



# City of Gahanna

200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

## Meeting Agenda - Final Committee of the Whole

*Brian D. Larick, Chair  
Stephen A. Renner, Brian Metzbower  
Nancy R. McGregor, Karen J. Angelou  
Michael Schnetzer, Jamie Leeseberg*

*Kimberly Banning, CMC, Clerk of Council*

---

Monday, July 25, 2016

7:00 PM

Council Committee Rooms

---

### UPDATES FROM THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS:

#### 1. Mifflin Township

[2016-0247](#) Mifflin Update

Attachments: [Mifflin Update 7.25.16](#)

#### 2. Jefferson Township

### PENDING LEGISLATION:

#### 1. M/I Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement

*This Ordinance was postponed from the July 18, 2016 Council Meeting.*

[ORD-0065-2016](#) TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A PRE-ANNEXATION AGREEMENT WITH M/I HOMES OF CENTRAL OHIO, LLC FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF A 62.3+/- ACRE PARCEL LOCATED ON DARLING ROAD SOUTH OF HANNAH FARMS SUBDIVISION.

**Attachments:** [old version -City-MI Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement v7 REDLINED](#)  
[old version - DEV-ATT-MI Homes](#)  
[DEV-RPT-06.27.16](#)  
[DEV-RCA-MI Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement JB](#)  
[old version - DEV-ATT-6.27.16 -City-MI Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement MODIFIED 6-23-15 Redlined](#)  
[old version - DEV-ATT-MI Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement](#)  
[DEV-RPT-06.13.16](#)  
[DEV-RPT-07.11.16](#)  
[Darling Road Annexation Presentation to Council](#)  
[Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma](#)  
[6.27- Darling Road Annexation Presentation to Council](#)  
[DEV-ATT-School Financial Impact Summary](#)  
[DEV-ATT-Jefferson Township Subdivision Map](#)  
[DEV-ATT-EMHT Letter on Darling Road](#)  
[7-11-16 Powerpoint](#)  
[old version- City-MI Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement v7](#)  
[EXHIBIT A - City-MI Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement v7](#)  
[ORD-65-16 SIGNED](#)  
[MI HOMES CORRESPONDENCE](#)

**Legislative History**

6/13/16

Committee of the Whole

Held in Committee

Jones said about a month ago we discussed policy on when we consider annexations for residential projects; we required additional revenue to be collected before we consider; we just approved a pre-annexation last week; have another annexation being presented to the City; have representatives here to answer any questions; MI Homes is the developer; a 62.8 acre site along Darling Road; proposing 94 single family residences; will require they become part of our New Community Authority; showed the location on the map; Hannah Farms is located just north of the property; adjacent zoning for Hannah Farms is SF-3; they feel single family is an appropriate use; approximately 1.5 units per acre; estimated value of the homes is around \$450,000; have tried to minimize the access off Reynoldsburg-New-Albany Road; the developer has created a stub road to accommodate any future development; want to ensure there is sufficient access; the developer would have responsibility to work with Franklin County for road improvements; will have a long-term maintenance obligation; City will not be out any expenses; there are large portions of open space conserved; 5 acres buffer Hannah Farms; intent is to soften the impact; there will be a multi-purpose path connecting to Hannah Park; will be an emergency access only from Darling Road; with enough right-of-way that if Darling becomes a through-road it will be sufficient; Leeseberg asked if the City will control the right-of-way; Jones said yes; not part of the capital needs but will be collaborative with Franklin County; 13.3 acres will buffer the homes and allow plenty of open space; showed a rendering of the housing product type; estimated square feet is 2500-4000; did an extensive cost analysis; total annual cost will be approximately \$94,405; street maintenance is calculated in; estimating 238 citizens will use the parks annually; Angelou asked about the schools; Jones said they have a net gain if the cost is over their threshold; they do not have a model that would show the age groups but expect .5 children added per home; Angelou asked about water; Jones said will be serviced by Jefferson Township; we do not have the means to expand there; will be water and sewer; our services are limited to streets, parks and police; McGregor asked about storm sewer; Jones said we would do stormwater maintenance; McGregor asked if township did water and sewer for Hannah Farms; Jones said yes; McGregor asked how Darling Road ends when it comes to this development;

Jones said a full turn movement; would not be any traffic north of that; would possibly be a bike path there; Mayor Kneeland said this would go through the Planning Commission process; not set in stone; ending would be large enough to accommodate a fire truck; Angelou asked about the input from residents at Hannah Farms; Jones said some had concerns with the traffic but pleased with homes and the acreage; have been concerns about stub road; said this was to go to the Township, but did not, and is now with the City; some are very against it but some are fine with it; Angelou said had heard there were some issues with this; asked if some of these issues have been resolved reducing the number of homes to 94; Jones said the number is down to a number that is comparable; Leeseberg asked the average lot size with regards to road maintenance; Underhill said each home is above requirement of SF-3; roughly frontage is 80-90 ft. lots to anywhere from 125-170' deep; Leeseberg confirmed they would maintain the stormwater of the basins; Underhill said would be on HOA; all green spaces would be maintained unless at Gahanna's request; already started looking into green management of water onsite; Jones said we look at costs, compatibility of surrounding neighborhoods and the strategy; estimated with New Community Authority would generate 33K in revenue annually; offsets annual costs; pre-annexation agreement is similar to Shull Road annexation agreement; number of documents that need signed to move forward; have not decided to implement any tax increment financing; more complex for a project of this sort; have received feedback for green infrastructure; want less of an environmental impact on the City and the Township; goal was to install various infrastructure elements to reduce the need to process storm water drainage off site; our SF-3 requires them to donate acreage; they are conserving far more than our code requires; will get more into tree planting at the next step; agreement states that the developer will comply with tree planting; stormwater management plan will be approved in the final plat stage; developer and their attorney is here to answer any questions; Schnetzer asked about net revenue calculation; asked for more detail on how the projected annual revenue is calculated; Jones showed revenues and cost analysis for the project; building out over the years; based on the 7 mil; total annual school revenue is identified; is a static number; understands minor and major appreciation values; standard property tax was calculated along with other tax revenue;

Schnetzler said he believes his question was answered; Schnetzler asked about the NCA charge; Jones said those are guaranteed to get; Leeseberg confirmed repairs are worked in already; Jones confirmed; Renner asked if the developer ; Zeppernick said we had this built in the DC division in March timeframe; is why you are seeing us increase our home value and reduce the homes in the area; wanted to step this down to a ranch product; have a project in Jefferson Township called Parkwood that is similar; likely to be closer to \$500K; this is the base value; first floor master plan buyer; at this stage, if we go down this path, will have a less impact on schools because of type of buyer we are targeting; Schnetzler said this idea of pre-annexation is the option; asked if we have the ability with a pre-annexation agreement that would require a minimum amount of surface; not vinyl; Underhill said would commit to all natural elements; would not look to doing vinyl; will not see that; Schnetzler said he appreciates that; none of us know what will happen with the market; asked we can insulate ourselves as a City; would recommend we put a statement in; could put in a limitation text in the zoning stage; Schnetzler said when things are approved, they are approved; want to know what we are shown is what we get; Jones said we can modify the language; Schnetzler said would like to see it; Renner asked what language is in the agreement that says if we are not getting what we need, what the back-up is and if we can walk away; does this really launch the entire process for annexation; Underhill said we cannot circumvent the Charter or Code; need to go through the Planning Commission process; if they disapprove at any stage; we do not have a lawsuit against the City; cannot contract around the process or standards; this is viewed as a roadmap to work out the details; there will be some other things like the NCA that we are agreeing to; Ewald asked when Final Development Plan will be finalized; Zeppernick said by that stage, will be happy to share full sets of plans; not the type of developer to show you one thing and you will get something else; will all be documented; Underhill aid would like to get as far as we can with the City; hopeful to do that; Leeseberg asked if it is their intention to come into straight residential; Jones said Section 4 of the pre-annexation agreement, page 3; the City agrees to delay the acceptance of the annexation until zoning is accomplished; zoning process would begin after this pre-annexation agreement; would know exactly what we are getting at the time we are annexing; Underhill said hope is to be caught up with everything to

present to Council; Jones said would be all or nothing at that time; Ewald asked if the preliminary plan will be sufficient to submit to Council; Underhill said yes; do not have a problem attaching elevations; will have a variety of home types but will show the flavor; will have something to enforce; Jones said that language would be prepared and reviewed prior to the annexation being voted on; limitation text, we would work on and clarify that we are meeting the needs; Renner confirmed restrictions come at a later step; Jones said would say it is required upon consideration after zoning; Mayor Kneeland said this has no meaning if we do not meet the next steps; Underhill said we do not want to tie everyone's hands; gives flexibility on the City's side; the zoning text will ultimately govern this; will straddle that line; can make that language as strong as you like; Jones said can require limitation text is part of the zoning; would require Planning Commission review; Underhill said we cannot vary from standards with limitation text, can only get strict; in this we cannot ask for variances; Renner said the stormwater management, our code has a lot of particulars in it; looking for something here; a statement of intent; what precisely are you planning to do with the green infrastructure; want to capture more of that; and capture it here; not familiar with this method; asked if we can do that; Underhill said the chicken before the egg; at a very early stage; how far do you go; Zeppernick said want to make sure it is a collaborative effort; willing to explore additional opportunities; want to make sure Council understands what they are committing to; Renner said our code is written very well; Jones said stormwater management plan must be agreed upon at final plat; if not satisfied, we would not be required to go forward with the annexation; Renner said understands but needs to see it; Jones confirmed the language needs to be more clear to accomplish that; Renner said will send his thoughts to Mr. Jones; McGregor recommends they save as many trees as possible; those trees are there because they are healthy and they grow; that is her wish; if there are larger trees, if those can be preserved; Zeppernick said smart developers are in line with that thought process; great trees sell homes; new homes need something that is 30-40 years old; Metzbower asked about the DC project; Zeppernick said demographics in DC are similar to that in Texas; moving to a field they had not looked at; empty-nester product types; this project is located on the Virginia side; have sales actually generating; have went through extensive market studies and sets of plans; Metzbower

asked about confidence level with this market and this product type; Zeppernick said absolutely; thought this would be a perfect fit; constant pull of wanting green space and smaller lot space; hard to combine those; they typically sell 70 square foot lots; these homes are deeper; believes it will be a phenomenal project; Jones said will work on modification of language for zoning; will follow up with Mr. Renner on his thoughts to modify text on green infrastructure; can email any questions throughout this process; Jones said we recommend a first reading and amend by substitution; Renner said would like to postpone; Larick is not present; would like time to finish reading; all agreed to hold in committee.

6/27/16

Committee of the Whole

Recommended for Introduction

Jones said since last Committee meeting have been comments and questions brought forward; have tried to address within the agreement and the Council report; wants to discuss what the pre-annexation agreement is; have seen agreements come in recently; seeing a lot of interest; the City of Gahanna identified an approach and strategy that is imperative as we consider these projects; we are not actively pursuing; not soliciting new residential; goals are primarily commercial; residential is dealt with as they come in; also want to ensure there is additional revenue associated with the annexation; will offset expenses and generate revenue; so the City will not see long-term impacts from new infrastructure and services; will also have a pre-annexation agreement that will outline the terms and obligations of developer; does not entitle for an annexation; outlines obligations of the City and the developer throughout the process; Council will have final authority to accept annexation; this is the first step in that process; and also the zoning; thanked Council for indulging the background; the agreement as structured now covers the shown bullet points on the slide; will go over how the process will work; will need an annexation petition, service resolution - which says we have a level of service to provide the area; will not provide water or sewer; roadway access identifies the location and requirements; land use, new community authority (NCA), and green infrastructure; parkland, does the city want it and where will it be located; tax increment financing - not proposing a TIF at this time; NCA, has been a lot of discussion; we have accepted the one annexation; this would be similar; green infrastructure - they are working with the developer to satisfy the request; reviewed the process on the PowerPoint slideshow (attached); first step is the pre-annexation agreement; said the pre-annexation agreement is not accepting the annexation; is saying what needs to be done to consider the annexation request; if this were to move forward, the developer would then file for petition for annexation; which includes a service resolution; goes to the County for review; developer would then submit plans to Planning Commission in a zoning application; which would include an overlay text and a storm water management plan; during that time, a new community authority document would be prepared; this is the legal obligation if it were to be annexed; cannot create an NCA on our own; has to be submission of the property owner; would have to wait for the property to be annexed; Council would then consider for

approval the following: annexation petition, zoning text with overlay limitations; storm water plan and petition for NCA; engineer and Planning Commission must approve; this is a several month process; County will have to review; not sure how long County takes for reviewing annexations; zoning changes take up to 6 months, depending; in response to developers request to come into the City, we have worked hard to ensure revenue component; also worked hard to bring in the character of what is in the area; density being proposed is 1.5 units per acre; estimated price for the home starts at \$450K; 93 homes are part of the development; that number is one less home than was previously provided and the developer will get into why that happened; same footprint exists; one homeowner on Reynoldsburg-New-Albany asked to be excluded from the plan; per Council's request; added language to the agreement for the turn radius, wanted to make sure emergency vehicles have sufficient access when coming from the west; clarified pedestrian connectivity coming from the south; language was changed to add the overlay text; specifically to eliminate exterior facade to natural elements; and limiting the size; required a minimum size for homes; said McGregor brought up a point to HOA long-term sustainability; similar to rezoning request to Meadowbrooke; have a clause stating once HOA is established, has to provide documentation to City that is legally binding to allow us access to the property; have to give notice to fix it; this is the strongest place to put this other than taking ownership ourselves; not in the position to determine at that time; Larick asked for clarification on being brought back on HOA; asked if it is actually against the owners: Jones said it is the real property as defined; Larick said so it is the owner; Jones said will leave that to the City Attorney; Ewald said yes; Jones said section is somewhat different as well; feel that the 5 acres adjacent from Hannah Park should be under the City's ownership; at first it was going to be part of the open space; after speaking with the Parks & Recreation Department, will require some fencing and match the Hannah Farms Park; want to be able to use it for passive activities; 5 acres are better in our control abutting our property; also tried to identify additional language from Code 1195.05; the post construction run-off control measures; due to Renner's comments; also added language to preserve mature trees in the open space; ensured plan would be considered by Council at the time of the zoning change consideration; would not be a decision without all the information given to Council; is our effort to limit the exposure risk the City has before accepting something they may not want; and Exhibit B

changed some of the footprints for the project; turn over to developer who will highlight some of the project; Kevin Zeppernick, Vice President of land for M/I Homes; said this is a project targeting off of Route-605 (Reynoldsburg New-Albany Road); assembled four property owners; had a fifth for a period of time; an access parcel; showed that location on the map; access parcel the gentleman had a change in terms; he came to us and asked to be let out of the contract; discussed how he would be involved; he will still have some frontage; would no longer be part of the project; would also not be annexing them into the project; are at 93 lots; is a 1.5 density per acre; have about 23.5 acres in green space; average lot size is pushing between 80 and 90; all meeting minimum SF-3 code; meet all of the qualifications; project from an estimation standpoint will take about 3 years; targeting a new product not done in central Ohio before; currently building in the Washington D.C. area; ranch product is not age restricted but is age targeted; thinking average price will be in the \$450K range; smallest plan is 1800 square feet; up to 2400 feet; all have full basements; most of the actual projects will have a two-car garage; have an option for 3 car; excited about bringing something like this to the area; despite price point, keep linear feet down in the front of the house; widest you will typically see is 50'; reason is every linear foot you add is more pipe feet you have; challenging to stretch a home wider; a lot of these projects move from 60-70' wide; when you walk into a home, even though you have a garage, you get an expansive view; from a street standpoint, get a strong elevation; even with a ranch, has some good height; fits quite well into the area; we are about a year into this process; did initially go to the Township; was not a fit for that time; found this product-type in the February timeframe; previous submission to Township was 106 units; excited about continuity going into Hannah Park; the 5 acres you see on the map, will likely go to the Parks Department; want the selling feature of having a great park; Darling and Rovilla Road, open to what the City wants; wants primary entrance to be off of 605; want all emergency vehicles to be able to access; have done the best we can to pull homes into the interior; want a large buffer; want to ensure a green necklace around the community; Larick said he mentioned 2-car option, standard, asked if all would have a 2 car garage; Zeppernick confirmed; Larick asked about space around the home; Zeppernick said most of it is being farmed; Larick said developed; Zeppernick said have not gotten that far into the project; would want Gahanna's input; McGregor said reference closing Darling Road; is a very narrow road; this would be adding more cars; have a hard time

closing Darling Road; asked why we would allow; Zeppernick said would be open to discussion with the City; could leave the opportunity to open the road in the future; original assessment from County; would be detrimental to the area; improvements are necessary; if they are already recommending us not to do it, or if you do, would potentially need easement or right-of-way eminent domain; left open to future discussion; happy to explore that option; Larick asked Priestas for comments; Priestas said if left open as an access, would be requirements that should be constructed on Darling; would leave that up to the developer; would impact the residents in the area; roadway condition is not at current standard; would need to be brought up to adequate standards; Leeseberg asked if they were the only access, if the access of RNA is sufficient; Priestas said would most likely need a left turn lane; would be through the County Engineer's office; Leeseberg said if you did a secondary access off Darling and improved the middle, does that meet our requirement; Priestas said does not believe so; Angelou asked for it to be shown on the map; Priestas showed on the map and said the turnaround would need improvement to meet County requirements; Zeppernick said one other concern initially with surrounding neighbors was traffic; what would additional 90+ lots do to the neighbors; if surrounding neighbors are fine with this, this is something we can explore; Leeseberg asked original number of homes proposed to Township; Zeppernick said around 106; possibly even higher at the 130 range with a certain product; then lowered to around 106 with the submission; Metzbower asked if he is confident with the price point; Zeppernick said fairly confident; others having huge success with this; have to do it in the right target market; great thing about this is having this built somewhere; seeing this now in Washington DC; they are around \$700-750K; the \$450K range believe is a sweet spot; Angelou said looking at the product in Virginia, some are in the \$800-900K range; Zeppernick said try not to over promise but if they want to option up on the inside, options will be there; Angelou asked about the type of product and the all natural; Zeppernick confirmed, is now in the text; will not see a vinyl product on this house; Larick asked facade or all around; Zeppernick said all four sides will be all natural; Schnetzer asked for additional from administration; one of his concerns with many items discussed; looking through the future; expecting a recession before this is done in 3 years; asked what protections are in place so the project doesn't change with time; want to make sure we get what we are being presented with; asked what text is in place; Jones said can

meet that in two ways; want to ensure exterior facade is a certain caliber that speaks to the price point; exterior facade, that is one point that we feel will govern the homes on that property; and the overlay text would require every lot to be constructed in that manner; Hannah Farms hit a break during the last recession but they are finishing up; no matter what is built, will be built to this standard; also the square footage correlates with the pricing; nothing will be less than that; no matter what is built, will have that level of standard; nothing saying it has to be built in a certain timeframe; Schnetzer said there was another product in the city that it was built and then it changed hands; what was proposed was not developed; asked if code here is sufficient to restrict that; Jones said zoning code goes with the land no matter who owns it; all 61 acres will have to adhere to those standards; if not, they must come back to Council; once the zoning is passed, goes with the land; Leeseberg confirmed with the overlay, not a standard zoning; change of product to meet basic, will not happen; Jones confirmed, said overlay adds restrictions; will be ironed out at the next phase; Zeppernick said discuss these things each week; do not believe we will see the recession like we did in 07 or 08; in 40 years, MI has never walked from a development site; we can attach elevations and floorplans to this agreement; can commit to those; Aaron Underhill said would rather attach to the text; at the Planning Commission level; Renner thanked Jones for the summary in the beginning; said the City did not solicit this; showed what we require at this point; thanked the discussion on being open to Darling Road; asked when we should have that discussion; a roadway access bullet was on the slide; Jones said agreement states emergency access only; could tweak that language; text now says emergency access; improving Darling Road, would lean on others to assist with that; is Council's prerogative; more we put in, the better the certainty; Renner said would like to put in language to explore the alternatives; Jones said can work with Shane and Aaron Underhill; Larick said proposal to close Darling was the original plan by MI; asked where it started; Zeppernick said started with the County; County wanted the road closed; said unless able and willing, do not have enough right-of-way in that area; have a lot of Township members in the room; open to hear concerns; know they have a voice here as well; heard very strong feedback that they did not want the additional traffic; this would go through engineering; could make it one way in; would not improve the road and add traffic, but would leave them open from both directions; would not be cut through; would give a little more flexibility; would be open to

explore opportunities; Angelou asked, demographics, the age they are looking for; Zeppernick said around 60 years of age; likely from the area; maybe Township or New Albany; want a first floor master; likely do not have kids in school; have an offering close in New Albany; is an empty nester; missed the market by a bit; narrower lots; looked at demographics and see there is a need; Angelou said knows demographics are changing in the next 30 years; want to go with the schools; assuming the schools have been given some sort of impact; do they want this and can they handle this; 93 is better than 106; Jones said spoke with superintendent at the very start of this process; indicated that is about .5 child per household standard throughout Gahanna; that .5 could be lower with this product type; they told us the cost to educate a child is \$11K annually; our model takes revenue at the price point and is compared; schools would generate \$618K a year; costs would be \$513K; would be a net revenue; did the best they could to take into consideration; Angelou said if this all works out, asked how many bedrooms; Zeppernick said all two-bedrooms first floor, with a flex room; Angelou said that in itself could deter people with many children; Zeppernick said could also build out the basement; Larick said in regards to green infrastructure; as a direction for us as a community; see there has been some change in the language; the concepts, does this code meet those expectations for water management practices; Priestas said it does; our code sections specifically address water volume and quality requirements; developers would provide a minimum of 50% green infrastructure; something we would have to determine with actual numbers later; feel comfortable with the language; Leeseberg said 50% is above what we usually ask; Priestas confirmed; Zeppernick said would also work closely for green infrastructure and maintenance; Larick said 50%, asked if that is inclusive to open waters that are untouched; or it does not include those and in consideration; Jones said entire project; Renner said he did introduce the City to a high-quality water specialist; Mayor has made great latitudes to where staff will meet later this week; Zeppernick said met once this week; they are having a follow up; meeting also on Thursday; Larick said also sent out questions that he is still waiting on a response from; Metzbower asked how the number 7 in arrived at for mills; Jones said estimated cost for project and feedback from multiple departments; 106 is what was worked with regards to revenue; took estimated costs annually and revenue; tried to get as close as possible to see the benefit to the City; the zero impact, is not worth our efforts; comparable to what is in the

area; feels this is as aggressive as we can be; Mayor Kneeland said we also looked at from a loading perspective as to what the market can bear; struggling today with maintenance and infrastructure; looked at this from a pragmatic perspective; we can say 10 mills, but the developer can say no thank you, these seem to be bringing a component to the area; as we are visiting businesses, learning more of what the community needs; looking for some executive housing from a development standpoint; learning as we visit with businesses; the demographics are changing; the area is changing; want to capture that; want to be best in class and right with the market; Angelou said called Mr. Jones on Friday about that; there was some need for clarifying how this would go on for many years and not fall apart; Jones said spoke with legal counsel, Greg Daniels, from Squire, Patton and Boggs and in the long-run how they will maintain the expectations; the code was changed in 2011 to allow for the City to choose to create an alternative method of establishing the board of commissioners; we are proposing Council appoint all 7 members of the NCA; Council would have full authority to appoint those who would oversee the NCA; would require the NCA to enter into a legal contract with the City to administer the 7 mill charge on the residential projects identified; we would have the political authority as well as a legal contract; in this instance would be charging the 7 mills; can renegotiate the contract; would give them as much comfort as needed; Angelou asked if this was for a 5, 30 or like 100 year-term; Jones said our model is based on 25-year resurfacing and 50-year re-construction; really Council's prerogative; no deadline; Angelou asked if this would be any citizen in the City of Gahanna; Jones said does not have to come from a specific area; there are NCA's over primarily commercial; alternative method state allowed is to allow Council to make appointments; in most instances is the petitions body; Angelou asked if they can say all members of Council; Jones said there isn't any limitations; will confirm that; Larick said would like to see this back in Committee; needs to follow-up on some items; Zeppernick asked if it is possible to do a first reading; on very sensitive timelines; Larick confirmed this is a 3 year project; asked if 2 weeks would hold that; Zeppernick said not 3 years for the folks selling the land; Angelou said we have two readings; Leeseberg said okay with first reading; Schnetzer asked if there is a benefit to first reading; Larick said speaker slips; Metzbower asked what the difference in flexibility is; Larick said if it is not put on first reading, it goes to Committee with option for moving forward; explained the process for

Council readings; Renner said good with going to first reading; definitely have it go back to Committee; to show the interest; the developer is coming to play with some of the amendments that we are discussing; we still have freedom to postpone or table the item.

7/5/16

City Council

Introduced

7/11/16

Committee of the Whole

Recommended for Adoption

Jones said want to identify items that have changed since we last met; the staff has met with the developer; have meet with representatives from Hannah Farms and County Engineer; want to address those; roadway section that came from last session; request to evaluate if Darling Road can remain open; County Engineer is willing to explore this option; concerned with it being closed and the flow of traffic; needs more analysis; will continue to meet with him, Rob and the developer; his determination will be made during the final plat; final plat lays out where the road will go; will be known impacts to Darling Road prior to this; emergency access will always be required; paramount for us; section 4 identified that the overlay text would require color renderings and floor plans; something that provides the City with confidence in what the end product will look like; section 5 was modified, changed the unobstructed use to passive use; concerned there would be activity that would impact Hannah Farms; Hannah Farms Home Owners Association (HOA) requested stub road be removed; Mayor agreed; was our goal to minimize Reynoldsburg New-Albany Road (RNA) access points; this project will no longer have a stub road per discussion with HOA; several questions about essential housing developments that have occurred in Jefferson Township; there have been 23 subdivisions, equates to about 2700 homes that have been allowed to be added based on plats; total acreage is 1355; equates to 1.99 acres per unit per acre in density; this is since 1994; Hannah Farms is 1.47; said Larick asked about pricing, pricing is very hard to get; went to Kitzmiller Crossing and identified \$370K, Village at Hannah Farms \$447K, Woods at Havens Run \$443K; Larick asked if that is current valuation; Jones said believes that is from auditor's website; in regards to the impact to school district; meeting with the superintendent and members of the school district on Wednesday to discuss the project in more detail; also reached out to Ohio Department of Taxation; specifically the division that is the head of real estate taxes; they provided a summary of property taxes being collected for Gahanna-Jefferson School District, as well as City of Gahanna and Jefferson Township; provided a memo that explains the three types of levies, bond types, millages, dating back to 1976 and what that equates to; in regards to new construction, does add to tax collections; inside millage and fixed rate; does not add tax rate for the fixed sum; if a City issues bonds in a certain amount, they cannot collect more on an annual basis to pay back those bonds; as more are approved, rates get lower; referred to as a fixed sum levy; Larick asked like getting a

bond that built the building, you get more money with the netted costs; Jones confirmed; said those are the three levy types provided explanation to Council; said also a question about Planned Unit Districts (PUD) versus overlay text; PUD is a unique zoning classification; no baseline limitations; whatever the site requires; an overlay has a baseline that makes those existing standards more strict; our PUDs are different and precluded from our code from being created; total amount of property taxes per home; per our tax rate a \$450K home should bring in \$12,397 in property taxes; schools get 53% of that, City gets a lot less, around 2 cents on the dollars; 7 mill charge will bring in 11 million dollars per home; on top of the property taxes; total taxation is \$13,891; includes total base taxes and the New Community Authority (NCA); the NCA is an additional tax that is requested by the property owner; they petition to have this tax added; last question is the process; spoke with Shane and the legal counsel for the developer; reviewed the process; first, Council will review and vote on the pre-annexation agreement; next is the petition to Franklin County by MI Homes; then Franklin County will review annexation petition; timeline depends on if the township objects; 4th step is Council approving a service resolution for the property; next the developer, staff and Franklin County Engineer will work on solutions for roadway improvements, green infrastructure, storm water management and zoning overlay text; this process would occur after annexation petition for Franklin County; then MI would submit a zoning application to be reviewed by our Planning Commission; would be for zoning change and final plat; must agree at this point on infrastructure items; if approved, it goes to Council; there are public hearings required; believes would have more than one public hearing; meanwhile, staff would prepare a New Community Authority (NCA) document; then Council will approve an annexation petition, zoning with overlay text, final plat and petition for NCA; this summarizes the process; a lot of timelines in between there; this is an overview; developer is here with their attorney.

Schnetzer asked about item 4; asked if this moves parallel or contingent; Ewald said once petition is filed, need service resolution within 20 days; Aaron Underhill said the township has authority to approve or disapprove which dictates timeline for County Commissioners; the 20 days comes in and requires the City to act within 20 days; will disclose which services will be provided if annexed; after that passage you have the right to approve or disapprove the annexation; certain thing governed

by the statute; requires those waiting periods; Ewald said will not be a problem for response to the City; Schnetzer asked if need a thumbs up on 3 before 4; Ewald said that is one of the checkboxes, if they don't have it; Angelou said have been through a number of annexations; this is a different process; this is expedited so everything is done at the same time; asked when this came about; Underhill said law changed in early 2000s; various types of annexation petitions; would not want to annex the property unless it is rezoned; Renner said on item 3, the roadway access in the agreement; the process to determine if the road should be determined; who determines and how is that done; Jones said the Franklin County Engineer; his staff would work with engineers for MI homes on traffic studies and impact studies; would determine what needs to be done on and off-site; have been working with them to ensure that they have all information needed; Renner asked for elaboration on partial access; Jones said discussed one-way in and one-way out; just discussion items; no analysis done; discussion was very broad; Renner confirmed Franklin County would look at that; Jones said yes; Renner said further on in section 3; will find and share with him and Shane; Schnetzer said will go back to the idea of overlay text; this will be the third meeting have brought this up; item 4 of the redline; additional text discussing the materials to be used, submitting floorplans; want some comfort that this is restrictive; have received countless emails, calls and have met with residents; part of the concerns are impacts to traffic and schools; in regard to schools, if we are consistent with what we are expecting to receive, theoretically there should be no students by definition; practically no impact to the schools; in regards to traffic, the one unit per acre density limit, guess if it is developed in that manner, you will have larger homes with more cars and possibly a 3 car garage; that will likely have an impact on schools as well as vehicles; 93 homes times 2 cars is 186 vehicles; 63 homes times 3 cars is 186 vehicles; net-net; no material difference at all; getting back to this comfort level and asked how we become assured we are talking empty-nester product even if the economy shifts; want to make sure we get what is being proposed; Jones said language in the contract states that the overlay text shall provide adequate specifications to provide the City the means to ensure and enforce the quality of architecture in the development; shall is definitive obligation; at the time the text comes to Council, have that discretion to see if the language is satisfactory; open to

any suggestions; there is wiggle room for the City; Schnetzer said the teeth will come in the overlay text; Underhill said this is a roadmap; sets expectations for us; no ability in the legal sense to contract around the code; the City has a process and we intend to follow that and the code; this document and at this time, does not address that; Zeppernick said our intention is to come out of the gate with the empty nester product; designed for people to age in place; will be consistent with a two car garage; in the process now of putting two models of this in the Parkwood community in Jefferson Township; our intentions are to make that product work here; want to make sure we can make minor tweaks if approved; want to reserve the right to pivot; if for some reason, this just does not hit, do not want to jeopardize the project; we need to be in the \$450K range; should something fall through, would pivot to the single family product style; in analysis initially, if we get to the product we want, impacts to the school will be minimal; believes after discussions, numbers would pay for any student attending the school; same would occur if we had to go to the other side; not our intention; want to make sure we have that option; would attach those floor plans; Schnetzer added for color on that product looks like from the square footage perspective; Zeppernick said would be larger; 3000+ square feet; 3 bedroom home; 2 car garage but an option for a third; would be a smaller width; empty-nester is a wide product; typically see the 3 car snap on option; having a lot of success in a community called Sanctuary of the Lakes; off Africa Road in Delaware County; happy to share those; Schnetzer asked if the market switches and requires them to go that route; asked if they would replace and do denser lots per the study; Zeppernick said probably not; the economics are still showing a price range that somewhat match; margins do not change a lot with lot size; changes with this product versus that product; planning on doing a lot of empty nester products; did a cost-benefit analysis for these; Angelou asked because this will be an older clientele, should be a good product, there is the homestead exemption; asked the number on lowering the amount; Zeppernick said very familiar; Underhill said we can run an analysis; Teal said we receive a rollback; state makes effort to make tax recipients whole; not a loss for us; Larick asked Jones if we have a statement from the schools; and do we have data in regard to student populations in the last 10 years and current population; Jones said do not but can ask that later this week when they meet; McGregor asked Scott

Schmidt if he wanted to comment; Schmidt said we have not had a chance to sit down and talk with the Mayor and his team; concerned a little that some information does not take into account all variables; our .6 students that we average per house, does not depend on type of housing, depends on housing available; if a family that currently lives in Rose Run, moves to the new product, the new family moves into Rose Run; will see an increase of 50 students; may not be from this neighborhood; each year when we do enrollment predictions, call the City and look at number of building permits issued; use .6 as the school standard; Larick asked the occupancy of the schools; Schmidt said those numbers need revised and updated because of today's programs being delivered; those take up additional square footage; have 8 modular classrooms at Blacklick; doing some reading in storage areas; 50 students will not require a new building; not making a statement at this point; just because we are talking about the empty-nester, does not mean we will not get an increase in number of students; McGregor asked about the NCA; in our Charter it says taxes cannot be increased without a vote; does that apply; Jones said not taxes, are considered charges; are assessed under the authority of what an NCA is; McGregor asked about road vacation process; talked with County Engineer last week, said it was not a short process; Jones said if a vacation, understands County Commissioners would need to approve that; correct, there is a longer timeline and process; will need identified as that process moves forward; part of that process; cannot speak to the County's timeline but they would have to approve; McGregor asked if believes they will object based on letter received; Jones said cannot say but knows they are not in favor of the project; Renner said understands if the Township objects it has to be on one item of the petition and not the annexation generally; Underhill confirmed; Renner said it has to be on one of the checklist items of the petition; said nothing in this agreement has changed the 7 members of Council that we can vote no on the annexation; Ewald confirmed; Renner asked if Jefferson Township has a restrictive overlay text, a proposed one, or that in the process, for the development; Jones said not sure if they have the means to do so or if they have that as part of their process; Underhill said with planned districts you can vary from the code and get less stringent; not sure if they have overlay; in our process can only can have a variance or get more restrictive; Renner confirmed we are putting more on this

development than the Township with all the requirements; asked if that is fair to say; Underhill said absolutely; McGregor said Leeseberg sent list of densities and developments spreadsheet of Jefferson Township; Jones said 1.23 is the density; McGregor said thinking at first that it is not very different than 1.5; actually, they would have to lose 18 houses to get it equal to Kitzmiller Crossing; would have to drop quite a bit to get there; asked what Hannah Farms is; Jones said 1.47; McGregor said it is about the same.

7/18/16 City Council Postponed to Date Certain to the Committee of the Whole

Angelou stated that she had not heard some of the facts presented by speaker Robert Sander and therefore thought it right to postpone vote in order to check such facts before next meeting.

## 2. Cell Tower Proposed Code

*This Ordinance was introduced. Public Hearing Date: July 18, 2016*

[ORD-0068-2016](#) TO AMEND CHAPTER 1181, PERSONAL WIRELESS SERVICE FACILITIES, OF PART ELEVEN, PLANNING AND ZONING CODE, OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GAHANNA.

**Attachments:** [CC-1-16 ROA](#)  
[7-7 Legal Ad](#)  
[Legal Ad OrderConf](#)  
[EXHIBIT A - 1181 Personal Wireless Service Facilities FINAL \(June 2016\)](#)  
[ORD-68-16 SIGNED](#)

### **Legislative History**

6/27/16 Committee of the Whole Held in Committee

Ewald said have been attending Planning Commission meetings and interacting with the public; Planning Commission approved the draft copy; were some changes incorporated into the final version; Larick confirmed it is set from a legal perspective; Ewald confirmed; said we have requested a public hearing; Renner said has not been advertised yet; a public hearing will be 7/18; Angelou asked if it should be introduced; Ewald said we have built in enough time that it does not; Larick said hearing will be second Council meeting in July; second reading will be August; first reading will be the night of the public hearing; Ewald said that should keep us on the timeframe.

7/11/16	Committee of the Whole	Recommended for Introduction Ewald asked if there were any questions; set for public hearing on the 18th.
7/18/16	City Council	Introduced

### 3. Tree Code

*This Ordinance has been introduced.*

[ORD-0066-2016](#) TO ENACT CODE CHAPTER 914, TREE PRESERVATION, PLANTING AND REPLACEMENT, OF PART NINE, STREETS AND PUBLIC SERVICES CODE, OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GAHANNA.

**Attachments:** [EXHIBIT A - 8-15-16 AMENDED - Chapter 914 - Tree Preservation, Planting and Replacement](#)  
[DEV-RPT-08.08.16](#)

[old version 8-8-16 AMENDED - Chapter 914 Tree Preservation and Planting Revised per 8-8-16 Council COTW](#)  
[old version -Tree Code Updated 08.05.16](#)

[DEV-RPT-07.25.16](#)

[old version-Chapter 914 \(Revised 07.21.16\)](#)

[old version - Chapter 914 Tree Preservation and Planting Code](#)  
[MODIFIED 6-23-15 Redlined](#)  
[DEV-RPT-06.27.16](#)

[old version - Tree Code Revised 6-17-16](#)

[DEV-RPT-06.13.16](#)

[old version - Chapter 914 Tree Code](#)

[DEV-RCA-Chapter 914 Tree Code JB](#)

[Council PPT Tree Code](#)

[DEV-RPT-07.11.16](#)

[ORD-66-16 SIGNED](#)

**Legislative History**

6/13/16

Committee of the Whole

Recommended for Introduction

Blackford said has been three years since tree code was repealed (ORD-73-2013); reviewed old tree code; sites with less than 60% canopy coverage; in the Central Park area, there is an area that is 100% clear; previous code did not require tree canopy; looking for a more balanced approach with the new code; will look at buildings, parking, drive aisles, etc.; one tree inch would be required per 1,000 square acres; soften the environment; sites that preserve protected trees are awarded credits on an inch for inch basis; mature trees are much better at softening the environment; a landscape plan would be required for a final development plan; type and species of trees would be considered; example: a two-acre site being developed at 70% impervious is 60,984 square feet; 61 tree inches to be planted; typical nursery tree is planted; Leeseberg confirmed this is in addition to the street tree requirement; Blackford said for existing commercial will look at new impervious areas; would also apply to single family homes; 1/2 acre lot = 6 trees; a site that may need to be cleared, would have a tree removal permit; language prevents clear cutting; clearing of buckles tract may be necessary to market sites; do not want a site cleared and sat on for a long period of time; Schnetzer asked about 914.05(C); is there a fixed dollar amount; asked if we can have a stick number and not revisit this every 5 years; Blackford said absolutely; McGregor said a lot may not be 100%; should not have that option; Blackford said most zone districts would cap at 75%; one zone district that in theory could go to 100%, wouldn't be feasible without a slew of variances; that is our OCT district; allows for more impervious than we see on like Hamilton Road; tree code is one way to soften the environment; McGregor asked if we have to give them the out; Blackford said would require a variance and would require Planning Commission approval; cannot imagine why staff would ever support that; Leeseberg said there is a zoning district currently that does not allow the tree code to be applied; OCT; Jones said this was our first attempt at creating a tree code; wanted both of our intentions aligned; trees play a big role; new tree plantings on vacant lots are very important; Leeseberg said does not see any requirement of a tree survey; how do we handle tree survey requirements; Blackford said would be done in conjunction with final development plan for commercial project and landscape plan; said at one point in time a tree survey was required; would go before Planning Commission; discussed the language and it was a rare occasion; McGregor confirmed we do not have a tree code currently; asked about the Shops at

Rocky Fork; would those tree plantings be adequate under this tree code; Blackford said can take a look at that; looked at some recently approved through Planning Commission but none that are actually built yet; Schnetzer said there are a lot more sections regarding current situation than this; asked if someone's goal was to keep the same amount of trees; would this code do that or prevent some reduction; Blackford said would permit some reduction; previous 914 language would deal with canopy; in theory, would not require the preservation of existing canopy; want to encourage that as much as possible; can look at some existing sites we have built and apply it to what the proposed code is; recently had a site with 55% impervious; varies with zoning classification; goal is to have plantings that when they reach maturity, provides softening of the landscape; shade trees have a larger canopy area than other types of trees; Leeseberg showed Ewald a cleanup recommendation for 914.07; Ewald said it can apply to residential; Jones said in final plats, not in existing.

6/20/16

City Council

Introduced, to the Committee of the Whole

6/27/16      Committee of the Whole      Held in Committee

Jones said Michael Blackford is here to discuss changes based on previous feedback; Blackford said there were a couple of suggested changes; and a request to look at recent development; those changes have been made; in reference to the offsite planting requirement, moved language to fee schedules, which are evaluated every year; also clarified trees damaged during construction process are replaced and not replanted; do not mean to replace a damaged tree; and there was a request to look at the Shops and Rocky Fork and Kemba area; both built around same time; Shops at Rocky Fork did not have any tree preservation; had a large impervious area; they were required 45 trees with code and they planted 55 trees; it would not meet the proposed language; would need another 40-48 trees; Kemba had 3-4 large trees preserved onsite; they had 109 tree inches preserved; they far exceed any code requirements; would have met proposed language and not had any additional requirements except parking; happy to answer any questions; McGregor thanked him for that work; Jones said some of the results spoke to how preservation can impact the requirements; Metzbower confirmed this would not be retroactive; Jones confirmed, would be going forward; Angelou asked if you were able to look at the statements from Mr. Jordan Fromm last week; Jones said in that process right now; have not been able to articulate some of our responses to their points; trying to identify ways to address those; Angelou asked if they are meeting him this week or next; Jones said meeting internally with staff based on our goals; Larick asked if we would discuss this in Committee until that discussion has happened; Larick said language refers to impervious pavement and parking areas; if they put in impervious paving, structures that would have been solid asphalt or concrete, how does this get impacted; Jones said not taken into consideration impervious paving, only standard impervious surface; Larick asked if Shops at Rocky Fork would have put in an impervious paving parking lot, would this code be relevant; Blackford said would be relevant; would be impervious surface; pervious pavement is not impervious; not the typical 70%; would be around 55%; would be based on that reduced number.

7/5/16      City Council      Postponed to Date Certain to the City Council

7/11/16

Committee of the Whole

Recommended for Postponement to a Date Certain

Blackford said three weeks ago Council heard feedback reference to the proposed tree code; have discussed the feedback; have provided comments in the Council report; the larger the lot, the more trees that will need to be planted; larger lots typically have larger buildings and larger parking areas; based on intensity of the development; looks at small and large lots the same; typically large lots have more trees on them; is an opportunity for large lots to have more tree preservation; would decrease onsite planting requirements; looked at a project under review right now and how the cost would impact their development; is a 2.5 acre lot; is the typical lot size for development in the City; based on amount of trees, if subject to this new code; about 63 tree inches; have the capital investment dollars; actual cost would be .3% increase in this case; minimal cost compared to overall construction of the site; comment was made that it is unclear how this would impact heavily treed lots; said old code was based on development conditions; heavily treed lots had to plant more regardless; this code looks at all lots the same whether heavily treed or cleared; planting requirement is based off post development conditions and amount impervious; heavily treed lots could be considered favorable because you have more opportunity for tree preservation; would reduce onsite tree planting; Larick asked if it is one-to-one; Blackford said depends on the size of the tree, diameter; 20" diameter tree being preserved, onsite planting requirement is reduced by 20"; basically one-for-one; believes this is a fair code; takes circumference divided by pi; another comment about the code being bad for business and bad for citizens; we believe it is fair and balances things for citizens while recognizing needs to development; will add to aesthetics; the Central Park, primary area of concerns; they are subject to an overlay; they have additional onsite planting requirements that are fairly similar to the proposed code; the City has been without a tree code for three years now; looked at surrounding communities; we are one of very few that does not have tree planting code requirements; there is definitely a need for this language to be approved; Larick asked if it would be advantageous to provide a higher value to keeping older growth trees as opposed to the one-to-one; equal to 110%; Jones said that is an incentive; right now that is an additional cost savings; did not go down that path, thought it was fine, open to considering that; Blackford said at one point it was a

half credit for onsite preservation; could be increased; would fully agree that the intent is to further incentivize the preservation, upping it from one to one and a half; nothing that would prevent us from doing that; would have an increased incentive to preserve trees; Larick said if we have a 10" tree or walnut in a rough spot but could be worked around; if it were more valued than a one-to-one; Jones said right now there is a protected tree; larger trees would get a greater credit; depending on type and size of tree; willing to explore that; becomes subjective, want objective; McGregor asked if you could say trees greater than 8" would have a greater incentive; Jones said not sure if landscape plan goes into more than just the actual caliber; Blackford said it can, most identify species type and size; would discuss with City arborist; if there was a certain type of tree we want to incentivize; certain tree sizes have a higher aesthetic quality; would be easier to say on size versus a list of species; can be done but will be more cumbersome; easy to identify a size; Schnetzer asked how we mitigate the value of cottonwoods in the agreement; McGregor said there are hard woods and soft woods; Jones asked for time to come up with a recommendation per the request; McGregor said maybe under 8" or something along those lines; would probably not be difficult at that point to identify species; Jones said fine with bringing this back to Committee again; Larick asked the risk without the code right now; Jones said nothing that he is aware of.

7/18/16

City Council

Postponed to Date Certain to the Committee of the Whole

## DISCUSSION ITEM FROM THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR & DIRECTOR OF FINANCE:

### 1. Capital Needs Assessment

[2016-0214](#)

2016 Budget/Capital Needs Assessments Documents

**Attachments:** [CA\\_RPT\\_6.8.16](#)

[CA\\_ATT\\_Capital\\_Needs\\_Assessment](#)

**Legislative History**

6/13/16

Committee of the Whole

Held in Committee

Teal said we are trying something new; when discussing page number, talking about number in the PDF; this is the 5th go-around with the Capital Needs Assessment (CNA); we have certainly evolved the process; it identifies all of the improvements, projects and programs as being identified as appropriate; the totals for the needs are staggering compared to the resources; this is the first step in meaningful conversations in our long-term needs; this years CNA is different as Council is receiving these very early on; thanked staff for their time getting this together; we have the strategic plan, we can start to look at projects; going to give a brief overview of the document; propose that for the rest of June and July we keep this as an open discussion item on the agenda; reach out if you need information gathered prior to the meeting; document is organized slightly different; page 3 provides visuals that show linkage with various strategic planning items; will see these links frequently; also created icons for the economic development strategy; have maintained the ranking system that we have had in the past; on-going projects and one-time projects are also identified; those one-time projects are divided into priority 1, 2, and 3; one being the most important and stating we cannot go on without; priority three is for projects that could be delayed; page 5 - a listing of projects that are new; projects that pertain to sustainable operating model, are the som projects and are at the beginning; in general government section, is all other projects; do not happen to be affiliated with GoForward Gahanna or the sustainable operating model; page 79 - spreadsheet that outlines the proprietary fund projects; many of those have components that have a general government piece as well; there is a lot in the document; can field general questions and discuss what committees will look like in the future; Schnetzer said it looks good; page 5, confirmed all new projects are governmental; Teal confirmed; if Council would provide advanced notice to prepare items and conversations for future meetings.

6/27/16

Committee of the Whole

Held in Committee

Teal said have received no questions from Council; as we discussed earlier, if you have any discussion questions, give us a heads up the week prior; will be able to bring that; will keep this as an open discussion item over the next 2 Committee meetings; wanted to allow for plenty of questions; Larick said the current estimate is a guess, not a hard and fast number; is the 1.7 million going to be added based on trend; Bury said does appear we will be leaning toward another surplus; Larick said from a personal comment, have no concerns with finding effective ways to use that 1.7 million; have had multiple discussions about our revenue streams; have concerns about putting into items with an at risk future and no means to recoup those; not recoupable; except the 1.7; recognize the strategy and work that has been put in; have a gap between objectives and future resources; Mayor Kneeland said met with Joann and Jennifer last week to discuss the amount we are collecting over estimate; being conservative; will provide an internal plan to get behind and provide continuous funding and have dedicated funding sources; had the same concerns; discussed multiple times with Mr. Schnetzer the future; would like to attack the most basic ones first; will be bringing a plan forward; Larick said would be much happier with having less unplanned at the end of the year and more effectively planned with our regular plan and tighten that up; within reason; based on our budget level, that is measurable; Mayor Kneeland wants to understand how the estimate is built; are we being too conservative; not something he has a good handle on at this point; Larick said does not remember ending with less than we planned; we have to plan and make better use of the funds.

7/11/16      Committee of the Whole      Held in Committee  
Larick said started some questions earlier today, sent to Joann; looking for an understanding on where can place level of comfort on where to spend; based on volume of projects in CNA; is pretty restrictive; will get those questions out this week; any questions, should be brought forward; earlier we can get that line drawn is beneficial to all; Teal said we draw the line all the time; but brought this early because it feels when this is discussed in November, is a short amount of time to answer a lot of questions; would love to be able to get through some of that discovery with Council; those with linkages with the Strategic Plan; would like to have as much opportunity to discuss those.

## DISCUSSION ITEM FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE:

### 1. Mid-Year Transfers

[MR-0036-2016](#)      MOTION RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CHANGES IN STAFFING, BENEFITS AND ALLOCATIONS. TRANSFER DETAIL ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT A.

**Attachments:**    [FIN RPT 7.25.16](#)  
                          [FIN RCA Mid Year Transfers](#)  
                          [MR-36-16 SIGNED](#)

## DISCUSSION ITEM FROM THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR:

### 1. GoForward Gahanna Quarterly Report Out

[2016-0245](#)      GoForward Gahanna Quarterly Report Out

**Attachments:**    [CA ATT Q2 2016 GoForward Gahanna Update](#)

## DISCUSSION ITEMS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES:

### 1. Civil Service Rules & Regulations

[ORD-0074-2016](#)      TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION RULES AND REGULATIONS AS RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL ON JULY 19, 2016.

**Attachments:**    [HR RPT 7.25.16](#)  
                          [EXHIBIT A - Rules and Regulations](#)  
                          [ORD-74-16 SIGNED](#)

## 2. Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, Inc. - Dispatch group Agreement

[ORD-0075-2016](#) TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A BARGAINING UNIT AGREEMENT FOR THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE, OHIO LABOR COUNCIL, INC (FOP-OLC) FOR THE PERIOD OF JANUARY 1, 2016 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2018 FOR THE POLICE RADIO DISPATCHERS.

**Attachments:** [HR RPT 7.25.16](#)  
[EXHIBIT A FOP OLC Agreement](#)  
[ORD-75-16 SIGNED](#)

## DISCUSSION ITEM FROM THE DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION:

### 1. McCutcheon Park Concept Plan

[ORD-0076-2016](#) SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS - McCutcheon Park Concept Plan

**Attachments:** [PR-RTC 7.25.2016](#)  
[PR McCutcheon Park Park Concept Plan - 05.12.16](#)  
[ORD-76-16 SIGNED](#)

### 2. Approval of Grants

[ORD-0081-2016](#) TO AUTHORIZE THE CREATION OF A CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND FOR THE STATE'S COMMUNITY RECREATION PROGRAM GRANT AND IF AWARDED, THE CLEAN OHIO TRAILS FUND GRANT, RECREATIONAL TRAIL PROGRAM GRANT AND NATUREWORKS GRANT.

**Attachments:** [PR-RTC 7.25.2016](#)  
[PR RCA Grant Fund JB](#)  
[ORD-81-16 SIGNED](#)

[RES-0024-2016](#) TO AUTHORIZE THE CITY TO OBLIGATE FUNDS FOR THE BIG WALNUT TRAIL, SECTION 4 PROJECT, IF AWARDED THE GRANT FOR THE CLEAN OHIO TRAIL FUND (COTF) GRANT, RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM GRANT, AND THE NATUREWORKS GRANT.

**Attachments:** [PR-RTC 7.25.2016](#)  
[PR RCA Grant Obligations](#)  
[PR BWT Sec. 4 Engineer's Estimate](#)  
[PR -Trail Segments Plan 1-14-10- BWT Sec 4](#)  
[RES-24-16 SIGNED](#)

### 3. Creekside Restoration Study

[ORD-0077-2016](#) TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH OHM FOR A CREEKSIDE RESTORATION AND USE PLANNING STUDY; AND TO TRANSFER FUNDS.

**Attachments:** [PR-RTC 7.25.2016](#)  
[EXHIBIT A - Creekside Restoration Proposal](#)  
[PR-RCA-Ordinance-OHM JB](#)  
[PR-RCA-MR transfer funds JB](#)  
[ORD-77-16 SIGNED](#)

## DISCUSSION ITEMS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE

### 1. Muni-Link SaaS Agreement

[ORD-0079-2016](#) TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH MUNI-LINK.

**Attachments:** [SVC-RPT-07-25-16](#)  
[EXHIBIT A -Muni-Link - SaaS Agreement](#)  
[SVC-RCA-Muni-Link SaaS Agreement](#)  
[ORD-79-16 SIGNED](#)

### 2. Hamilton Rd Lease Agreement - Lustron House

[ORD-0078-2016](#) TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO LEASE AGREEMENT WITH POINT PLUS PERSONNEL FOR THE USE OF 79 S. HAMILTON ROAD.

**Attachments:** [SVC-RPT-07-25-16](#)  
[EXHIBIT A - Hamilton Rd Lease Agreement - Lustron House](#)  
[SVC-RCA-Lustron House Lease](#)  
[ORD-78-16 SIGNED](#)

[ORD-0080-2016](#) TO GRANT A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 1143.04, SF-3 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GAHANNA; TO ALLOW A NON-RESIDENTIAL USE WITHIN A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (SF-3) ZONING DISTRICT FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 79 S. HAMILTON ROAD.

**Attachments:** [ORD-80-16 SIGNED](#)

[V-0006-2016](#)

To consider a Variance application to vary section 1143.04(b), Conditional Uses, of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Gahanna; to allow a non-residential use on an SF-3, Single Family Residential zoned property; for property located at 79 S. Hamilton Road; Parcel ID no. 025-000277; current zoning, Single Family Residential (SF-3); City of Gahanna/Dottie Franey, applicant.

(Advertised in the RFE on 7/7/2016)

**Attachments:** [V-6-2016 - 79 S Hamilton Rd - Office Rental - Agenda Packet](#)

[CU-5; V-6 CPO](#)

[7-7 Legal Ad](#)

[OrderConf](#)

[ROA V-6-16](#)

[Proof of Publication](#)

**Legislative History**

7/13/16 Planning Commission Approved  
Priestas gave a summary of the application; City of Gahanna is seeking approval of these applications; is commonly known as the Lustron House; currently a vacant structure; this property has not been used as residential in many years; structure will be used and maintained by Point Plus Personnel thereby reducing the utility costs and maintenance by the City; will not adversely affect any of the neighbor properties; property is located west of the high school on Hamilton Road; a site photo was shown.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Applicant, Dottie Franey, Director of Public Service & Engineering, 200 S. Hamilton Road, Gahanna; available to answer any questions.

Chair called for proponents. There were none. Chair called for opponents. There were none.

Keehner asked if this was a City office; Franey said is a City building we are leasing to someone else; Keehner said glad it will be used and preserved; have only seen one other Lustron House in Columbus; make sure they do not disappear with their historical value; Andrews said he agrees with Keehner.

Chair closed the public hearing at 7:44 p.m.