



ROCKY FORK-BLACKLICK ACCORD IMPLEMENTATION PANEL
APRIL 16, 2026 MEETING AGENDA
4:00 P.M. in the New Albany Village Hall

Members of the public must attend the meeting in-person to participate and provide comments at New Albany Village Hall at 99 West Main Street. The meeting will be streamed for viewing purposes only via the city website at <https://newalbanyohio.org/answers/streaming-meetings/>

I. Call to order

II. Roll call

III. Action on minutes: March 19, 2025

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

V. Oath

Administration of oath to all witnesses/applicants/staff who plan to speak regarding an application on the agenda. "Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth."

V. Hearing of visitors for items not on this agenda

VI. Case:

5953-6065 Central College Rd

City of Columbus conceptual review to develop 246 multi-family residential units on the 9.05-acre site located at 5953-6065 Central College Rd. The RFBA Plan recommends "Office", and "Natural/Rural Corridor" uses at this location.

Parcel ID(s): 010-284651 & 010-286890

Request: The applicant is seeking conceptual design feedback from the RFBA prior to submitting a rezoning application.

Current Zoning: LC4 (H-35), L-ARLD (H-35), CPD (H-65)

Proposed Use: 246 multi-family units

Applicant(s): David Perry, Paul Pardi, Jason Snyder

Owner: GRANAZ PROPERTIES LLC

VII. Other business

VIII. Adjournment



ROCKY FORK-BLACKLICK ACCORD IMPLEMENTATION PANEL
MARCH 19, 2026 Meeting Minutes - DRAFT
4:00 P.M. in the New Albany Village Hall

I. Call to order

The Rocky Fork – Blacklick Accord Implementation Panel held a regular meeting on Thursday, March 19, 2026 in the New Albany Village Hall. Chair Brubaker called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. and asked to hear the roll.

II. Roll call

Those answering the roll:

Mr. Mike Chappellear	present
Mr. Scott Harper	present
Mr. Jay Herskowitz	present
Mr. Ralph Smithers	present
Mr. Dave Paul	present
Mr. Todd Brubaker	present
Mr. Scott Billman	present
Mr. Kyle Sellers	present

Having all voting members present, the panel had a quorum to transact business.

Staff members present: Planner Jay Henderson, Planner II Sierra Saumenig, Deputy Director of Public Service Steve Mayer, Deputy Clerk Madriguera.

III. Action on minutes:

Chair Brubaker asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from the January 15, 2026 regular meeting.

Clerk Madriguera noted that Panel Member Chappellear had one correction and that the correction had been made.

Hearing no further corrections Panel Member Billman moved for approval of the minutes. Panel Member Smithers seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Billman yes, Mr. Smithers yes, Mr. Chappellear yes, Mr. Harper yes, Mr. Herskowitz yes, Mr. Paul yes, Mr. Brubaker yes, Mr. Sellers yes. Having eight yes votes, the motion passed and the January 15, 2026 minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

Chair Brubaker asked if there were any additions or corrections to the agenda.

Planner II Saumenig answered none from staff.

V. Oath

Chair Brubaker administered the oath to all present who wished to address the panel.

V. Hearing of visitors for items not on this agenda

Chair Brubaker asked if there were any visitors present who wished to address the panel for an item not on the agenda. Hearing none, he introduced the first and only case on the agenda and asked to hear the staff report.

VI. Case:

ZC-05-2026 Community Facilities Rezoning

Review and action regarding a New Albany application to rezone 69.654 +/- acres from Agricultural District (AG) to Community Facilities (CF), to allow for a new police training facility, service facility, and park restroom facility.

Acreage: 69.654 ac +/-

Current Zoning: Agricultural District (AG)

RFBA District: Park/Open Space, Park Zone

Proposed Zoning: Community Facilities (CF)

Applicant(s): City of New Albany and New Albany Plain Local Joint Parks District c/o EMH&T

Property Owner(s): City of New Albany and New Albany Plain Local Joint Parks District

Planner Henderson delivered the staff report.

Chair Brubaker asked whether there was anyone present who wished to comment on the application.

Applicant and Deputy Director of Public Service Steve Mayer spoke in support of the application. He explained that in addition to providing the new field house and police training facility, this is the comprehensive plan to allow for growth.

Panel Member Billman asked whether the police had requested the additional training facility, noting that of course they probably did so. He explained that he has visited and walked the property and he is impressed and very excited to use the fieldhouse. He stated that it looks beautiful, and that many people he has spoken with share his view.

Panel Member Herskowitz noted that the northern most curb cut does not align with the curb cut across the street.

Deputy Director Mayer responded that the city is aware of that and there may be an opportunity in the future to line them up.

Panel Member Chappelle confirmed that the property to the north is owned by private residential property owners.

Panel Member Paul asked about notification requirements for properties on Peter Hoover, noting however, that the construction that has taken place provides notification. He further asked whether the police training facility will also be a substation.

Deputy Director Mayer responded that in advance of the planning commission review, and city council review, all property owners within 200 feet will be notified of the proposed zoning change, but no prospective discussions have taken place. He further responded that there will not be a substation, this will be a training facility only.

Paul asked about properties on Peter Hoover – and whether these plans have been notified

Panel Member Chappellear remarked that he travels Bevelhymmer several times per week and asked about improvements to Bevelhymmer Road and to the leisure trails.

Deputy Direct Mayer explained that the roundabout will be finished this spring, in conjunction with that the road will be widened and a leisure trail will be installed.

Panel Member Harper asked about the shooting range at the police training facility.

Deputy Director Mayer explained the security features and noise mitigation features of the shooting range.

Chair Brubaker asked whether there were additional questions.

Hearing none, Panel Member Paul moved to approve ZC-05-2026. Panel Member Billman seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Harper yes, Mr. Billman yes, Mr. Smithers yes, Mr. Paul yes, Mr. Chappellear yes, Mr. Herskowitz yes, Mr. Sellers abstained from the vote, Mr. Brubaker yes. Having seven yes votes, the motion passed and ZC-05-2026 was favorably recommended to the New Albany Planning Commission.

VII. Other business

Chair Brubaker thanked staff for the distribution of the meeting materials.

Planner II Saumenig responded that the duty of circulating meeting notices and materials has rotated to New Albany.

Panel Member Paul stated that it is his understanding that his term will expire soon, and he confirmed that Columbus planning staff would handle next steps.

VIII. Adjournment

Having no further business and having completed their agenda, Panel Member Billman moved to adjourn the March 19, 2026 meeting of the Rocky Fork – Blacklick Accord Implementation Panel. Panel Member Sellers seconded the motion. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Submitted by Deputy Clerk Madriguera, Esq.

Appendix

ZC-05-2026

Staff Report

Record of Action

EVALUATION CHECKLIST

PROJECT: **5953-6065 CENTRAL COLLEGE RD**

EVALUATED ON: 1.6.26

REVISED: 4.2.26

APPLICANT: DAVID PERRY, AVENUE PARTNERS

BY: MOSE LATTIMORE, COLUMBUS

CURRENT ZONING: LC4, LARLD (H-35)

RFBA DISTRICT: OFFICE

Checklist is intended to convey how the proposed development addresses the intent and criteria of the Accord plan.

SUB-AREA	REQUESTED ZONING	RFBA DISTRICT	USE TYPE	SIZE (# OF UNITS OR SQ. FT.)	ACREAGE	PROPOSED DENSITY (DU/AC)	PERMITTED DENSITY		PARKLAND /OPEN SPACE/ GREEN AC/CIVIC SPACE	
							BASE	BONUS	PROVIDED	REQUIRED
		Office	Multifamily	246 units	9.05ac	27.18du/ac	10,000sf/ac	12,000sf/ac		
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT				246 units	9.05ac	27.18du/ac	10,000sf/a c	12,000sf/a c		
TOTAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT										
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT				246 units	9.05ac	27.18du/ac	10,000sf/ ac	12,000sf/ ac		

EVALUATION SUMMARY	YES	PARTIAL	NO	?	COMMENTS
1.0 Key Principles	5			1	
2.0 Strategies	5				
3.0 General Development Standards	6		2	9	
4.0 District Development Standards	18			3	
TOTAL	34	0	2	13	(34 “yes”) + (0 “partial”) – (2 “no”) - (13 “?”) / (49 applicable questions) * 100 = 38.78%

p = partially met ? = cannot determine (-) N/A = not applicable

1.0 KEY PRINCIPLES (NON-NEGOTIABLE)		YES	NO	COMMENTS
1.1	Maintain aesthetic character of rural roads.	-	-	
1.2	Use open space as an organization element.	x		
1.3	Use a compact form of development in town and village clusters with defined edges such as green belts and natural corridors.	-	-	
1.4	Develop mixed uses in town and village centers.	-	-	
1.5	Develop diversity in housing prices and types.	x		
1.6	Create a center focus that combines civic, cultural, and recreational uses.	x		
1.7	Create an ample supply of squares, greens, parks and landscaping.	x		
1.8	Guarantee permanent protection of greenbelts, streams, creeks, woodlands, grasslands, wetlands, and historic sites.	x		Wooded area /stream corridor zone to the west of the site protected.
1.9	Development in town must be located within easy walking or biking distances of other neighborhoods, schools, retail centers and transit stops.	-	-	
1.10	Development must pay its own way. <i>(Evaluation is limited based on defining what this principle includes -- schools, parks, utility and road infrastructure, and city services.)</i>	?	?	

2.0 STRATEGIES		YES	NO	COMMENTS
2.1	Development should be compatible with the rural landscape.	x		
2.2	Higher density residential should be located adjacent to open space.	x		
2.3	Natural features should be preserved.	x		
2.4	Retail development should be community-based.	-	-	
2.5	Developers should be encouraged to mix uses and housing types where appropriate.	x		
2.6	Historic and cultural resources should be protected and preserved.	-	-	
2.7	Scenic qualities along roadways should be maintained.	x		
2.8	Rural character of the land along regional roads should be maintained.	-	-	Site located on a stretch of Central College Rd. identified as "Collector road", not "Rural road".
2.9	Density bonuses and design flexibility are encouraged to allow cluster development.	-	-	
2.10	Confine neighborhood commercial uses to community centers or plazas.	-	-	
2.11	Future development should have adequate facilities such as parkland, schools, and police protection, to support the new development. <i>(Community-wide strategy.)</i>	-	-	
2.12	Land that has direct access to the expressway should be designated for light industry, office or commercial use.	-	-	

p = partially met ? = cannot determine (-) N/A = not applicable

3.0 GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS	YES	NO	COMMENTS
3.1 Open Space			
3.1.1 Strategies to preserve and maximize open space.	?	?	Common open space courtyard proposed near clubhouse. Measurements not included.
3.1.2 Maintain major stream corridors in their natural state or allow such state over time.	x		Stream corridor protection zone established
3.1.3 Construct pathways through stream corridors.	-	-	
3.1.4 Rural road open space should be left in its natural wooded state, be allowed to revert to that state, or remain as farmland or grassland.	-	-	
3.1.5 Open space should connect with stream and rural road spaces and with each other.		x	No open space indicated to connect to stream corridor zone.
3.1.6 Maximum lot coverage of buildings and parking lots shall not exceed 70%; meaning that at least 30% of the site shall be dedicated to open green space.	?	?	Lot coverage data not indicated. Proposal appears greater than 70% lot coverage.
3.2 General Landscape, Screening, & Buffering			
3.2.1 Street trees on both sides of new public and private streets at a maximum separation of 30 feet apart, unless tree groupings are more practical.	x		
3.2.2 Preserve or replace hedgerows on rural roads and arterials. Within rural road setback, provide 4 trees/100 lineal feet in natural hedgerow manner.	-	-	
3.2.3 Landscaping within the setback along roadways should appear natural in character.	x		
3.2.4 Site layout should avoid unnecessary destruction of wooded areas. Attempt to preserve existing trees and tree rows.	x		
3.2.5 Landscape designs reviewed by registered landscape designer or architect.	x		
3.2.6 Headlight screening in parking lots a minimum of 4 feet.		x	Proper headlight screening not indicated
3.2.7 Mounding if used for screening, shall have a maximum 3:1 slope with landscaping.	-	-	
3.3 Lighting			
3.3.1 Fully shielded, cut-off lighting used.	?	?	Lighting information not submitted.
3.3.2 Security lighting is "motion sensor" type.	?	?	
3.3.3 Outdoor light poles do not exceed 30 feet.	?	?	
3.3.4 All wiring is underground.	?	?	
3.3.5 All external outdoor lighting fixtures are similar.	?	?	
3.3.6 Ground mounted lighting is shielded and landscaped.	?	?	
3.4 Roadways			
3.4.1 Roadways should follow the Roadway Plan.	-	-	
3.4.2 Appropriateness of street light fixture, type, and light level of the luminaire.	?	?	
3.4.3 Size and use of streets should be consistent with Accord.	x		

EVALUATION CHECKLIST – Office

P = partially met ? = cannot determine (-) N/A = not applicable

4.0 DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - OFFICE	YES	NO	COMMENTS
4.1 The office zones are envisioned as campus-style suburban office development where greens and landscaping play a prominent role in public open space delineation.	-	-	
4.2 Buildings should front major roadways with parking located behind the buildings.	X		
4.3 Building arrangements should provide convenient and safe pedestrian connections between buildings and parking lots, and other civic or public uses.	X		
4.3 Permitted base density is 10,000 square feet per acre; w/ bonus up to 12,000 sf	?	?	Square footage measurements not delineated in site plan. Proposed density is 246units/9.05ac=27.18du/ac
4.1 Streets			
4.1.1 Streets within the Office District should be two-way.	x		
4.1.2 On-street parking is discouraged.	x		
4.1.3 Sidewalks should be provided to encourage walking and should be setback a minimum of 10 feet from the street.	x		Sidewalk proposed along Central College Rd.
4.1.4 Street trees should be provided on both sides of the street at a minimum of 40 feet on center.	x		
4.1.5 Streets should connect with each other. Cul-de-sacs are discouraged.	x		
4.2 Parking			
4.2.1 Primary parking should be located behind office buildings and not between the primary street and the office buildings. Minimal short-term visitor and “drop-off” parking can be provided at the front of the building.	x		
4.2.2 Parking lots between buildings should be interconnected to encourage parking areas shared among buildings and to reduce paved areas.	x		
4.2.3 Parking areas should be screened from view by evergreen landscape materials or masonry walls to a height of no less than four feet.	?	?	Screening measurements and information not delineated in submission.
4.2.4 Parking areas located behind buildings should include curbed landscaped spaces with deciduous trees. These landscaped areas shall amount to not less than five percent of the vehicular use area and be evenly distributed throughout the parking area to minimize the visual impact of the parking areas.	x		
4.2.5 Use of non-automotive transportation such as walking and bicycling is encouraged. Bicycle parking should be convenient, covered and located near all building entrances.	x		Bicycle racks are shown in plans.
4.2.6 The maximum amount of parking permitted is one space per 250 square feet.	x		
4.3 Civic Space			
4.3.1 Office buildings should be setback from the primary street right-of-way a minimum of 50 feet to maintain a natural greenway as a visual amenity.	-	-	
4.3.2 Common open spaces or greens that are framed by buildings and that create a “campus-like” office environment are encouraged.	x		

4.4 Site Orientation			
4.4.1 Buildings should be oriented to front the primary public roadways.	x		
4.4.2 All lots should front on public or private roads.	x		
4.4.3 When open space between buildings occurs, pedestrian connections shall be established between the rear parking area and the sidewalk in the front of the building.	x		
4.5 Architecture			
4.5.1 Buildings should be sited in relationship to each other to provide convenient pedestrian connections between each building, to parking, and to any other civic or public uses within convenient walking distances.	x		
4.5.2 The maximum building height is three stories, not to exceed 65 feet in height.	?	?	3 stories proposed in rendering. Height not delineated in submission
4.5.3 Any side of a building which faces a public right-of-way or green shall be of compatible materials and style as the other sides of the building.	x		