

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 12, 2010

Immediately Following Previous Committees or

7:30 PM

Council Committee Rooms

Committee of the Whole

Shane Ewald, Chair

Beryl D. Anderson

Thomas R. Kneeland

Brian Larick

John R. McAlister

Nancy McGregor

David L. Samuel

Members Present: Shane W. Ewald, John McAlister, Nancy R. McGregor, Beryl D. Anderson, Thomas R. Kneeland, David L. Samuel and Brian Larick

Additional Attendees:

Tony Collins, Mike Andrako, Terry Emery, Dottie Franey, Karl Wetherholt, General Williams, Grant Reveal, Angel Mumma, Mayor Stinchcomb, Sadicka White, Matt Huffman, Ken Fultz, Amanda Waples, Bryan Rhoads, Tom Weber, Isobel Sherwood, Brian Hoyt, Chief Murphy, Lt. Spence, Kristen Treadway, Samantha Shuler, Press

PENDING LEGISLATION:

ORD-0066-2010

TO ZONE 2.3+/- ACRES OF PROPERTY AS L-AR, LIMITED OVERLAY/MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL; SAID PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1105 BEECHER CROSSING NORTH; MELISSA'S HOUSE FOUNDATION BY PIZZUTTI, INC., APPLICANT.

Ewald called Committee of the Whole for Monday, April 12, to order; said the reason the meeting is in Chambers is because of the large number of people in attendance; this is a working session no different than a Planning Commission Workshop; we are here to vet and openly discuss any legislation that is before us; it is not a public speaking opportunity; if Council members have questions they may ask anyone to come up and engage in dialogue; normally the public speaking opportunities are the first and third Monday of the month and everyone has the right to come in and voice their opinion at that time; to go ahead and get started, we have pending legislation of ORD-0066-2010 to rezone 2.27 acres identified as 1105 Beecher Crossing North; are there questions from Council.

Kneeland said I have a question on the ownership of the property; is this property owned by the foundation or owned by someone else and contingent on this zoning request. Shuler said she represents the CHN (Community Housing Network) and it is in contract; it is not owned by the foundation at this point.

McAlister said some residents last week expressed concern that so much of the funding for this project comes from government sources; does any of it come from Medicaid or Medicare? Shuler said the service portion could possibly be Medicaid or Medicare; but the development and the actual operating costs to run the apartments are not from Medicaid or Medicare. McAlister said how would you address the concern that funding from these sources could dry up and where would that leave the project. Shuler said it is a service side issue; when a tenant comes here to live here, he would have a case manager; that case manager is billing Medicare or Medicaid to get paid so if those were no longer available, this case manager would have to locate new governmental sources of funding in order to get paid. McAlister said are there funding sources besides the government for this type of home. Shuler said yes, for the services there are funding sources available from local, State and Federal; so all 3 sources have some funds available; for example the Franklin County ADAMH (Alcohol Drug and Mental Health) Board has a levy that helps fund these types of services; it is often matched by Medicaid and Medicare but there are other sources; for the development and operations side of this, the Melissa's House Foundation actually plans to support with money they have started raising, which could be up to 5 million dollars, some of which will go to the development and the rest will be endowed to specifically help operate the location; this is not like usual public funding; you usually do not have this second enhanced source and this is how we are able to make the commitment to the quality of the housing; also

the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development will be a funding source to this partly to development and partly to operating costs and that source has been around since 1978 and has always been funded; it is a 40 year commitment on their part; CHN has been doing these types of HUD 811 (Housing and Urban Development) programs from the 90's; we have 111 units that we have been running from the early 90's and we have never had a funding cut, or even had it threatened to be cut; I know that there were also questions about the fiscal impact of this property on the neighborhood, and I understand why Council wanted a Fiscal Impact Analysis to compare office to residential since it is zoned residential, but honestly, if you do that study any day of the week, that is how it would come out regardless of how high end the apartment building is, or even if you used single family housing; residential housing is always going to lose to commercial; and frankly that is why there is a Land Use Plan; a Land Use Plan doesn't just tell you where to put the office; it tells you how much office you need to have a sustainable tax base; and out of context the Fiscal Impact Study doesn't really help you that much; the question is what does the Land Use Plan recommend; that is when City Officials and Planners considered this mix; and in your North Triangle Plan, it actually recommends residential; so the request isn't just consistent with the Plan, it is more consistent with the Plan; if the Plan thought there wasn't enough office space it would not have recommended residential; I think also practically speaking if you look at today's economy this site was zoned for office in 2000 and for 10 years nobody has put an office building on it; no one has been interested in putting offices here; and that is during a few boom years; the economy really didn't crash until 2008 and even in all that time there was no interest in an office building here; now the chance of there being an office building development here is incredibly low; the office vacancy rates right now are historically high; in suburban Columbus they have a 20% vacancy rate which is 22 million square feet of office space available; in Gahanna that vacancy rate is almost 29 % which means you have close to 800,000 square feet of vacant office space; you combine that with credit being very tight or not available and you are not going to have a lot of people spec building new office buildings; so theoretically an office building would bring more income here to Gahanna but practically speaking, those chances are incredibly low; it is probably going to be 10 to 20 years before the office vacancy that is now available is absorbed in the Franklin County area; so for the fiscal impact , I am not sure there is a bird in the hand there.

Kneeland asked White how much developable land do we have left in the City of Gahanna; just an estimate. White said we are in the process of determining that; I would say that it is less than 1,000 acres, probably closer to 700 acres; not sure of a total; I know of 555 that can be developed; some other tertiary locations have less than 20 acres of contiguous land; we are actually counting almost parcel by parcel the remaining ones; and we are at 555 acres now; the areas that are the smaller ones do not add up to more than 200 acres.

Ewald said he had a follow up question for White concerning the Triangle Plan; has the City followed that? White said yes; we believe we have followed the Triangle Plan in it's guidelines, it's principles and it's values that it is supporting as well as some of the development standards, when we actually do a comparative analysis of what the plan called for 10 years ago and what actually has developed, it indicates to us what is remaining to be developed; in other words what vacant lands are there. Ewald said she specifically referred to it being residential in nature; when you look what we have been doing over the last 5 years with encouraging medical light office, is that still consistent with the Triangle Plan. White said it is consistent with the triangle plan, but the Triangle Plan called for mixed use development which means it can be office commercial and residential within the whole Triangle Plan; it did indicate some areas where, from the Plan standpoint, it would best accommodate residential and then at best those were

guidelines; a lot of the commercial was best on the corridors like Hamilton, Morse, and Johnstown Roads, and where there could be residential was talked about as appropriate for the interior areas; but not necessarily inappropriate for the legs of the triangle; so from the standpoint when we talk about balance, it would be mostly interior multifamily housing as opposed to single family, but it did not preclude that; so basically I'm saying that her estimate of what the Plan says as residential for the interior is more preferable, but both of these uses are appropriate uses.

Ewald said another point I would like clarified; I had a resident of Gahanna call me; there was mention that there might be some flooding originally or some flooding through the ravine in the back section; is that to your knowledge resolved. Wetherholt said water would have to be 30 feet deep. Ewald said so your answer is it would have to be fairly deep to cause any problem; next, by changing this to L-AR, multifamily residential, there is a small pocket of land east of this property but west of the existing multifamily basin that may be isolated based on a map I checked, does that still reside as L-SO and does that render that piece of property unusable for suburban office. White said it would remain L-SO unless it comes in for rezoning; I am not sure what the acreage is but we don't necessarily have minimum acreage for L-SO; it would not have to do with the zoning it would have to do with that particular site.

Anderson said I have a question; in terms of a contingency contract, what is the contingency. Ewald said do you mean the land contract. Anderson said yes the land contract. Shuler said it has the basic contingencies in it; environmental and appropriate for the use proposed by the buyer; which is essentially the zoning contingency; so if it doesn't get zoned for the proposed use of Melissa's House then the Melissa's House Foundation would not be required to buy the property, but there is an extension fee; they actually entered into the contract last year I believe in June of 2009, so each time it is extended it is \$5,000; that is non refundable; so even though it is contingent, there are non refundable fees that have been paid; not just for extensions but in all the due diligence; the phase one, the appraisal for the Parkland dedication, all of those types of costs.

Anderson said you mentioned an endowment; is that an endowment that would be specifically for Melissa's House or for other projects as well. Shuler said solely and specifically for Melissa's House and nothing else. Anderson said finally going back to the irregularity of the land; is any of that a concern. Shuler said I don't see that the other site is ever going to get zoned in the short term; there is no market for office space; but holding this property hostage because someone else can't get their's developed to me doesn't seem fair and frankly I'm not sure the site should have been zoned office to start with; it's more as Ms. White pointed out, the Plan makes more sense when the legs of the triangle are the retail and commercial and office and the interior is the multifamily residential; but it would remain as L-SO; we are not in control of that property and there is nothing we can do about that; were they to build an office building, I don't think it would negatively impact either side, but frankly I don't see that happening anytime soon.

McGregor said when this was originally zoned was it an overlay; when this whole area was developed there was some suburban office and the condos; was that an overlay? White said the condos are. Ewald said there was discussion 2 weeks ago about when the property was rezoned from estate residential and there was a concern whether the property in question changed twice; Ms. White do you know if it was changed once to it's current designation or was it changed from residential to office. White said this property was zoned in 2000 to suburban office. Ewald said so it has not changed twice. White said it came in as ER; is that right Sherwood. Sherwood said the property in question was zoned Suburban Office from ER. Ewald said at the same time Mechwart

was zoned L-AR. White said yes.

Larick said bear with me, I am trying to get caught up; can you provide the high level cost of the project. Shuler said for just development, we don't have an actual cost; we haven't bid it out yet; but we are estimating somewhere between 1.5 and 2 million for development. Larick said is this intended to be permanent or long term transitional housing. Shuler said it is permanent; tenants will sign leases and pay rent. Larick said there has also been some discussion about transportation; where is the bus stop. Shuler said on Morse Road. Larick said at Hamilton and Morse. Shuler said exactly; it is 1 mile away; each tenant will have a case manager who is responsible for their transportation; in addition the Melissa's House Foundation, other area churches have started working together so that they can have volunteers to help with transportation; and finally there will be a staff person there 7 days a week, 4 hours a day, who can also help with transportation. Larick said specifically why was this location selected versus other possibilities that were out there; what made this the selection of choice. Shuler said for the Melissa's House Foundation, one of the visions that they have, is that they will build something that is in a very residential setting and in a suburban community because the idea is that even though there has been the experience of a lot of housing built for people disabled by mental illness, it does not have those qualities; it is either in a neighborhood that is not safe frankly, or not as homelike; it may be on a retail corridor for example; sometimes there is nothing you can do about those things; but their idea is let's do something about it; let's put it someplace in a suburban community that is safe and involving and in an area that is very residential so it is almost like a single family home; and also the ideal is here, because the property itself is just beautiful; it has a ravine; and it is wooded and it is a serene place; so what attracted them is it would be a beautiful place to live. Larick said I looked at the layout of the land and actually stopped by the property, is there any access to the property outside of the main entry area; is there any back access to Hamilton Road? Shuler said no; one has to use Beecher Crossing; in addition there is a bus stop nearby, there is employment nearby, there is a grocery store nearby, all of those, so it fit 2 bills not just the beautiful land bill.

Samuel asked is this the first property for these types of disabilities in Central Ohio or has there been something before like this that was successful. Shuler said oh yes; CHN has been in existence since 1987; so we have developed since that time over 1100 units scattered throughout 27 zip codes in Franklin County; we were actually formed by the Franklin County Alcohol Drug and Mental Health Board as part of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation pilot program in response to a lot of deinstitutionalization of people with mental illness that was going on at that time; they were capable of living on their own with minimal supports but who had been institutionalized because there was no other place to put them and so the idea was we need to have a community setting scattered all throughout the community so people can become part of their community again; as long as they are connected to case management and have some supports they should be successful; so we were the pilot program; we started in 1990 and grew from 10 units to 1100 units throughout Franklin County and we remain the ADAMH's contract agency for this type of housing; there is community based housing for people disabled by mental illness with no staff on site where people sign leases and pay rent all over the 27 different zip codes including Arlington, Worthington and Bexley; what is a little bit unique about this project, as I mentioned earlier, is the private/public partnership; Melissa's House brings a vision and funding to this that might not normally be available to this type of housing. Anderson said is this housing strictly for people that have been institutionalized or for anyone with this diagnosis. Shuler said it is not strictly for people who have been institutionalized; it is for people who have been disabled by mental illness. Ewald said he would interrupt that discussion; we need to stay away from discussion of the individuals who will stay at the site and stick to the zoning. Anderson

said I think it is important to follow up on her definition of the people staying here; that is how it started. Weber said it is ok since the question was asked and it is just background and historical references. Shuler said it is not people who need to be institutionalized in order to live; it is people who are capable of living on their own whose daily living skills are high enough that they can live on their own with minimal supports; in other words supports that are not on site. McAlister said his question had been answered. Anderson said she wanted to ask Anthony Penn if he had anything to say. Penn said he had nothing to add at this time.

McAlister said he had a comment; Gahanna has a record of housing people in an institutional setting; right over on Olde Ridenour we have a facility that backs right up to a residential neighborhood; I asked the Chief if there has been any problems what so ever with that and he said none what so ever; unless the administration knows of any I have not heard of any; that has been a very successful project right here in Gahanna. McGregor said do you have other multiple unit facilities that we could go look at; I mean drive by not go in; to see how they are maintained. Shuler said sure we could get you that list. McGregor said I don't need 10. Shuler said we can do that for you.

Larick said I have a clarification; the rough cost number that you gave earlier for the project; does that include the entire property or does that not include the property. Shuler said I'm sorry what number. Larick said the 1.5 to 2 million cost. Shuler said that is the entire cost including land.

Kneeland said in the documents that were packaged with the issue, one came from Mifflin Township Fire Department; they stated they have no comment on these applications; does that mean they are ok with it; it is a pretty vague comment. White said usually if they have a comment it is regarding a fire hydrant or the curb radius or the access with regard to the parking; when they say they have no comment it means they have found nothing needs to be added to the project for their benefit.

Ewald said he had an additional question for White; given the Triangle you defined earlier of Johnstown, Hamilton and Morse Roads do you have any precedent, since I can't recall any since I have been on Council, of changing L-SO to L-AR; has this been done in the last decade; and this was brought in as ER . White said so going from residential to suburban office, then commercial, then back to residential. McAlister said how about the condos that are there; they came in residential went to office and changed back to residential. Ewald said no they went from ER to L-AR. White said we have had zoning changes that have gone more than one way; the limited means you have to build exactly what is proposed; so in this particular area I would have to look to see how the developments came in; I am thinking about the Portrait housing development on Johnstown Road; what that was. Ewald said that is something we can look at next committee meeting. McGregor said to White can you also determine when the last office building was built in that Canini area; what ever the most recent one was. White said sure we can. McGregor said I could find out from the Auditor's web site. White said we can tell you. Ewald said any other questions or comments; I think this should come back to committee. Kneeland said we should give Larick some time to also get his questions answered; I would recommend it come back to committee in 2 weeks. Ewald said given the fact that majority of Council wants this to come back to Committee, we will bring this back to Committee in 2 weeks; there will be opportunity for anyone between now and then including next week at public Council meeting to voice any concern or support; I appreciate everyone coming and I know this seems like it is taking a long time, but the zoning change is permanent once it is made, so we need to take our time and do our due diligence to make sure we make the right decision. Kneeland said next Monday is a regular Council meeting where we have hearing of visitors; it is not another public

hearing. Ewald clarified there has already been a public hearing; but any resident is welcome to come in to the regular Council meeting; you get a 3 minute period of time to voice your support or opposition. Kneeland said I would recommend it be new information and not a repeat; we would like to keep the process moving. Anderson said, so everyone knows, we have a new Councilman, Larick, sworn in tonight, who is just coming up to speed on this issue and this will give him time to read the material and digest it. Ewald said is there any other action we need to take. Weber said no that is it; it is postponed another 2 weeks or to a date definite and then bring it back to committee. Sherwood said it will be on the Consent Agenda next week for Council to postpone to a date certain because you postponed it until next week.

Recommendation: Return to Finance Committee in 2 weeks; April 26, 2010.

Recommended for Postponement to a Date Certain

ISSUES - From Council Meeting:

Canini Project - 1255 Beecher Crossing North

Ewald said we will stay in Council Chambers for one more agenda item; the Canini Project at 1255 Beecher Crossing North.

Kneeland said I received a letter and photos from a constituent about the project in it's current state of partial construction and I asked for it to be on the agenda so we could get some feedback on where we stand with it from zoning, enforcement and development.

White said Fultz is here so he can address questions; he has a reporting and some additional pictures taken by the Code Enforcement Officer and what we have done to date and what that means and perhaps if you have any other recommendations you would like for us to follow.

Fultz said construction on this project has been suspended for over a year; we have been trying to work with the developer to maintain the site and secure it from anyone who might venture on to the site; we haven't tried to have it altered in terms of visibility or to lessen the visibility from adjacent properties; we are just trying to secure the site; we weren't trying to have it demolished at this point since we really have no precedent on anything that has been under construction and ceased construction other than a project we had a number of years ago; we had one that sat for many, many years before we took any action to have it demolished.

Kneeland said is it feasible the existing building plan that was submitted can be finished or will it eventually need to be demolished and have a new plan submitted. Fultz said the Code has not changed with respect to the project that has already been approved; in terms of continuing the construction as the plans were approved previously they can continue with the construction; they would have to resubmit the plans for approval but the Code would allow it to continue as it was previously submitted. Kneeland said I understand the Code part; I was referring more to material exposure to the elements; there are things that can be damaged because it was exposed to the elements; are there things that will require us to do inspections over and above what we typically do. Fultz said not at this time; everything has been constructed in the correct manner and exposure to the elements should not be an issue or have any impact on continuing the construction.

Ewald said this is a different set of pictures from what we saw last time; basically is this just the foundation of concrete block that is sitting there. Fultz said it is poured concrete; the foundation that is in place. Ewald said as far as enforcement; is there anything we can do; we can't make them build it; if it stopped it is stopped; we have the permit

process to go back to. Fultz said we have had them fence the site to maintain security as much as possible. Samuel said how long can it sit there like that and how long has it been sitting there. Fultz said I do not have the exact date they suspended construction and in terms of how long can it sit there, it is a matter of how long do we decide to let it sit there; we could place orders on it anytime we felt it was necessary. McGregor asked is there a basement or is this a slab. Fultz said it is a slab for a 2 story with a lower level because of the grade of the site the lower level would be at the grade. McGregor asked is there anything that would hold water. Fultz said a slight amount of water could be held on the lower level slab; it doesn't drain entirely so there could be a small amount of containment on that lower level. McGregor said are you talking about inches or feet. Fultz said inches. McGregor said and that fence is not going to really keep anybody out. Fultz said yes if someone really wanted on the site they could get on. McGregor said I went up and looked at it.

Larick said I am familiar with a property in the same situation; what are our options to get this aesthetically pleasing again without extreme cost; what are the City's options. Fultz said it is a matter of what would the developer be willing to spend on the project that would not be something that he couldn't recoup when he would continue the project; I don't think the developer is willing at this point to spend any more money on this project in terms of any landscaping or anything to make it more palatable. Larick said then is there any recourse for the City; my understanding is that if worse comes to worse there is an order to demolish and go down that path; I don't know if that is the right thing but status quo is not the right thing either; what options exist. Fultz said we could present the developer with options if we prefer to do something other than demolition that would be acceptable to our department and to Council; if the only option we gave them was some other amenities on the site or there would be the demolition he might be willing to go a little bit further with some other things that might be acceptable. Larick said they are voluntary options; is that correct. Fultz said yes.

Kneeland said for White and Weber regarding our Code and the application process; should we be looking within the Code to change it to reflect some sunset clauses in these developments. White said some; in their FDP if it runs out they have the opportunity come back and renew it; but they are out of time and they have to come back and say they want to develop this or something else; the zoning FDP says that is all the zoning says you can develop within that time frame; if you need more time you need to come back and reapply; so it doesn't say that they have to be partially built by this time; so if they start up we would say you have to go back and reapply to continue; we are caught between planning and zoning who say you can't build anymore in this case since they started building it goes over to the building department which says this is appropriate how you do it as Fultz and I discussed; normally there is a time frame and builders work on it; but the Code doesn't really say that you have 2 years or 3 years and after that if you haven't complied you have to tear it down; we need to have something that would say as of this point if you are not going to make substantial progress toward what has already been approved, or something else is going to remedy it; then we need some Code with some teeth that would allow us to in fact say order this demolished; the other issue is if they then did not demolish it we would have to have funds to do it and make a lien. Kneeland said right now we don't have that legal authority to do anything with it; I understand the FDP piece, but beyond the FDP there is a construction period of time that seems like it should have a beginning date and a sunset date and when they go beyond that maximum they need to come back and renegotiate. Weber said you can't unless you have a public health and safety problem, like some kind of open sewer or rats, but if it is a project that wasn't completed and there is no harm to the public as you are in this area we don't have any options. Kneeland said the folks that sent this in are going to say there is an overt problem. Mayor said is there other Codes in other cities similar to ours that

does have limits on construction periods; is that a typical thing to do or not; would we have to research that. Fultz said we would have to research it; but typically the way the building code is set up, we have to follow the State Code. Mayor said the State Code has no limits on construction time periods. Fultz said correct. Kneeland said we have the ability to create our own. Kneeland said I think back in time to the west side of Columbus where they had apartments off of 270 and I don't know how many years those stood there; there are certainly arguments on both sides as to whether construction projects can be continued or not; I would argue that we need to take a look at this; is there a way to create a timeline that is maintainable and sustainable. Ewald said we need to be careful we tread lightly on property rights; we may not like this but we have no ability to enforce build it or tear it down. Kneeland but if it is not finished it doesn't meet our zoning code. Ewald said we are stuck in between. Kneeland I would like to hear something from the administration on what we can do to help remedy this; it may be a 3 year process.

Anderson said I was wondering if currently any of this is posing a public nuisance, safety hazard, or attractive nuisance; concern with the fence; does any of this pose a nuisance; that state of things as it relates to Hazard. Fultz said I could look at that in more depth; we have tried to address it with fencing he has rented; but currently it is not being maintained as well as it should be; if that is more the issue we could address that; if we saw something unstable; then we could start the process of demolition. Anderson said with the past snow storms how was it impacted. Fultz said we can look into it; and see if it is has become more of a safety hazard; or if it is unstable that would support ordering demolition. Ewald ask if, based on the picture, they have a no trespassing sign; this is private property. Fultz said they have a no trespassing sign posted; I am not certain if it is in the photo but I have seen it on site. White said we can try to have the developer come and discuss what his plans are for proceeding with the project. Council members agreed they would like that to happen. White said we will continue in the mean time to look further and confer with Weber and see if we have something with more teeth in it.

Recommendation; Return to Finance Committee in 2 weeks; April 26, 2010.

ISSUES - From Director of Public Service:

Unidirectional Hydrant Flushing Sequencing Report

Emery said Bryan Rhoads is here from our water utility to explain what this is and the legislation necessary for it. Rhoads provided a Power Point presentation; a copy is available in the Council Office.

Emery said for the next step, we need to hire W. E. Stilson to perform some professional work; they will prepare a report analyzing our entire system to separate it into segments; they were involved a while back when we did a water distribution upgrade; this project is also in line with the policy we discussed in February where we will have detailed examples of what we do on the shelf and not depend on individual people for complex processes.

Ewald said how many local companies did you look at before choosing Stilson. Emery said we went to them since they have our model in place; there is some cost advantage with that; I can check with others. Kneeland said will this new process reduce the work of water testing. Emery said no; it doesn't really improve quality; it does provide a cost savings that pays for it and there is the savings in water. Samuel said is there any additional cost for equipment. Rhoads said no; we have everything in place. McGregor said won't it take longer since you are doing every third one. Rhoads said it takes a little

more time to close the valves; and we do flush for 10 minutes instead of 5; so it takes a little more time but it isn't done as often. Anderson said did you look at any other processes besides this. Emery said this is 1 of 2; there is the old way and this; this is what the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) wants done; they are using us as an example; they have asked Rhoads to send in his information. Anderson said so there are no other EPA methods. Rhoads said only this and traditional flushing. McGregor said is there any down side to not checking all hydrants. Rhoads said we will still check them; maintenance is separate from flushing. Larick said where is the dollar savings included in that benefit. Emery said the dollars are in the budget to hire Stilson and implement the Unidirectional Flushing; using less water, we save \$12,280 the first year since we clean every 3 years the savings is \$36,840 over that. Kneeland said we need to make a decision; no other questions from Council.

Recommendation: 1st Reading, no need to come back; 2nd Reading, Consent Agenda.

ISSUES - From Director of Development:

Department of Planning & Development Presentation

White said she wanted to say thank you for allowing us to make the presentation; this will also allow me to introduce you to Amanda Waples who is our second year intern; she has finished her second year of Planning with a degree from The Ohio State University; she came to us from Canada; she has had interesting dialogue and done a great deal of work; she is the first intern who has worked with Fultz in the Building Department; we are sad to see her leave; she has been a great addition to our team; in our annual report, she helped with the graphics and design where she has a lot of expertise; people asked us if we farmed it out and we were always pleased to say we did it in house; we will miss Amanda; she is also getting a masters degree in higher education.

White said Huffman will provide a Power Point presentation with our 2009 accomplishments and trending data; we have just finished a decade unlike any other; we are not like other departments; ours is a longer term process and returns take a great deal of time; they are not annualized; in order for the data to be properly presented, we knew it would take more than one meeting; it will take 3 meetings actually; this is Part One of our report; it is focused on Community Development, accomplishments, and goals. Huffman provided the Power Point presentation; a copy is available in the Council Office.

questions:

Kneeland said on the Building Division's financial comparison, it is saying the revenue in the Building Division is \$190,545 and the Division spent \$278,866; we called that a 15% savings; but we are cash negative to get the job done; we are approximately \$88,000 short. White said we covered our costs; we are at the higher end of the Cost Coverage Ratio at 68%; we did have some difficult contracts and we got those done. Larick said can you elaborate on why you can't cover costs. White said the with the terms of the permits, they won't be covered by fees; and administrative costs are not in the permits; our front desk help is not in those but it is the cost of doing business; we cover the costs of permits and inspections and the overhead is administrative. Huffman said a lot of the cost can be to be to have a certified plans examiner and for the computer work and inspectors regardless of if one inspection or permit is required or if there are multiple ones; we were able to capture 70% per of that cost through our activities; we look at how we are trending; Planning Commission is trending same way; at a certain point we will have no large areas of development. Samuel said have our fees gone up a

little or a lot. White said we take an annualized look at them; a yearly increase is not in Code but we look at the schedules and increase if needed; we believe that our fees are appropriate to the market. Larick said how much have they changed in five year. Fultz said we raised them 2 or 3 years ago but it has not been done in 2 years; we are not allowed to make a profit but we can take the average over a year; we also expected other projects to come in and that didn't happen. Larick said when this changed a couple of years ago, how much was it. Mayor said I have a comment about fees; we maintain a delicate balance; we are trying to keep fees down but we don't want to price ourselves out of the market; we can look at them, but we do not want to be too expensive.

McAlister asked with regard to the Olde Gahanna Vision Plan, other than Stonehedge, how many developers are interested. White said we had stakeholders provide input; they gave information for planning purposes. McAlister said what I am asking is have any developers come to Gahanna and looked at the plan and said I want to redevelop here. White said yes; we have a developer looking at an intermediate level project. Huffman said we have Charles Porter coming in, and one stake holder is coming forward with a new building along Mill Street.

Ewald said if there are any other questions that come up, please email them to White.

ISSUES - From Council Office:

Appointments

Sherwood said the appointment for the Community Reinvestment Housing Board is up; Maurice Jones is interested in another term. Kneeland said it is tough to get people to serve. Anderson said have we looked at our resumes for this or any of the other appointments. Kneeland said we can look at what we have; but he is willing and does a good job; I would like to reappoint him to another 3 year term. Anderson said she was fine with that; but maybe we could consider some other people for the other ones. Sherwood said so for the Parks & Recreation Foundation and the Hamilton Road Corridor Study, we can hold those.

Recommendation: Motion Resolution to reappoint Maurice Jones to the Community Reinvestment Area Housing Council Board.

Acceptance of Deed Restrictions

Sherwood said this is for the Acceptance of Deed Restrictions; this is already been approved for the Mayor to sign and it has been recorded; the City Attorney likes to track these.

Recommendation: 1st Reading, no need to come back; 2nd Reading, Consent Agenda.

Della Brandenberger, Reporting