

# City of Gahanna

200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230



## Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 10, 2014

7:00 PM

Council Committee Rooms

### Committee of the Whole

*Thomas R. Kneeland, Chair*

*Karen J. Angelou*

*Ryan P. Jolley*

*Brian D. Larick*

*Jamie Leeseberg*

*Stephen A. Renner*

*Michael Schnetzer*

*Kimberly McWilliams, CMC, Clerk of Council*

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present** 6 - Thomas R. Kneeland, Brian D. Larick, Jamie Leeseberg, Michael Schnetzer, Karen J. Angelou, and Stephen A. Renner  
**Absent** 1 - Ryan P. Jolley

**ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES:**

Jennifer Teal, Dottie Franey, Matt Holdren, Karl Wetherholt, Anthony Jones, Tony Collins, Mayor Stinchcomb, Gen. Williams, Chief Murphy, Sue Wadley, City Attorney Ewald, Clerk McWilliams, Carter Bean, Greg Gallas, Tom Warner, Mark Wagenbrenner, Doyle Clear, Diana Redman, Press.

**PENDING LEGISLATION**

[ORD-0009-2014](#) TO REZONE 3.55+/- ACRES AS CX-1, NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL, MIXED USE DISTRICT; FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 291-361 SOUTH HAMILTON ROAD AND 390 ROCKY FORK DRIVE SOUTH; RANGER DEVELOPMENT GROUP LLC, JASON ZADEH APPLICANT.

Kneeland stated there were general questions and questions regarding the traffic study; would like to know what type of impact was being evaluated for internal streets in Rocky Fork subdivision like Flint Ridge and Iroquois. Jones introduced Jason Zadeh, Mark Wagenbrenner, Greg Gallas, Carter Bean, Tom Warner and Doyle Clear. Wetherholt said that trip generation is very small compared to background mainline traffic; usually don't study side streets as part of this; try to address impact of driveways on mainline road; don't see why there would be new problems given that the ratio between generated and background traffic is so small; if there is a problem with Flint Ridge, that has other causes; wouldn't expect you to see a difference at all. Kneeland stated the egress/ingress is right off of Rocky Fork Drive; that Flint Ridge corridor is a very large cut through; certainly not this developer's problem but is a problem; there will be some type of impact. Wetherholt stated study does take into account Rocky Fork South; developer purchased another lot because there was inadequate stacking with first plan; also they moved the access point on Hamilton Road farther north to make enough stacking in there. Kneeland confirmed no traffic generated that will put traffic on Flint Ridge and zero impact. Wetherholt stated if any, very small; if there is a cut through problem, that is because of something else. Clear stated know Flint Ridge well and Rocky Fork well; we drive that area quite often; when we reach intersection of Flint Ridge and Granville Street; there are times we do take Flint Ridge; if you are at

the intersection of Flint Ridge and Granville and determine 2 different paths, speed limit on Flint Ridge is 20 mph, if you drive it without stopping, you can make it in between 1 and 1/2 to 2 minutes; takes less time to go down Granville and Hamilton; people going to this new facility are going to choose Hamilton most of the time; did assume 6% of new traffic would use internal street; adds about 2 cars in morning, 13 in midday and 7 in evening; we consider that to be incremental increase on Rocky Fork South; some of those are going to be people who live in the neighborhood; that's the volume we expect going to this facility on Rocky Fork South; never zero; liken it to how many might choose to use Flint Ridge and Rocky Fork South to go to Bob Evans; treat this development just like Tim Hortons and Huntington Bank; these numbers are based on assumptions; probably volumes on Friday night; most of these restaurants not open in morning; we use highest traffic volumes.

Angelou stated with the development coming north of that area, the cumulative amount of traffic is not your problem but may be a concern; just wanted to bring that up; clearly we want to make traffic run smoothly; not a new issue; project sounds really good; think it is appropriate zoning as long as people behind there are satisfied; this is excellent work and would not expect anything different.

Larick asked how you came up with 6%. Clear stated we considered trip generation and trip distribution; morning pattern and volume; most of that are people leaving home and going to work; how many coming from north, east, south and west; that is fairly representative for a market area for a zone; used that distribution and today about 6% of that traffic comes from the west; staying with that percentage. Larick stated that sounds like a fair estimate. Kneeland asked Wetherholt if the northern portion of Hamilton Road develops, would we assume that the second portion would double that. Wetherholt stated we're speculating what that development would be. Kneeland stated we're talking about a residential street that will become more traveled.

Wetherholt stated would need another analysis. Clear stated would not expect that you would double traffic on Rocky Fork North; the Havens Corners/Granville/Hamilton Road intersection has greatly improved; think the traffic systems works well for volume of traffic you see.

Renner thanked Jones for explanations of how storm water is being handled; were other methods for mitigating that looked at; this development is creating more impervious surface and is close to major watershed. Warner stated we often defer to City of Columbus stormwater designs when developing; they adopted EPA guidelines in 2004; the way we've worked out pre and post developed conditions is we've analyzed this development and stormwater difference; this site is mostly single family houses; we've taken that into account as grassland; assumption is as if those houses, driveways, etc. are not there; curve numbers are 77 for pre-developed condition; curve

number for post-development condition is a 92; full development with commercial development; estimated 20,000 units of storage to meet needs; planned a water quality feature and water quantity feature; parking lot detention; above grade surface ponding; enough room in back for a lot of that; need to store some of that below grade; for water quality, the EPA requires that you treat for a 3/4" rainstorm; can go to a mechanical system; planning on using a downstream defender; vortex system; aqua swirl; 4' structure; designed to handle sediment; that's our starting point. Renner said he appreciates that and asked if alternatives were considered instead of handling it and discharging it; what about percolating it back into soil; very familiar with City of Columbus's standards and they are insufficient; Franklin County Soil and Water District has another set of standards we need to be looking at; Columbus has many systems that have been put in place that have failed; did you look at alternatives; what were they. Warner stated when talking to Jones, talked about putting in pervious parking areas; the soil here is Bennington Soil and is somewhat deep, poorly drained soil; not conducive to pervious pavement; that application is very specific to soil conditions; this time of year when we have a freeze and water trapped in subgrade, you get frost heave. Renner agrees 100%. Warner stated pervious pavement is not a good idea for sustainability of this project. Renner stated too many people run to pervious as a solution; did you look at increasing vegetation to cause more percolation; understand retention problem; did you consider any scenarios with retention with more vegetation. Zadeh stated as a matter of best practices, we have this conversation with Warner as often as possible; we push Warner to come up with solutions where it is financially viable; resonates with tenants; believe it; grateful for your comment; pushed us to think a little more; talked a bit about adding vegetation; this is suburban infill; we are constrained by size of the lot; we came up with the science and system that Warner suggested; it can address water quality to those watersheds; understand the need for high quality coming out of these; used that system to meet current standards in countless of our developments to reach broader events; think with that technology we can get to the point of a much higher standard than required of a development; it is underground so no one sees that; would be a condition where a 100 year rain event, this system could handle up to that; that was solution that came out of charrettes; starting to set a different standard. Warner stated with this analyzed stormwater system, we've designed for a 10 year critical storm; knocked detention down to 1 year storm event; this will take everything up to 100 year event and release it at the pre-developed rate; Columbus might have a flaw where it doesn't address the typical vortex system treating 3/4" rain event; typically it is a bypass system; anything above that bypasses the system; if we upsized the system, we can put vortex in line with output and all events will be routed through system; now we have a higher degree of sediment control; the

water quality coming into public system is a fact to be cognizant of; no different than a water basin; have same concept removing sediment at a higher degree. Renner appreciated the comments; spot on with water quality; impressed you can handle the 100 year event; that is all good; stacks up to the spirit of standards out there; the other portion to mitigation is the recharge of the ground below us; that area is most likely part of that basin of the stream; is there any way to recharge that basin; go down into the ground; know it is not always possible; been involved in a lot of areas in the County; am pro-development as my voting record has already shown; simply wanting to push a little further; understand vegetation may take away from parking spaces; always trying to figure out where that balance is; not just get water clean but push it down as well. Wagenbrenner stated this is a really tough site; recognize all those issues; looking at cost and explaining that to eventual tenants, this is just a challenging site; real challenge is limited space and soil condition; we are open but think this is a difficult site. Warner stated water is released from 100 year post-developed down to 10 year pre-developed rate.

Renner stated did ask about small businesses; would like to see more initiatives to push mom and pop shops; Smashburger is from Ohio; franchisee is closer to it; is a complicated network; believe this is an overarching initiative that we need to be looking at citywide. Zadeh stated we seek local tenants when we can marry that; see franchising as a means to live an entrepreneurial dream; still putting money in the system; nationals have the credit that banks and investors seek; Commons at Clark Hall is a good example of combination; Rusty Bucket is local; Gahanna Vision is local; have that mix where we can; once we've hit a critical point of credit; we like to do business with local businesses when we can; made significant personal investments to start these businesses; don't act just as a capacity as a landlord, we invest in these businesses. Renner thanked the developers. Gallas stated for whatever reason our experience is in the early stages, the local tenants tend not to even pay attention to project; start to feel locals when the steel starts going up; difficult to predict what reception we'll get.

**RECOMMENDATION: Consent, Postponement to March 3, 2014.**

## **ISSUES - From Director of Development**

[DOC-0032-2014](#) Planning & Development Department Action Items

### **1. Shops at Rocky Fork TIF Agreement**

Jones discussed infrastructure agreement proposed by Development to encourage the developer we just heard from to make infrastructure

investments. Hamilton Road (Tax Increment Financing) TIF District was passed in 2013; eligible expenses within this district. Kneeland asked what environmental issues may come in. Jones answered if there were any Brownfield areas; this is just a broad scope provided by ORC. Jones continued by detailing Shops at Rocky Fork Project; if TIF agreement were passed and zoning passed, how can Council ensure that development is built as passed; developers have agreed to Restrictive Covenants to ensure project will be built according to plan; Covenants would be included as part of the TIF Infrastructure Agreement; map and renderings of site as proposed were displayed. Leeseberg asked about right of way with bike trail. Wetherholt stated we chose the south side because it is all in the right of way. Jones continued by stating the developer pays infrastructure expenses and City reimburses TIF for eligible expenses; in order to ensure project generates the amount we want it to, developer agrees to a Minimum Service Payment; agreeing to make payments of \$80,000 into TIF district; that is guaranteed regardless of property value; upon complete repayment, normal tax levels would apply; feel that they will continue to only go up; terms would use up to 50% of entire portion to help recoup costs there; district is estimated to collect \$90,000 for the entire district; estimated repayment period would be 8 years; TIF district is a 30 year term; detailed cost benefit analysis was done; would generate about \$11,847,264 without the project over a 30 year-term; with the project, we have estimated \$14,634,610; request approval of a TIF Infrastructure Agreement between City and Developer; legal counsel is completing documents at this time; will have them by February 24th committee.

Angelou stated we are passing Zoning next week, this will not be done by then. Larick asked about schools. Jones stated the schools would be made whole by this TIF; only reimburses schools; township is not being reimbursed; township has been informed of the TIF agreement. Larick confirmed that this TIF is already in place, this is just about the use of the funds and we will have documents distributed as early as possible. Kneeland asked if the zoning project is dependent on this. Jones answered yes; if they were both voted for on the same night, that would be sufficient; don't see the developers being against that; in favor of this being on March 3rd. Angelou asked how the delay of zoning will affect the project. Jones stated the project is hinging on zoning and TIF financing agreement both.

## 2. Eastgate TIF

Jones said this is one of the first TIFs created; originally established to fund infrastructure improvements in that district; we are systematically paying ourselves back from that; like to open up that funding allowing us to modify current Eastgate TIF ordinance to fund all eligible costs under ORC; need the modification to add additional infrastructure

improvements; 20 years left on the TIF's life; pertains to lands within the district or directly supporting the district; original district was very specific and limited; have more money and more need in the district. Angelou asked about specifics. Jones said we are currently amending that ordinance. Larick asked if this is writing specifics in as items or opening it up to allow item such as those. Jones answered the latter; wouldn't be able to spend anything without coming to Council. Teal stated getting authorizing legislation consistent with wording will help us be consistent TIF by TIF and improve our efficiency in that regard; from a sustainability regard this TIF is performing well and we have no ability beyond repayment; we are in a use it or lose it situation with this TIF. Angelou asked if we need a policy. Teal stated ARGUS is pulling TIF policies; they really cross all departments; having a solid set of guidelines for initial setup and ongoing administration will be great. Angelou asked if we adjust this one, what other ones are out there. Jones stated most out there are drafted the same. Teal stated we have learned since we've moved forward; still all goes through Council but we are getting more permissive so we don't have to do this again.

**RECOMMENDATION: 1st Reading, No Need to Come Back, Consent Agenda.**

## **ISSUES - From Information Technology**

### **1. GIS Hosting and Service Agreement**

Teal stated the GIS Department is requesting Council authorization for the Mayor to sign a hosting and service agreement with Whitehall; with minimal incremental cost, we could provide those needed services; would provide \$18,000 in revenue; would require minimal amount of time for GIS technicians; \$30/hr. additional amount negotiated for any work above and beyond normal; this is unlike a normal contract, where we're asking to spend money; looking for permission to do this work and collect funds for it. Kneeland stated going more towards a collaborative effort makes sense; will be abstaining even though I don't benefit from this; this is a model to look at as provider and receiver; produces \$18,000 year in revenue for City; pays half of what annual ESRI costs are; helps reduce costs internally and provides service to community that needs this; there are other communities that need this. Teal stated money coming in will come into General Fund; IT charges for service; help offset General Fund expenses for GIS services; for one community, we can handle that; if there was additional groundswell, it might help fund a part time position that was cut due to budget constraints; not moving in that direction at this time. Renner asked how the value of \$18,000 was derived. Kneeland answered it was based on workload and also the amount of impact on internal systems; there is a small amount built in to do map generation and things; any additional work done by GIS expert is billable at \$30/hr.

Renner asked how many hours are we expecting for initialization. Kneeland stated it's already implemented; essentially it is done. Renner asked what paragraph 5 in agreement is for. Wadley stated typically you need to state who the employee is working for in case of any liability issue.

**RECOMMENDATION: 1st Reading, Regular Agenda, Waive Second Reading, Emergency.**

[DOC-0033-2014](#) GIS Hosting & Services Agreement with Whitehall

**Jayne Maxwell, CMC, Reporting**