

# ROCKY FORK - BLACKLICK ACCORD

## IMPLEMENTATION PANEL

---

### MEETING AGENDA

July 16, 2020

4:00 p.m.

WebEx Virtual Hearing/ Streamed online at <http://www.youtube.com/cityofcolumbus>

#### *I. Call to Order*

#### *II. Organization*

#### *III. Record of Proceedings*

- A. Approve record of proceedings from June 18, 2020 meeting

#### *IV. Old Business*

#### *V. New Business*

*(Review procedure: staff report; applicant presentation; panel comments; public comments)*

##### **1. 6465 N. Hamilton Rd (Z19-007):**

Review and action regarding a Columbus application to rezone a site at the southwest corner of North Hamilton and Warner Rds.

*Acreage: 1.3 ac (re-zoning), 2.75 ac (full site)*

*Current Zoning: Commercial Planned Development (CPD)*

*RFBA District: Multi-family*

*Proposed Zoning: Commercial Planned Development (CPD)*

*Applicant(s): TH Midwest c/o Christopher Rinehart*

*Property Owner(s): Cardinal Title Holding Co.*

##### **2. 7488 Lee Rd (Z20-041):**

Conceptual regarding a Columbus application to rezone a property at 7488 Lee Road.

*Acreage: 2.71 ac +/-*

*Current Zoning: Rural (R)*

*RFBA District: Rural Residential*

*Proposed Zoning: Suburban Residential (SR)*

*Applicant(s): Benjamin Simms c/o Denise Diyanni*

*Property Owner(s): Benjamin Simms*

#### *VI. Adjournment*

# ROCKY FORK - BLACKLICK ACCORD

## IMPLEMENTATION PANEL

### MEETING MINUTES

June 18, 2020

6:00 p.m.  
New Albany Village Hall  
99 West Main Street, New Albany, OH

#### *I. Call to Order*

The virtual meeting opened at approximately 4:00 pm with the following members present: Todd Brubaker, Mike Chappellear, Jay Herskowitz, Ron Lachey (arrived at 4:11pm), Dave Paul and Mohit Gupta, Kyle Sellers, Kim Burton and Raplh Smithers. Kim Burton chaired the meeting. Staff members present were and Stephen Mayer and Chris Christian, City of New Albany as well as Marc Rostan, Stephanie Kesnler, and Christopher Lohr from the City of Columbus.

#### *II. Record of Proceedings*

Mr. Herskowitz motioned to approve the minutes of January 15, 2020 meeting, seconded by Mr. Gupta. Minutes approved by an 8-0 vote.

#### *III. Old Business*

#### *IV. New Business*

##### **Motor Enclave District Rezoning (ZC-43-2020)**

Review and action regarding a New Albany application to rezone a property generally located north of State Route 161, south of Smith's Mill Road and west of Kitzmiller Road for an area to be known as the "Motor Enclave Zoning District"

*Acreage:* 19.68 ac +/-  
*Current Zoning:* Commercial Planned Unit Development (C-PUD)  
*RFBA District:* Office  
*Proposed Zoning:* Infill Planned Unit Development (I-PUD)  
*Applicant(s):* The Motor Enclave New Albany, LLC, c/o Aaron L. Underhill, Esq.  
*Property Owner(s):* New Albany Company LLC

Mr. Christian presented the staff report and report card information for the application.

The applicant, Mr. Underhill, presented additional information about the application.

Mr. Oleshansky presented additional information about the application.

The board asked various questions about the application and expressed concerns regarding parking and intersection safety.

Ms. Burton asked if anyone else from the application team would like to speak.

Mr. Underhill provided some additional information.

Ms. Burton asked if there were any members of the public who wished to comment on the application.

Mr. Rostan and Mr. Christian confirmed that there were no members from the public wishing to speak.

Ms. Burton asked if the board would like to comment on the application.

Mr. Paul asked what location on the site would serve as a common space for public or private events and how traffic would be accommodated on the site.

Mr. Underhill stated that the applicant has been working closely with the city and they have determined that a traffic study is not needed for the application as the expected traffic is minimal.

Mr. Oleshansky stated that the expected on site traffic will be minimal (12-24 people per day). Additionally, there are two types of events, smaller private events in the community building as well as public events which would be very infrequent (six times a year at most) and they hoped to create some sort of shared parking program with adjacent properties.

Mr. Brubaker asked what was intended for the remaining 2+/- acres at the corner of Smith's Mill Road and Kitzmiller Road.

Mr. Underhill stated that Mr. Oleshansky has the option to purchase the additional property and if it is used, it would be used as green space and minimal recreational amenities.

Mr. Oleshansky stated that Mr. Underhill was correct in his description of the potential use of the remaining acreage.

Mr. Smithers asked about the lighting requirements in the text.

Mr. Oleshansky stated that the intent is not to add any flood lights but use low lighting in between and on the buildings in order to maintain the desired aesthetic.

Mr. Chappellear asked questions about the architecture and stated that he preferred the horse barn design.

Mr. Oleshansky provided some clarification on the architecture.

Mr. Gupta asked the applicant to confirm the hours of operation and if there is an intent to drive the vehicles throughout the city.

Mr. Oleshansky stated that owners would have 24/7 access to the site. Additionally, the development will have very strict condo association rules that prohibits users from leaving cars outside the garage when they leave and that most of the events would be held on site.

Ms. Burton stated that this an interesting and unique use stating that it is a nice buffer along State Route 161.

Ms. Burton asked about the environmentally sensitive area surrounding the site and if there were any potential negative impacts to these due to the current site design.

Mr. Oleshansky stated that they are designing around them and that there would not be any floor drains on the site.

Mr. Underhill stated that the wetland areas are permitted and there are buffer areas around them.

Ms. Burton asked about the partial credit given for standard 4.1.3 in the checklist and if the applicant could explain the site pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Oleshansky stated that there is not room for sidewalks on the site given how small it is and users walk through the paved areas to get between buildings.

Ms. Burton stated that it seemed like this was appropriate based on the use.

Ms. Burton 4.1.7 asked if there would be a trail provided along Kitzmiller Road.

Mr. Underhill stated that this was an ongoing conversation with the city.

Mr. Mayer stated that the partial credit was given because it was not mentioned in the zoning text and that this was the location for the future VeloLoop which will be completed by the city.

Mr. Brubaker asked the applicant for the web address for their current project in Michigan.

Mr. Oleshansky provided the website address for multiple sites.

Ms. Burton asked if there were any other comments from the board.

Mr. Lachey stated that this use appeared to be appropriate based on surrounding uses.

Mr. Paul asked about the ratings that the Michigan development received on Google.

Mr. Oleshansky stated that the Michigan site has a race track in the middle of a residential area. The negative comments were a result of an event were 30,000 people came to the site and created a lot of traffic and noise which would not be the case at this site here in New Albany.

Ms. Burton asked if the board felt comfortable moving forward with a motion.

Mr. Smithers moved to approve the application and seconded by Mr. Lachey. The motion passed 9-0

Mr. Chappellear asked if it was possible to watch the meeting on YouTube at a later date.

Mr. Rostan stated that the file would be available at a later date that could be requested.

Ms. Burton asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Chappellear moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Paul. Meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.

## Multifamily EVALUATION CHECKLIST

PROJECT: 6465 N. HAMILTON RD.  
 APPLICANT: TH MIDWEST INC.  
 RFBA DISTRICT: MULTI-FAMILY  
 EXISTING ZONING: CPD

EVALUATED ON: 07/09/2020  
 REVISED: 7/16/2020  
 BY: MARC ROSTAN, CITY OF COLUMBUS

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
	CPD	Multi-Family	Commercial	N/A	1.269	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				N/A	1.269	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				N/A	1.269	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

EVALUATION SUMMARY	YES	PARTIAL	NO	?	COMMENTS
1.0 Key Principles	2	1			
2.0 Strategies	3				
3.0 General Development Standards	8	1	1		
4.0 District Development Standards	16	2	2		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>		86%

<b>1.0 KEY PRINCIPLES (NON-NEGOTIABLE)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
1.1 Maintain aesthetic character of rural roads.	-	-	This location is not rural in nature.
1.2 Use open space as an organization element.	-	-	N/A
1.3 Use a compact form of development in town and village clusters with defined edges such as green belts and natural corridors.	-	-	N/A
1.4 Develop mixed uses in town and village centers.	-	-	N/A
1.5 Develop diversity in housing prices and types.	-	-	N/A
1.6 Create a center focus that combines civic, cultural, and recreational uses.	-	-	N/A
1.7 Create an ample supply of squares, greens, parks and landscaping.	P		Hamilton Rd landscaping and parking lot trees included. Staff note absence of parking lot screening to west and south
1.8 Guarantee permanent protection of greenbelts, streams, creeks, woodlands, grasslands, wetlands, and historic sites.	-	-	N/A
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.	-	-	

<b>2.0 STRATEGIES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
2.1 Development should be compatible with the rural landscape.	-	-	This location is not rural in nature.
2.2 Higher density residential should be located adjacent to open space.	-	-	N/A
2.3 Natural features should be preserved.	-	-	N/A
2.4 Retail development should be community-based.	✓		
2.5 Developers should be encouraged to mix uses and housing types where appropriate.	-	-	N/A
2.6 Historic and cultural resources should be protected and preserved.	-	-	N/A
2.7 Scenic qualities along roadways should be maintained.	-	-	This location is not rural in nature.
2.8 Rural character of the land along regional roads should be maintained.	-	-	This location is not rural in nature.
2.9 Density bonuses and design flexibility are encouraged to allow cluster development.	-	-	N/A
2.10 Neighborhood commercial uses should be confined to the community centers or plazas.	✓		Recommended for multi-family, however site is within a cluster of commercial uses.
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>	-	-	N/A
2.12 Land that has direct access to the expressway should be designated for light industry, office or commercial use.	✓		

<b>3.0 GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
<b>3.1 Open Space</b>			
3.1.1 Strategies to preserve and maximize open space.	-	-	N/A
3.1.2 Maintain major stream corridors in their natural state or allow such state over time.	-	-	N/A
3.1.3 Construct pathways through stream corridors.	-	-	N/A
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.	-	-	This location is not rural in nature.
3.1.5 Open space should connect with stream and rural road spaces and with each other.	-	-	N/A
3.1.6 Maximum lot coverage of buildings and parking lots shall not exceed 70%.	✓	-	60% impervious on original parcel, 61% after right of way dedication.
<b>3.2 General Landscape, Screening, &amp; Buffering</b>			
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 (of equal quantity) are more practical.	✓		
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. Mix of 2" caliper trees.	-	-	N/A
3.2.3 Landscaping within the setback along roadways should appear natural in character.			
3.2.4 Site layout should avoid unnecessary destruction of wooded areas. Attempt to preserve existing trees and tree rows.	-	-	N/A
3.2.5 Landscape designs reviewed by registered landscape designer or architect.	✓	-	Jeff Sampson, Prime AE
3.2.6 Minimum size at installation shall be 2" caliper for deciduous shade and ornamental trees and 6' high for evergreen trees. Landscaping requirements may be waived if healthy plant material within the setback area is preserved.	✓		Deciduous shade trees have 2.5" caliper.
3.2.7 Headlight screening of parking lots should be a minimum of 4 feet high.		✓	Headlight screening not shown by rear parking spaces.
3.2.8 Mounding for screening purposes are usually 4' foot high having a 3:1 slope beginning at the setback line, a 5' wide crest, and sloping gently to the R.O.W. line. Mounds should be landscaped with a mix of shrubs, deciduous, evergreen, and ornamental trees.	-	-	N/A
<b>3.3 Lighting</b>			
3.3.1 Fully shielded, cut-off lighting used.	✓		
3.3.2 Security lighting is "motion sensor" type.	-	-	N/A
3.3.3 Outdoor light poles do not exceed 30 feet.	✓		All area lights on new 15 foot pole.
3.3.4 All wiring is underground.	✓		Confirmed by project engineer
3.3.5 All external outdoor lighting fixtures are similar.	✓		
3.3.6 Ground mounted lighting is shielded and landscaped.	P		Ground mounted lighting in rear not landscaped.
<b>3.4 Roadways</b>			
3.4.1 Roadways should follow the Roadway Plan.	-	-	N/A
3.4.2 Appropriateness of street light fixture, type, and light level of the luminaire.	-	-	N/A
3.4.3 Size and use of streets should be consistent with Accord.	-	-	N/A

<b>4.0 DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - VILLAGE MIXED USE*</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
4.1	A wide variety and combination of land uses are permitted; including retail, restaurants, administrative business and professional office, research facilities, personal and consumer services, and single-family and attached residential.	✓		
4.2	Permitted base density 8,000 square feet per acre, w/ bonus up to 10,000 sf.	✓		
4.3	Permitted residential base density is 1.5 units per acre, w/ bonus up to 3 du/ac.	-	-	N/A
4.4	Residential uses may not exceed 35 percent of the mixed-use area.	-	-	N/A
<b>4.1 Streets</b>				
4.1.1	The maximum length of a block is 500'.	-	-	N/A
4.1.2	The primary town arterial street should have a 110 foot right-of-way with a landscaped median.	-	-	N/A
4.1.3	Town arterial streets may be two-way with diagonal on-street parking on the retail side of the street.	-	-	N/A
4.1.4	The streetscape should include deciduous street trees planted 40 feet on center.	✓		Five deciduous shade trees are proposed to front N Hamilton Rd.
4.1.5	All power and communication utility lines should be underground.	✓		Confirmed by project engineer
4.1.6	Decorative street lighting should be provided.	-	-	N/A
4.1.7	Sidewalks, other than in retail areas, should be four feet wide and located a minimum of ten feet behind the curb.	✓		A five foot wide sidewalk is proposed.
4.1.8	In retail areas, the sidewalk should extend generally from the back of curb to the "build to" line to create a wide comfortable pedestrian area in front of the buildings.		✓	Setback and landscaping separate sidewalk from building.
4.1.9	The rural 250-foot setback does not apply in this district.	✓		
4.1.10	Narrower streets are encouraged where appropriate to promote a pedestrian friendly scale.	-	-	N/A
<b>4.2 Parking</b>				
4.2.1	Parking areas should be located behind buildings. Diagonal on-street parking should be provided in front of buildings for retail uses only.	✓		Parking is to the rear for the Z19-007 parcel.
4.2.2	Parking should be consolidated into public parking lots behind the buildings. Private parking areas for individual commercial uses should be discouraged. Shared parking between individual commercial, retail and residential uses is encouraged.	✓		
4.2.3	The following parking ratio requirements should not be exceeded: Retail: 1 space per 250 gross square feet Office: 1 space per 250 gross square feet These parking ratios should be used in designing parking areas for mixed-use development for which shared parking is encouraged to reduce parking areas.	✓		14 parking spaces on parcel with building approx. 3300 square feet= 1 space per 250 square feet.
4.2.4	Bicycle parking should be conveniently provided at the front and/or rear of all buildings.	-	-	N/A

4.2.5	Parking areas located behind buildings should contain curbed landscaped spaces with deciduous trees. These landscaped areas shall amount to not less than five percent of the vehicular use area and be located throughout the parking area to minimize the visual impact.	✓		
4.2.6	Parking lots should be screened from all public rights-of-way, residential areas and open spaces by a 4 foot minimum evergreen hedge or masonry wall.	-	-	Parking abuts a circulation lane and separate parking lot.
4.2.7	When abutting dissimilar uses, a minimum shared 25 foot buffer zone shall be maintained.	-	-	Abuts a commercial use.
<b>4.3 Civic Space</b>				
4.3.1	Common open spaces and/or public greens that are framed by buildings are encouraged.	-	-	N/A
4.3.2	For residential uses, a minimum of 20 percent of the gross site area will be set aside as publicly accessible open space. This open space must be fronted on at least two sides by a public street.	-	-	N/A
<b>4.4 Site Orientation</b>				
4.4.1	For retail uses along Central College Road, a “build to” line should be established ten feet back from the street right-of-way, which provides for a 30 foot wide setback from the curb with sidewalk and street trees. At least 80 percent of the building elevation must be constructed to the “build to” line.	-	-	
4.4.2	For office and residential uses, a “build to” line should be established 50 feet from the street right-of-way.	-	-	N/A
4.4.3	Attached and/or multi-tenant buildings are encouraged. Excessive gaps and non-usable spaces between buildings are discouraged.	-	-	N/A
4.4.4	When open spaces between buildings occur, pedestrian connections should be established between the rear parking area and the sidewalk in front of the building.		✓	Pedestrian connection not established from Hamilton.
4.4.5	Buildings and individual establishments (i.e. shops, stores, offices) should have front and rear entrances whenever possible.	-	-	
<b>4.5 Architecture</b>				
4.5.1	The massing and architectural detailing of buildings should be stronger and more prominent at corner locations.	-	-	Site reviewed is not on a corner.
4.5.2	Individual building length should not exceed 200 feet. Building height should be a minimum of two stories and not exceed three stories.	p		Building length is approx.102'. Height is one story.
4.5.3	Sloped or pitched roofs are encouraged. Flat roofs are allowed only with highly detailed or decorative cornices.	✓		Cornices included on elevations
4.5.4	The maximum use of see-through glass is encouraged on the street level of buildings. Reflective, opaque and non-translucent building materials are discouraged at street level. Operable recessed windows on all building levels are encouraged.	✓		Windows on car wash are transparent
4.5.5	The rear elevation of buildings facing the parking areas should be designed in a coordinated manner with high quality building materials, lighting and signage. Rear entrances should be attractively designed. Loading and refuse areas should be consolidated, shared and attractively and completely screened.	✓		

4.5.6	Building materials should be traditional and natural such as brick, stone, wood, and glass.	✓		Materials used include cultured stone, EIFS, and metal panel siding
4.5.7	Storefronts should relate directly and clearly to the street. Extensive use of glass is encouraged for storefronts.	-	-	N/A. No storefront.
4.5.8	The building height shall not exceed two and one half stories in appearance. The minimum building height shall be no less than one and one half stories in appearance.	p		Car wash only. Height is one story.
4.5.9	Architectural massing shall be broken up to maintain a village scale.	✓		
4.5.10	Any side of a building which faces a public street, r.o.w., or green shall be of compatible material in style as the other sides of the building.	✓		
4.5.11	For multi-family residential development, garage doors shall not face the primary street.	-	-	N/A

\*District standards reviewed in light of the site's existing zoning and surrounding development pattern.

**THE ROCKY FORK-BLACKLICK ACCORD  
STAFF REPORT**

**Meeting Date: July 16, 2020**

**Z19-007: 6465 N. Hamilton Rd.**

Review and action regarding a Columbus application to rezone a site located at the southwest corner of North Hamilton and Warner Road.

**Proposed Uses:** Car wash

**Applicant:** TH Midwest, Inc. c/o Christopher Rinehart

**Staff Recommendation:** Conditional Approval

SUB-AREA	REQUESTED ZONING	RFBA DISTRICT	USE TYPE	SIZE (# OF UNITS OR SQ. FT.)	ACREAGE (GROSS)	PROPOSED DENSITY (DU/AC)	PERMITTED DENSITY		PARKLAND /OPEN SPACE/ GREEN AC/CIVIC SPACE	
							BASE	BONUS	PROVIDED	REQUIRED
N/A	CPD	Multi-Family	Commercial	N/A	1.269	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT				N/A	1.269	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT				N/A	1.269	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Introduction/Proposal Summary:**

The applicant requests review and action of Columbus application Z19-007. The site is an undeveloped, 1.27 acre parcel at 6465 N. Hamilton Rd. It is proposed a car wash will be built on the site. Although currently zoned Commercial Planned Development (CPD) following conditional approval from the Panel in Z03-010, the applicant is proposing changes to the development text, thus requiring a rezone. The car wash will be developed in conjunction with a fueling station and convenience store with drive thru on the adjacent parcel to the north, which is applying for variances through the Board of Zoning Adjustment in application BZA19-145. Supplemental materials related to the BZA application may be viewed [at this link](#). BZA applications are not reviewed by the panel, however staff have commented and requested revisions to the site design of that portion. Staff review and the panel’s action will focus on the car wash only.

**Considerations:**

The Accord recommends “Multi-Family” at this location with a rural corridor along Warner Road. However, this site occupies a corner of the Hamilton and Warner Road intersection, where development patterns have grown to include a mix of uses, including commercial, multi-family, and condominiums.

Although the application for a commercial use is inconsistent with the plan recommendation, given the surrounding development pattern staff consider it an appropriate proposed use for the site. For this reason, Village Mixed-Use standards are reviewed for appropriateness of the development standards.

**Staff Comments:**

Staff finds the proposal to be an appropriate land use for the site, given the existing commercial zoning and emerging development pattern at the Hamilton and Warner Road intersection promoting a mixed use environment.

Staff finds the proposal generally meets the design guidelines with regard to lighting, building design and parking placement. It improves pedestrian connectivity by placing sidewalks along N Hamilton Rd. Staff has requested additional information regarding lot coverage, which may exceed 70%. Staff note landscaping is included along the Hamilton Road frontage, but observe an absence of headlight screening landscaping from rear parking lot spaces and no landscape buffering along the southern property line.

Staff analysis found the principles and strategies that were applicable to this application were generally adhered to. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- Additional landscaping be included to the west to screen the parking lot, and to the south to screen the circulation lane from the adjacent property

## EVALUATION CHECKLIST

PROJECT: **7488 LEE RD. (43081)**  
 (2.7 ACRES)  
 APPLICANT: BENJAMIN SIMMS; C/O DENISE DIYANNI, AGENT.  
 EXISTING ZONING: R, RURAL DISTRICT  
 RFBA DISTRICT: RURAL RESIDENTIAL (RR)

EVALUATED ON: JUNE 24, 2020  
 REVISED: TBD  
 BY: STEPHANIE KENSLER

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
A	SR, Suburban Residential District (H-35)	RR	Lot Split, Single Family House	1 new; 1 existing	2.7 total, tbd split.	1 du/ac	1.0	2	0	0
<b>TOTAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>2.7 ac</b>	<b>1 du/ac</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>										
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>2.7 ac</b>	<b>1 du/ac</b>			<b>0 ac</b>	<b>0 ac</b>

EVALUATION SUMMARY		YES	PARTIAL	NO	?	COMMENTS
1.0	Key Principles	-	-	-	3	Need additional information- site plan, landscape plan, renderings.
2.0	Strategies	-	-	-	3	Need additional information- site plan, landscape plan, renderings.
3.0	General Development Standards	-	-	-	15	Need additional information- site plan, landscape plan, renderings.
4.0	District Development Standards	3	-	-	12	Need additional information- site plan, landscape plan, renderings.
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>XX%</b> (incl. half of partials) compliant

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

<b>1.0 KEY PRINCIPLES (NON-NEGOTIABLE)</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
1.1	Maintain aesthetic character of rural roads.	?	?	
1.2	Use open space as an organization element.	-	-	
1.3	Use a compact form of development in town and village clusters with defined edges such as green belts and natural corridors.	-	-	N/A.
1.4	Develop mixed uses in town and village centers.	-	-	N/A.
1.5	Develop diversity in housing prices and types.	-	-	N/A.
1.6	Create a center focus that combines civic, cultural, and recreational uses.	-	-	N/A.
1.7	Create an ample supply of squares, greens, parks and landscaping.	?	?	
1.8	Guarantee permanent protection of greenbelts, streams, creeks, woodlands, grasslands, wetlands, and historic sites.	-	-	N/A. None identified.
1.9	Development in town must be located within easy walking or biking distances of other neighborhoods, schools, retail centers and transit stops.	-	-	N/A.
1.10	Development must pay its own way.	?	?	Need to confirm with Economic Development if PAWG is applicable to single family lot split (staff to follow-up).

<b>2.0 STRATEGIES</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
2.1	Development should be compatible with the rural landscape.	?	?	Use consistent with Accord other factors difficult to evaluate without site plan, landscape plan and renderings.
2.2	Higher density residential should be located adjacent to open space.	-	-	N/A.
2.3	Natural features should be preserved.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
2.4	Retail development should be community-based.	-	-	N/A.
2.5	Developers should be encouraged to mix uses and housing types where appropriate.	-	-	N/A.
2.6	Historic and cultural resources should be protected and preserved.	-	-	N/A; none identified.
2.7	Scenic qualities along roadways should be maintained.	-	-	Cannot determine without site plan.
2.8	Rural character of the land along regional roads should be maintained.	?	?	Identified as natural/rural corridor. Cannot determine without site/landscaping plan.
2.9	Density bonuses and design flexibility are encouraged to allow cluster development.	-	-	N/A.
2.10	Confine neighborhood commercial uses to community centers or plazas.	-	-	N/A.
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> )	-	-	N/A. Single Family Home.
2.12	Land that has direct access to the expressway should be designated for light industry, office or commercial use.	-	-	N/A.

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

<b>3.0 GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
<b>3.1 Open Space</b>			
3.1.1 Strategies to preserve and maximize open space.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan.
3.1.2 Maintain major stream corridors in their natural state or allow such state over time.	-	-	N/A.
3.1.3 Construct pathways through stream corridors.	-	-	N/A.
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.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan. Lee Rd. is identified as rural corridor. Retention of land within the 50' setback is possible.
3.1.5 Open space should connect with stream and rural road spaces and with each other.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan.
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.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan.
<b>3.2 General Landscape, Screening, &amp; Buffering</b>			
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.	-	-	N/A. No new streets proposed.
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.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
3.2.3 Landscaping within the setback along roadways should appear natural in character.	?	?	Cannot determine without landscape plan.
3.2.4 Site layout should avoid unnecessary destruction of wooded areas. Attempt to preserve existing trees and tree rows.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan.
3.2.5 Landscape designs reviewed by registered landscape designer or architect.	?	?	
3.2.6 Headlight screening in parking lots a minimum of 4 feet.	-	-	N/A.
3.2.7 Mounding if used for screening, shall have a maximum 3:1 slope with landscaping.	?	?	Cannot determine without landscape plan.
<b>3.3 Lighting</b>			
3.3.1 Fully shielded, cut-off lighting used.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
3.3.2 Security lighting is "motion sensor" type.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
3.3.3 Outdoor light poles do not exceed 30 feet.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
3.3.4 All wiring is underground.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
3.3.5 All external outdoor lighting fixtures are similar.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
3.3.6 Ground mounted lighting is shielded and landscaped.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
<b>3.4 Roadways</b>			
3.4.1 Roadways should follow the Roadway Plan.	-	-	N/A. No new roadways proposed.
3.4.2 Appropriateness of street light fixture, type, and light level of the luminaire.	-	-	N/A
3.4.3 Size and use of streets should be consistent with Accord.	-	-	N/A. No new roadways proposed.

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

<b>4.0 DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - RURAL RESIDENTIAL</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
4.1	The rural residential district is intended to include low-density residential development within a context of large open spaces and agricultural uses.	?	?	Low density residential proposed, but cannot evaluate open space without site plan.
4.2	Permitted land use is single-family residential.	X		
4.3	Permitted base density is 1 unit per acre.	X		
<b>4.1 Streets</b>				
4.1.1	Two-way streets with a 50-foot right-of-way w/o parking or curbs are encouraged.	-	-	N/A. No new streets proposed.
4.1.2	Bike paths and sidewalks can be combined for pedestrian use.	-	-	N/A.
<b>4.2 Parking</b>				
4.2.1	On-street parking for residents is discouraged.	?	?	
<b>4.3 Open Space</b>				
4.3.1	Incorporate the natural landscape & open space into residential design & development.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscape plan.
4.3.2	Within rural cluster development, provide at least 50% contiguous natural open space.	-	-	N/A. Single Family Home.
<b>4.4 Site Orientation</b>				
4.4.1	Single-family houses should front onto public open spaces and not back onto public parks or roads.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan.
4.4.2	The average single-family lot width should not exceed 85 feet.	X		New lot width is 70 feet.
4.4.3	The average single-family lot area should not exceed 11, 500 square feet.	?	?	Confirm total lot area
4.4.4	Existing woodlots and fence rows should be preserved and used to structure rural cluster development. Residential development should be at the “edge” of woodlots and fence rows rather than “in” the woodlots. The existing landscape structure should be preserved and used to frame rural cluster development.	?	?	Cannot determine without site/landscaping plan.
<b>4.5 Architecture</b>				
4.5.1	The massing of each house should be simple and traditional.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan/renderings.
4.5.2	Sloped and pitched roofs are encouraged. Flat roofs are allowed only with highly detailed or decorative cornices.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan/renderings.
4.5.3	Side loaded garages are encouraged. When a garage faces the street, the front façade of the garage must set back a minimum of 3 feet from the front façade of the house.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan/renderings.
4.5.4	The maximum width of a garage door which faces the street is 10 feet.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan/renderings.
4.5.5	Building materials should be traditional and natural in appearance, such as brick, stone, wood, and glass.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan/renderings.
4.5.6	The maximum building height should be two and one-half stories and the minimum building height should be one and one-half story in appearance.	?	?	Cannot determine without site plan/renderings.

**THE ROCKY FORK-BLACKLICK ACCORD  
STAFF REPORT**

**Meeting Date: July 16, 2020**

**Z20-041: 7488 Lee Road (43081)**

Conceptual review regarding a Columbus application to rezone a site generally located north of Central College Rd., south of Walnut St, east of Cabbage Rd., and west of Harlem Rd.

**Proposed Uses:** SR, Suburban Residential (lot split).

**Applicant:** Benjamin Simms; c/o Denise Diyanni, Agent

**Staff Recommendation:** N/A, Conceptual Review

SUB-AREA	REQUESTED ZONING	RFBA DISTRICT	USE TYPE	SIZE (# OF UNITS OR SQ. FT.)	ACREAGE (GROSS)	PROPOSED DENSITY (DU/AC)	PERMITTED DENSITY		PARKLAND /OPEN SPACE/ GREEN AC/CIVIC SPACE	
							BASE	BONUS	PROVIDED	REQUIRED
N/A	SR, Suburban Residential District (H-35)	RR	Lot Split, Single Family House	1 new; 1 existing	2.7 total; split tbd	1 du/ac	1	2	0	0
<b>TOTAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1 du/ac</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				<b>1 unit</b>	<b>2.7 ac</b>	<b>1 du/ac</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Introduction/Proposal Summary:**

The applicant requests conceptual review of Columbus application Z20-041. The site consists of one single family home on 2.7 acres. The applicant is requesting a lot split that would allow for the future construction of one additional single family home. The site is currently zoned Rural Residential.

**Considerations:**

The Accord designates Lee Road as a natural/rural corridor.

The proposal is within an area with a recommended maximum density of 1 unit per acre. The proposal meets that recommendation.

The Rocky Fork Blacklick Accord Plan recommends new rural residential development be of traditional design and material while preserving the existing, natural landscape (p. 140-141). Information addressing these Plan recommendations was not yet able to be provided by the applicant.

**Staff Comments:**

Staff finds the proposal to be an appropriate land use for the site, based on the size of the site and the number of dwelling units/acre. The Rocky Fork Blacklick Accord (2003) recommends 1du/ac. (p. 137)

Staff requests additional information in the form of elevations, site and landscape plans to review the proposal for consistency with the recommendations of the Plan.

The applicant is submitting for conceptual review only at this time. As such, staff is not offering a recommendation at this time.