	Conditional uses permitted in C.O. 1149.03	Prohibited uses include funeral services, self-service laundries, and gasoline service stations or retail convenience stores selling gasoline as an ancillary use and carryout food and beverage establishments with drive-thru facilities.
2	10.5+/- acres	Single family attached or detached townhomes and single family detached homes.  Attached or detached townhome units are permitted to be configured as flats. No more than 20% of the units in this subarea are allowed to be configured as flats and no more than 20% of the units may be detached, single family homes.	Model home or leasing office and home occupations	The permitted uses of Subarea 1 are allowed to be operated within a limited area of Subarea 2 in an area identified as the "Transition Zone" on the preliminary development plan
3	5.25+/- acres	Single attached townhomes and single family detached homes.	Model home or leasing office and home occupations	No more than 45 units are permitted to be developed in this subarea and no more than 10 of them

				may be detached, single family homes.
4	4.4+/- acres	Parkland/Open space, recreation facilities, outdoor markets, food trucks and outdoor performance areas.		All athletic and playground or similar lighting is required to be turned off by 10pm.
5	7.4+/- acres	Senior Living Facility Uses and supportive uses  Maximum of 55 single family, attached townhomes if no senior living uses are developed  Maximum of 25 detached, single family homes if no senior living facilities are developed	Administrative, business, professional and medical offices as described in C.O. 1143.02(a, b and c)  Daycares and preschools	The preliminary development plan shows townhomes being developed in this subarea. The zoning texts allows alternative, permitted uses to be developed on the site and determined at the time of a final development plan application.

4. The Engage New Albany Strategic Plan recommends a gross density of 6 dwelling units per acre for the hamlet development. The proposal meets this recommendation as 188 residential units are proposed to be developed on 32.6 acres (gross acreage) resulting in a density of 5.76 units per acre. Additionally, the zoning text states that a maximum of 6 residential units may be developed per gross acre.
5. The strategic plan recommends that a hamlet development should include a ratio of approximately 200 square feet of commercial uses for every 1 dwelling unit to ensure a vibrant mixed-use development is achieved. The zoning text commits to meeting this recommendation and the preliminary development plan exceeds the recommendation by showing 253 square feet of commercial space for every one residential unit developed.
6. A school impact statement was submitted with the application as required by City Code Section 1111.03(h). A student impact statement includes a yield factor for each housing type proposed to be developed on the site at the time of the rezoning application.
7. On October 18, 2022, the city staff met with the New Albany Plain Local School District to obtain actual student enrollment numbers for each housing type within the city corporate boundary. The student population numbers are for the 2022-2023 school year. The city staff obtained student population for all flats and townhomes, select single family subdivisions and the total number of students within the city corporate boundary. The number of housing units is from city permitting data.



8. A comparison of submitted student yield ratios and the actual enrollment information is provided below. The zoning text states that a maximum of 6 residential units per gross acre may be developed on the site. The preliminary development plan currently shows 188 total units being developed on the site (40 flats, 142 townhomes and 6 single family homes) for with a total density of 5.8 units per acre. The zoning text allows the total number of each different housing type to be finalized at the time of a final development plan application within the restrictions outlined in the use table above and at a max overall density of 6 units per acre. Based on this flexibility, the applicant estimates that the development could generate up to 37-52 students.
9. The city staff compares the breakdown of housing units as currently shown on the submitted preliminary development plan:

<b>Housing Type</b>	<b>Number of Units Proposed</b>	<b>Developer's Student Yield Factor</b>	<b>City Data Student Yield Factor</b>
Flats	40	0.102 students per housing unit x 40 units= 4.08 students	0.149 students per housing unit x 40 units= 5.96 students
Townhomes	142	0.146 students per housing unit x 142 units= 20.73 students	0.122 students per housing unit x 142 units= 17.32 students
Single Family	6	0.499 students per housing unit x 6 units= 2.99 students	0.832 students per housing unit x 6 units= 4.99 students
<b>Total Number of Students</b>		28 students	28 students

10. While the submitted ratios for each housing type differ slightly between actual student enrollment numbers obtained from the school district, the overall student impact is the same.
11. The Engage New Albany Strategic Plan states that alternate street typologies and reduced setbacks may be appropriate in mixed use environments. The text provides a 65-foot building and pavement setback from the centerline of Central College Road and New Albany Condit Road. The text contains a variety of other internal and perimeter boundary setbacks that take into consideration adjacent uses to provide an appropriate setback from those boundaries. There are minimal interior setbacks to ensure that a cohesive development is achieved where pedestrian connectivity between subareas is encouraged. The proposed setbacks are appropriate based on the desired development pattern of a hamlet and meet the recommendations of the strategic plan.
12. The zoning text states that all development within this area must be accessed from a public road. The text commits to providing right-of-way for Central College Road, New Albany Condit Road and all new roads in the development. The city engineer recommends additional right-of-way in addition to what the text requires. See section IV Engineer's Comments for additional details. The zoning text states contains varying lot coverage requirements between 70% and up to 90% based on each subarea. The proposed lot coverage amounts appear appropriate due to the desired compact form of development and since the open space and parkland requirements are met.

**C. Access, Loading, Parking**

1. The zoning district is located at the southwest and southeast corners of the Central College Road and State Route 605 intersection. As proposed, the zoning district is accessed via 4 new curb cuts along these corridors. The applicant also proposes to connect into an existing private drive in Columbus where several commercial users exist such as Huntington Bank and Taco Bell, if approved by those property owners. The text requires all new major roads and alleys within the zoning district to be dedicated as public streets. There are provisions in the texts which would allow for some drives to be privately owned where there are parking lots and associated drive aisles.
2. The zoning text states that the final alignments and designs of public streets, public alleys and any private drives shall be reviewed as part of a final development plan or final plat application.

A traffic impact study (TIS) was submitted to the city as part of the rezoning application. The city traffic engineer reviewed and approved the results of the study with recommendations. A summary of the traffic study, warranted improvements and recommendations of the city traffic engineer is included below.

#### Background & Traffic Generation

- New traffic data was collected during the school day in September 2022 and used for the study. The 2021 traffic study used data from 2019. In comparison, the traffic volumes generated from the 2022 are lower than the data from the early study. The city traffic engineer states that the lower volumes are a result of the closure of the nearby Discover facility, employees continuing to work remotely and new roadways/improvements in the area which have impacted traffic flow patterns.
  - The new study assumes that the Discover site will be reused as a general office facility and accounts for it in the results.
- Compared to the 2021 traffic study, the proposed development generates 40% less traffic during the morning commuter peak hour. Morning commuter peak hour is measured between the hours of 7:30am and 8:30am.
- Compared to the 2021 traffic study, the proposed development generates 24% less traffic during the evening commuter peak hour. Evening commuter peak hour is measured between the hours of 5:00pm and 6:00pm.
- The study notes that the proposed development would have its greatest traffic impact during normal commuter peaks as listed above, and a lesser impact during school peak periods. Specifically, the study notes that there is 40% less traffic along State Route 605 during the school afternoon peak times compared to the volumes during the evening commuter peak hour. No additional roadway improvements are warranted nor recommended in the traffic study related to school peak periods and the city traffic engineer concurs with this result.

#### Recommended Roadway Improvements

The study recommends the following left turn lane roadway improvements and the city traffic engineer agrees. These improvements are consistent with the 2021 traffic study however, the length of the turn lanes has been reduced due to the lower site trips.

- Left hand turn lanes are needed on State Route 605 for site access points 3/4 and 5 as shown in the image below. State Route 605 will need to be widened to 3 lanes in order to accomplish these improvements.
- A westbound left turn lane is needed at access point 2 along Central College Road as shown in the image below. The existing pavement will need to be restriped in order to accomplish this improvement.

Figure 2 – Location of the Proposed Development (Yellow), Site Drives, and Study Intersections



If the Planning Commission should approve this application, staff recommends a condition of approval that the recommendations of the city traffic engineer are met, subject to staff approval. The City Traffic Engineer recommendations are:

- Provide left turn lanes in the locations identified above.
- State Route 605 will need to be widened to 3 lanes in order to accommodate the installation of the left-hand turn lanes.
- Coordination between the city and the applicant is needed regarding the final design at the intersection of State Route 605 and Snider Loop, to address any left-hand turn concerns. Final design of intersections is typically provided at the time of a final development plan application. The city will continue to monitor this intersection to determine if other traffic control measures or design features need to be considered in the future after construction is completed.
- In conjunction with the development, the city will determine the steps for potentially lowering the speed limit to 35 MPH along, State Route 605 between Central College Road and Walton Parkway.
- Additional right-of-way be dedicated by the developer on the east side of the Central College/605 intersection in order to accommodate a potential northbound right turn lane onto Central College Road.
- The developer must install a northbound, right turn lane onto Central College Road at a length recommended by a traffic impact study and approved by the city traffic engineer. The installation of this turn lane may be avoided if the applicant re-runs the traffic impact study showing the Discover Campus being used as a call center and the study shows that the turn lane is not needed.

3. The text requires 8-foot-wide, asphalt leisure trails to be installed along both Central College Road and New Albany Condit Road. The text commits to providing additional leisure trail and sidewalk connections throughout the zoning district which place a high priority on walking and bicycling, meeting an important strategic plan recommendation for this development type.
4. The text permits the development of a new public street in subarea 5, along the southern boundary of the zoning text that includes the installation of a 5-foot sidewalk to be installed on the north side of it. In order to be consistent with the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan roadway character classifications, the Leisure Trail Master Plan and city code requirements, a condition of approval may be added stating that the text be revised to require sidewalk to be installed on both sides of this road, should the Planning Commission approve the application.
5. The text commits to providing a comprehensive shared parking model as part of a final development plan application in Subareas 1, 2 and 4. Parking needs for Subarea 4 shall be provided within Subarea 1. On street parking is permitted throughout the zoning district. The text states that the model must analyze the hourly and peak demands for commercial, office, parkland, and residential uses based on shared parking principles and ratios and must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Providing a shared parking model meets a recommended development standard found in the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan in order to balance the need for parking and providing a pedestrian oriented environment.
6. The hamlet development standard that recommends a shared parking model be submitted and also recommends that it be resubmitted for staff review if the mix of uses changes substantially in the development.
7. The text contains specific, minimum parking space ratios for certain uses as follows.
  - A minimum, two-car garage must be provided within each residential unit in Subarea 3.
  - Within Subarea 5, a minimum of 3 off street parking spaces must be provided for each residential unit. At least two of these required spaces must be provided within an enclosed garage and the other may be provided in the driveway or a shared parking lot if it is a townhome.
  - On street parking is permitted throughout the zoning district.
  - Assisted living facilities, in Subarea 5, are required to provide one parking space per employee on the largest shift, plus 0.5 for each unit in the building.
  - Memory care facilities and skilled nursing facilities, in Subarea 5, are required to provide one parking space per employee on the largest shift, plus one space per every 10 beds in the facility.

#### **D. Architectural Standards**

1. The New Albany Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs) ensure residential and commercial development both sustain their quality and vibrancy over time. These guidelines have been developed by New Albany to ensure that the community enjoys the highest possible quality of architectural design that has made the community successful thus far. The text states that the DGRs will be applied to all subareas unless waivers are granted at the time of a final development plan application with the following exceptions. The city DGRs contain regulations for residential and commercial buildings.
  - The DGRs state that the width residential garage doors are not permitted to be wider than 9 feet. The zoning text states that these doors may be wider than 9 feet only if they face an alley. Since alleys are not primary roadways, this exception is appropriate.
  - The DGRs require active and operable doors to be installed along all public streets. The applicant is meeting this requirement with the exception of subarea 1 where single tenant buildings are not required to have one along Central College Road. The text does require building facades facing Central College Road to include an architectural feature that encourages pedestrian connectivity, meeting the spirit and intent of the DGR requirement.

2. For all subareas, the text commits to meeting or exceeding the architectural standards of New Albany. Additionally, the text commits to 360-degree design for all buildings in the zoning district, meeting an important goal of the city. More detailed architectural designs/renderings are required to be reviewed and approved as part of future final development plan applications by the city Architectural Review Board and Planning Commission.
3. The hamlet development standards recommend that buildings, within a hamlet, should not be taller than 50 feet in height around the civic green, at least 250 feet from Central College Road and SR 605/New Albany-Condit Road, nor taller than 40 feet at the perimeter. These recommendations are met within each subarea of the zoning district.
4. The text permits the use of the following building materials and prohibits exposed concrete foundations and the use of vinyl as a building material.
  - Brick and brick veneer
  - Cementitious or composite siding
  - Metal panels, EIFS, wood and aluminum are permitted as trim or accent elements.
5. The text requires rooftop screening for sight and sound within Subareas 1 and 5. Should be the Planning Commission approve the application, staff recommends a condition of approval be added requiring the text be revised to require screening for all rooftop and ground mounted equipment for all subareas within the zoning district.

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

1. The Engage New Albany Strategic Plan emphasizes the importance of providing greenspace and promoting sustainability by protecting, preserving and enhancing natural features in these mixed-use areas. The hamlet development standards from the strategic plan recommends a minimum of 25% of the total developable area of a hamlet be dedicated as parkland/open space. City code section 1165.10(a)(3) also requires 25% of gross developed land within a hamlet to be dedicated as parkland/open space. The zoning text commits to meeting this requirement. As shown on the preliminary development plan, the applicant proposes to exceed this requirement by providing 28-30% of the total site area as open space. The zoning text requires a parks and open space plan to be provided and reviewed by the Planning Commission at the time of a final development plan application.
2. The zoning district is bisected by the Sugar Run Creek. The applicant proposes to activate parkland/open space around Sugar Run Creek to serve as an organizational element of the development and the text allows the applicant to install trails, benches and other amenities within this area to make it attraction for the entire New Albany community.
3. The texts states that areas determined as parkland at the time of final development plan shall be owned by the city. Areas identified as open space at the time of final development plan may be publicly or privately owned. Maintenance obligations for parkland and open space shall be determined at the time of a final development plan application.
4. The text commits to providing 3-inch caliper street trees along all public, primary streets at an average rate of 30 feet on center. The applicant commits to providing a master perimeter and streetscape plan as part of a final development plan application. Additionally, the applicant is also required to meet the minimum interior parking lot landscape requirements of city code and submit landscape plans with each final development plan application for review by the city landscape architect.
5. The text contains screening requirements for dumpsters, loading and service areas that is consistent with city code.
6. The zoning text exempts the applicant from providing the internal landscaping buffering requirements between dissimilar uses as required by C.O. 1171.05 which is appropriate due to the mixed-use development pattern of the zoning district.

**F. Utilities, Lighting & Signage**

1. *The text requires all utilities to be installed underground.*
2. The text states that all security lighting be motion sensor type.
3. The text states that parking lighting shall not exceed 18 feet in height, that fully shielded cut off type fixtures be used and be consistent throughout the zoning district.
4. *The text requires standard New Albany street regulatory signage to be used and that any entry feature signage be subject to review and approval at the time of a final development plan application.*
5. The text requires a master sign plan to be submitted in conjunction with the first final development plan for one or more subareas and where this sign plan is silent, the city sign code regulations will apply.

**G. Other Considerations**

1. As recommended in the strategic plan for hamlet areas and required by city code section 1157.07, the zoning text requires the Architectural Review Board (ARB) to review final development plan applications and provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission.
2. The zoning text states that deviations from the development standards of the text shall be heard by the Planning Commission as waivers rather than a variance application.

**IV. ENGINEER’S COMMENTS**

The City Engineer has reviewed the referenced plan in accordance with the engineering related requirements of Code Section 1159.07(b)(3) and provided the following comments. If the Planning Commission should approve the application, staff recommends the conditions of approval may be added stating that the City Engineer comments be addressed, subject to staff approval.

1. Sugar Run is a FEMA studied stream (Map No. 39049C0180). We recommend that the Stream Corridor Protection Zone (SCPZ) width be established in accordance with Chapter 1155 – Flood Damage Reduction.
2. Consistent with the Engage New Albany plan, we recommend that 50’ of r/w as measured from road centerline be dedicated along Central College Road.
3. Consistent with the Engage New Albany plan, we recommend that 40’ of r/w as measured from road centerline be dedicated along the west side of SR 605 and 55’ of r/w be dedicated along the east side to accommodate a potential north bound turning lane.

**V. SUMMARY**

The Engage New Albany Strategic Plan envisions the concept of a hamlet at this site. This concept was included in the strategic plan based on public feedback the city collected from residents during the 2021 strategic planning process. Residents cited a lack of local dining and retail options as the city’s second greatest weakness and one of the top areas where the city should focus their efforts in the future. Additionally, residents expressed interest in adding a diversity of housing options to ensure that New Albany is a life-span community.

The goals and objectives for a hamlet is to create a walkable, mixed use master planned environment that is connected into surrounding neighborhoods and integrated into open space networks. The proposal meets or commits to meeting all of the recommended hamlet development standards found in the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan.

The applicant submitted a traffic impact study (TIS) which has been reviewed and approved, with recommendations, by the city traffic engineer. The study concludes that minimal improvements are warranted to Central College Road and State Route 605 to accommodate the development. The site layout provides appropriate circulation in order to disperse traffic while maintaining the character of the hamlet as envision in the strategic plan.

If the zoning change application is approved by New Albany city council, the applicant is required to submit a final development plan application prior to construction. Final development plan applications for a hamlet area are required to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) who makes a recommendation to the Planning Commission (PC). The PC takes final action on the application and any associated waivers that are also applied for at that time. Per city code, final development plans require neighbors within 200 feet of the subject property be notified of the meetings. Members of the public can participate in these meetings and provide input to each board. Final development plans are required include detailed site plans, street designs, landscaping, parkland and open space designs, building architecture, size and number of units, engineering plans, and more to ensure the commits of the zoning text are met.

The proposed rezoning accomplishes the following city code considerations found in C.O. 1111.06:

1. The zoning amendment results in a more comprehensive planned redevelopment of the area and ensures compatibility between uses in the immediate area (1111.06(a)).
2. The proposed zoning classification permits consistent uses found within other adjacent zoning districts (1111.06(b)).
3. The zoning amendment application is an appropriate application for the request (1111.06(e)).
4. The overall effect of the development advances and benefits the general welfare of the community (1111.06(f)).

## **VI. ACTION**

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

Move to recommend approval to city council of zoning amendment application ZC-104-2022 based on the findings in the staff report with the following conditions.

1. The city traffic engineer's comments must be addressed, subject to staff approval.
2. The city engineer's comments must be addressed, subject to staff approval.
3. The text must be revised to require screening for all rooftop and ground mounted equipment for all subareas within the zoning district.
4. The text must be revised to require sidewalk to be installed on both sides of the "southern road"

### **Approximate Site Location:**



Source: NearMap