

## Report for Council – July 11, 2016

---

### **Planning & Development Department Agenda Items:**

#### **Darling Road Pre-Annexation Agreement UPDATED**

Based upon the discussions from the previous City Council meeting, email correspondence from individual Councilmembers, feedback from the Hannah Farms Home Owners Association, Franklin County Engineer's Office and dialogue with M/I Homes of Central Ohio ("Developer"), the Department has modified the Pre-Annexation Agreement in the following ways:

- **Section 3 - Roadway Access**
  - Added language that requires the Developer to work with the Franklin County Engineer and City Engineer to determine the impact that the project will have on Darling Road. Specifically, the follow options are being evaluated as it pertains to Darling Road:
    - Provide full access to traffic external to the project site
    - Provide partial access to traffic external to the project site
    - Provide only pedestrian and emergency vehicular access to the project site
  - No matter what option is chosen for Darling Road, pedestrian and emergency vehicular traffic will always be maintained for the project site and the City will not be responsible for any roadway improvement costs.
  - EMH&T has also submitted a brief history and summary of the analysis that was completed by M/I as it pertains to the potential impact on Darling Road. See the attached letter from EMH&T.
- **Section 4 – Use**
  - Added language that requires the Developer to incorporate colored renderings and residential floor plans in the limited overlay zoning text for the project.
- **Section 5 – Parkland**
  - Added language that requires the City to use the 5 acres of parkland that abuts Hannah Park as "Passive Space" instead of the City having an unobstructed use of the property.
    - This change was at the request of the Hannah Farms Home Owner's Association.
- **Exhibit B – Preliminary Site Plan**
  - Removed the stub road that would allow for access to future development north of the property along the western edge of Reynoldsburg New Albany Road.
    - This change was at the request of the Hannah Farms Home Owner's Association.

In addition to these modifications, the Department received the following questions from Councilwoman McGregor and Councilman Larick:

- 1) How many residential developments have been added in Jefferson Township in the last 15 years? What is the density, number of units and price point for these homes? What is the density, number of units and price point for the homes at Hannah Farms?

<b>Residential Development in Jefferson Township since 1994</b>					
Year	Subdivision Name	Acreage	#		Density
			Homes	Density	
1	2000	Woods at Swisher Creek	43.925	37	1.187162162
2	2003	Asbury Heights	25.08	95	3.787878788
3	1999	Blacklick Ridge	104.18	307	2.946822807
4	2002	Creekwood Estates	29.63	28	0.944988188
5	2003	Field Stone	104.81	177	1.688770156
6	1999	Jefferson Meadows	281.18	262	0.931787467
7	2002	Jefferson Pond	26.3	85	3.231939163
8	2003	Jefferson Village	20.5	40	1.951219512
9	1994	Kitsmiller's Crossing	104.95	130	1.238685088
10	2006	McIntosh Village	6.09	18	2.955665025
11	2000	Morrison Farms	73.75	198	2.684745763
12	2013	Parkwood	53.12	52	0.978915663
13	2006	Pinecrest	47.29	66	1.395643899
14	2006	Reserve at Clark State	32.36	30	0.927070457
15	2004	Royal Elm	67.37	224	3.324922072
16	2000	Stepping Stone	75.36	66	0.875796178
17	2000	Stratshire Meadows	19.71	49	2.486047692
18	1998	Taylor Ridge Estates	28	46	1.642857143
19	2003	Villages at Jefferson Run	46.1	328	7.114967462
20	2004	Villas at Hawks Crest	11.1	24	2.162162162
21	2003	Waggoner Chase North	25.84	97	3.753869969
22	2002	Willow Brook Crossing	99.87	315	3.15410033
23	2006	Woods at Havens Run	28.87	28	0.969864912
Totals:			1355.39	2702	1.993529514

<b>Recent Residential Annexation from Jefferson Township to Gahanna</b>					
1	2008	Village at Hannah Farms	40.61	60	1.477468604

Please see the attached map of the Jefferson Township Subdivisions for additional information. Since 1994, Jefferson Township has added 23 residential subdivisions that created 2,702 new homes on 1,355 acres. The average density for these 23 residential subdivisions is 1.99 units per acre. This is more than the 1.5 units per acre that is being requested for the M/I Annexation Project.

The Department was able to calculate the average price point on a few of the residential subdivisions listed above. The average home value within the Village at Hannah Farms subdivision is \$447,136; \$369,681 in Kitsmiller's Crossing; and \$443,254 in Woods at

Havens Run. The estimated average home value for the M/I Annexation Project is \$450,000.

- 2) Is there a statement from the Gahanna-Jefferson School Administration that states the impact that this project will have on the school system and the school's position on the project?

The Department does not have statement from the school that states their position on the project. The City Administration will be meeting with members of the Gahanna-Jefferson School Board and Superintendent on July 13<sup>th</sup> to discuss the impact to the school district in greater detail.

In addition, the Department connected with the Tax Equalization Division of the Ohio Department of Taxation. Their representative provided a detailed summary on how property taxes are collected for the Gahanna-Jefferson School District. The property tax summary is attached for your review. Based upon information from the Tax Equalization Division of the Ohio Department of Taxation, the Gahanna-Jefferson School District will receive approximately \$613,422 annually in new property taxes from an additional 93 homes with an average value of \$450,000.

- 3) What is the difference between a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and an Overlay Text?

A PUD can be defined as a specific zoning classification that has completely unique requirements that are designed for a specific property. A PUD does not have any baseline zoning requirements, but rather is a brand new zoning classification that is created for a specific property. However, Gahanna's Codified Ordinance does not use PUD zonings in this manner. Gahanna's PUD is an existing zoning classification with detailed restrictions that cover all properties that are zoned PUD in Gahanna. It is important to note that Section 1151.16 states that the City of Gahanna is prohibited from creating any additional PUD zonings for properties within the city limits.

An Overlay Text can be defined as a zoning classification that includes all the standards of a base zoning with additional restrictions. Specifically for this project, the Overlay Text adds additional restrictions on top of the existing requirements of the SF-3 zoning classification.

- 4) Can you clarify the estimated amount of property taxes that will be paid by these new residential homes?

The estimated annual property taxes on a residential home valued at \$450,000 is approximately \$12,397. The school system portion of the property tax amount is equal to \$6,596, which is approximately 53% of the total property tax amount.

The 7 Mill NCA Charge will add an additional \$1,103 in property tax charges to each home. Therefore, total amount of property taxes and property charges is estimated to be \$13,831 for homes that are valued at \$450,000.

### **Tree Code Modification**

At the June 20 Council meeting, Council heard feedback from a representative of Value Recovery Group (VRG), owners of property within Central Park, regarding the proposed tree code. Below is a summary of their questions/concerns and staff's response. After thoughtful consideration, staff does not propose any changes to the previously proposed language.

- VRG Comment - Planning and Development Department says it is a development friendly code. May be true for small lots but not large properties in Central Park, Buckles, or Eastgate.
  - a. Staff believes that the proposed language is fair to both property owners and citizens. The proposed language attempts to balance the desires of the community, an aesthetically pleasing built environment and maintaining property values, with the needs of the development community. The proposed language does not penalize large lot properties, rather, it affords the opportunity to reduce costs for these properties by promoting tree preservation. The proposed language does favor lots with tree preservation, regardless of the property size.
- VRG Comment – There should be a reduction in the planting requirements for properties abutting a conservation area.
  - a. Staff disagrees. Conservation areas typically are designated as such because of the environmental significance of the property. Staff believes that it is as, or more important, that properties developing adjacent to conservation areas plant an appropriate number of trees. Doing so will help protect the environmentally significant corridor.
- VRG Comment – Land donation in lieu of onsite planting or payment into the tree replacement fund should be considered.
  - a. The City’s policy is to not accept land without a substantial public benefit. Accepting small patches of disjointed land does not provide a substantial public benefit. It would however create additional costs for the City to properly maintain.
- VRG Comment – Tree replacement cost is detrimental to developing large lots. Cannot imagine the cost of developing lot 5, a 19 acre tract in Central Park.
  - a. Staff is aware that developing larger tracts of land is more costly than developing small tracts of land for many reasons. The proposed language attempts to treat all development equally in that the planting requirement is based on the intensity of development. It should be noted that large tracts such as lot 5 in Central Park are heavily treed. The opportunities for tree preservation are greater on large lots such as this. Tree preservation benefits the developer as it reduces costs and it benefits the community.
- VRG Comment – Suggest the City create an incentive to waive the tree replacement fund fee.
  - a. Staff does not believe that an incentive to waive the fee is warranted. The City desires trees to be planted in areas where development occurs. Incentivizing the removal of trees and waiving the requirement to replant or pay into the tree replacement fund contradicts the purpose and intent of the proposed tree code.
- VRG Comment – It is unclear how the proposed language affects heavily treed lots or minimally treed lots. Staff should look at case studies.
  - a. Staff has evaluated two sites on Hamilton Road, the Shops at Rocky Fork and Kemba Financial Credit Union and provided those findings to Council. In addition

to the aforementioned sites, staff has also looked at recently approved but not yet constructed sites to see how the proposed code would affect them. Two sites under construction on Morse Road appear to meet the proposed code.

The proposed code does not penalize heavily treed lots. The City's previous tree code did consider the pre-development conditions of a site and, heavily treed lots had a greater requirement than a cleared lot. The proposed code looks at the post development conditions of a site, rather than the previous pre-development policy position. Planting requirements are based on the amount of impervious surface, not the amount of trees prior to the development. Heavily treed lots do however have the opportunity to reduce planting requirements by preserving trees. The proposed code rewards property owners of heavily treed sites rather than punishing them.

- VRG Comment – The proposed code is bad for business, residents, and Gahanna.
  - a. Staff disagrees. The proposed language softens the built environment, helps ensure an aesthetically pleasing environment, and helps protect the significant investments made by the business community. Additionally, Gahanna may be the only City in the region without tree planting/preservation code. The proposed code is substantially similar in the way planting requirements are calculated to the City of Powell, which is one of the regions fastest growing communities in Central Ohio.

It should be noted that Central Park has an Overlay Text zoning classification. The overlay texts contains provisions that are more restrictive than the baseline Office, Commerce and Technology zoning classification. One of these provisions is the requirement to plant trees based on the size of the building. One tree inch per 1,000 square feet of building is required to be planted under the Central Park Overlay Text. Therefore, the City's proposed tree planting requirements are similar to the requirements delineated within the Overlay Text for Central Park.

### **Planning & Development Department Updates:**

**None at this time.**

### **Upcoming Meetings & Events:**

- *Gahanna Area Chamber of Commerce: A Board Meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 12, 7:30am, at C-Suites, 81 Mill Street – Suite 300.*
- *Olde Gahanna Community Partnership: A General Meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 13, 8:15am, at the Olde Gahanna Sanctuary, 82 N. High Street.*
- *Gahanna Community Improvement Corporation: A Board Meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 19, 7:30am, at Gahanna City Hall, 200 S. Hamilton Road.*
- *Gahanna Convention and Visitor's Bureau: A Board meeting will be held on Thursday, July 21, at 4:00pm. Location to be determined.*