

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS -- excerpt

May 20, 2004

Application Review

2. 5461 New Albany Road East (Z04-015)

Review of Columbus rezoning application to reconfigure subareas & open space to permit new user

Zoning Request: To rezone from LARO, Limited Apartment Office & LC-4, Limited Commercial to LC-2, Limited Commercial (Office) & LC-4, Limited Commercial (Community Scale)

Proposed Use: Office, Retail, Open Space —

Applicant: The New Albany Company; c/o Ben Hale

Staff Report: Staff responded to questions, particularly regarding the checklist.

Applicant Presentation: Representing EMH&T, Mr. Ben Hale, of the law firm Smith & Hale, presented the case for a new corporate office building just north of the New Albany Road "wishbone" T-intersection to house the engineering firm's current 350 employees. In addition to aerials and zoning area maps provided by staff, rendered sketches of the building and site plan were distributed. A larger scale line drawing of the site plan showed the building footprint and parking area. The 100,000+ square foot proposal consists of two three-story buildings separated by a covered open air plaza. A six foot high mound will be planted to effectively screen the parking from road. A fence and leisure trail will be provided along the roadway. Of an existing 8.5 acre open space, approximately 3.5 acres will be relocated along Sugar Run Creek in adjacent subareas. The new open space will serve in similar manner as it does in its current location. A one acre plus open space will remain as a prominent element at this location. Central to this open space will be a retention pond, one of three to be developed around the existing tributary. The second pond serves a filtering and settlement function before draining to the last pond, conceived as a manufactured wetland.

Mr. Hale further explained the zoning request and the need to change the text in the new subareas receiving the relocated open space.

Mr. Hale continued to explain the transfer of open space and the remaining large open space serving as an organizing element for the site. He mentioned staff's desire to incorporate more of the open space into the roadway environment by breaking the mounding and fencing. Mr. Hardesty and others supported that concept.

Panel Discussion: Mr. Geiger pointed out that the Accord document illustrates the entire site as open space yet half the site was zoned commercially. He asked if the all green was in error. Though it has been shown as open space consistently from the Accord's inception, office has been indicated on one map under the most recent update. Mr. Sudy honestly didn't know whether if the discrepancy was a result of electronic imaging.

Mr. Kosling questioned the impacts of the lower wetland area. EMHT has a vested interest to insure the stormwater management system is done correctly. In response to Mr. Kosling's question, Mr. Hale explained the retail component is merely a reflection of the existing zoning, particularly in Subarea 2 along the expressway.

Mr. Geiger thought the use made sense. He then asked staff if the application met setbacks and Accord standards. Mr. Klare presented the results of a preliminary checklist evaluation utilizing the office district standards. With a few remaining questions, compliance was about 89%. Mr. Carelton asked why the 30% open space requirement was met. Staff explained the text permitted eighty percent coverage by buildings and parking. Applicant agreed to revise text to 70% coverage. Pathways through stream corridors were

discussed. Though alluded to in the text, none was identified on the plan, particularly relating to a north-south connection off-site. Applicant said the culvert below SR-161 was designed to accommodate future pedestrian traffic. Mr. Geiger thought it wasn't practical to have the parking behind the building at this site. He asked that building mounted lighting and ground mounded lighting be shielded.

Pre-motion discussion: Treatment of frontage to satisfaction of staff. Reallocation is consistent with the prior open space requirement. Provide some continuity and integration between the north and south via a pedestrian linkage.

Public Comment: None.

MOTION: To approve based on approval of the reconfiguration of open space to the satisfaction of staff; approval of the landscape treatment & fencing along the north side of New Albany Road to the satisfaction of staff; to address the connectivity of the open space system to the south, potentially under SR-161 to the satisfaction of staff; and to revise text to insure a net 30% open space.

MOTION BY: Hardesty / seconded by Carleton

RESULT: Approved. (5-0)