



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Finance Committee

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

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

April Beggerow, CMC, Clerk of Council

Monday, September 9, 2019

Council Committee Room

***Immediately Following Committee of the Whole**

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Leeseberg called the Finance Committee to Order at 7:37 p.m.

B. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

[2019-0126](#)

Mill Street Development Project; Gahanna Mill Street Investors, LLC

Mr. Hodge shared that it is the developer's goal to work with the City of Gahanna to complete this project. The idea is to create more street energy to encourage economic growth in the Creekside area. The Development agreement is a precursor to formally going through the process which entails a development plan and design review application with Planning Commission and we have conceptual plans and architecture to discuss tonight.

Mr. Schnetzer said he would like to go through the agreement itself. He asked the developer what the limiting factor is for adding more units than what is proposed.

Mr. ** replied that parking was the number one thing and the ability to lease the commercial space given the vacancies now.

Mr. Schnetzer asked for them to expand why the project cost is so high.

Mr. ** replied that construction costs are up right now and that they want to deliver a high quality project which requires high quality materials. There is about \$50,000 in demo and removal of some old tanks. There are some soil issues to address and utility removal and work in the right of way, replacing the brick walks and improvements to continue the

cohesive look of the area.

Mr. ** said that right now, this project is projected to have about 128 units with a new 175 residents living in Gahanna and being a high quality product, will draw high quality residents. Incomes expected to be at or higher than the area median income.

Mr. ** said that roughly income \$70,000 area household income also identified in our market study and generally the national average of discretionary spending on meals and entertainment is roughly 9% or roughly \$800,000 of discretionary spending annually that would be spent by residents of this development. It wouldn't be all at Creekside, but it will be a benefit to Creekside.

Mr. Schnetzer asked Mr. Maddy if he had any discussions with the Creekside Business owners.

Mr. Maddy responded that he met with the Creekside District Alliance and that the shops and restaurants are starving for additional foot traffic.

Mr. Schnetzer asked what the vacancy rate is of the existing buildings.

Mr. Maddy said nearly 100%, there are only 3 employees.

Mr. Schnetzer asked what new public infrastructure would be needed.

Mr. ** replied that as part of the vacation of North Street, Mill Street will need to connect the 2 sidewalks together. There will be some utility and sidewalk improvements. He stated they are detailed out in the exhibit.

Mr. Schnetzer asked about Carpenter and walkability. He asked about the east building and expanding the brick and continuing it around the corner.

Mr. ** replied that that was in the estimate and they will work with the City to determine how to work through that.

Mr. Leeseberg asked that that project Carpenter Road improvements be placed into the budget for this upcoming year. These are for curbs and walks at the very least, the design of it.

Mrs. Angelou asked if retail was in the original plan.

Mr. ** said he believed so. He said the CVB, who is in one of the existing buildings now, would love to stay and they would love to go into

the project. They are working on a letter of intent with them.

Mrs. Angelou said she thought there wasn't going to be any retail because of the limited...

Mr. ** said that if they can work out a letter from the CVB with intent for a lease.. they have a high comfort level.

Mrs. Angelou said that was fine, she was just surprised there was going to be retail.

Mr. Leeseberg said that he didn't think it was retail, but commercial-offices.

Mr. Renner asked if the developer can identify what the square footage for commercial space was planned? The agreement says up to 3,000.

Mr. ** replied that 2400 was planned.

Mrs. McGregor said she has issue with taking park space away.

Mr. Leeseberg said he may have a solution to that issue. Looking at the plans, the rear 50 ft of the property, behind Shampooch. 25000-89, the existing path now comes in a we have a couple of easements that you're asking us to vacate. What I would ask, is where the back of that parking lot, it looks to be about 50-85 from the back of parking to the stream and I understand streams change, but again maybe we could do a land swap there and get some movement to the city, the parkland would be along the stream, that can extend that path a little further and move it closer to Carpenter Road as opposed to having the easement through, it would be a way to continue that path a little bit further to the north. Understanding we are competing with the stream, but if nothing else it would be good for the city to control the bank of that stream. If it's a flood plain, you can't use it anyway. I understand the history of Lintner's Park and all of that and I still have concerns with the pump station there and viability of a parking lot. Again, just a thought for a swap. It looks to be about 146 feet wide by 50 feet and it's a considerable amount for a swap.

Mr. ** said there is an easement that gives the city the right to come in and do maintenance work on the slope. He said you're talking about this piece beyond the parking lot.

Mr. Leeseberg said we could continue the trail this way- north, and then bring it up and around. It facilitates putting in and taking out kayaks, canoes and we've talked about that sort of thing. I spoke with Mr. Barr

and he'd be in favor of that.

Mr. ** said I don't see any issue with that.

Mr. Maddy said that they will be required by code that the bottom floor has to be 18 inches above the flood plain.

Mr. Metzbower said that we are waiting on some additional information in regards to this project from the administration.

Mayor Kneeland said the information has been sent to the Financial Planner, Greg Daniels and we're looking at early next week for the information to come back.

Mr. Renner asked about the land swap, but has the same concerns as Mrs. McGregor and would like to see the proposed land swap. He said conceptually he supports it and he asked about the bicycle trail.

Mr. Leeseberg said he's like to see the layout and asked how many parking spots are they looking at in Rock Park.

Mr. ** responded 18.

Mayor Kneeland asked how the vacation of North Street would apply.

Mr. Ewald said that it can be taken in parallel with the agreement and be approved by Council.

Mrs. Angelou asked if the other develops they've done have brought the foot traffic to the areas they've been built.

Mr. ** said absolutely they have.

Mr. Larick asked about item 1 on the agreement. The CRA and what does it mean to the projects that occur in the area in general.

Mr. Blackford said it is CRA #5 meaning is a pre-1994 CRA meaning there is an entitlement- that entitlement is a 15 year 100% tax abatement. This project and any other.

Mr. Larick asked about number 2 and 3 in reference to the CIC and said that he didn't know if CIC needs to be involved, it just adds to the complexity. The other item is in regard to utility relocation, but perspective is whenever we have the opportunity to bury, we bury. If that is what we have on the table, we need to determine what it will take to

bury.

Mr. Leeseberg said that it looks like the plan is to leave it as it is now, but Carpenter road improvements should allow an option to bury those. He said I would like to see all of that underground. It just cleans all of that up.

Mr. Schnetzer asked about the 15 year 100% abatement. That is not something that Council has to bring, the applicants is already entitled correct?

Mr. Blackford replied correct.

Mr. Schnetzer asked about the clause about a deficiency in reimbursement by the city, a 9% annual rate of penalty. Is that negotiable? It seems steep.

Mr. Ewald replied that that is negotiable between the parties.

Mr. ** said to clarify that would be if there is a deficiency by the city, the CIC would pick up the difference and the city would owe the CIC.

Mr. Ewald said if I had a preference, I would ask the city to take on the obligation and remove the CIC.

Mr. Renner said thank you for thinking about this and wanting to invest. He asked about the CRA, and making the schools "whole". He said we have the agreement that whatever agreement we make we must make the schools whole and also Mifflin fire. He wanted to make sure that was on the table.

Mr. Ewald replied that that would be cleared up with the financial analysis.

Mr. Renner asked for a pro-forma for the project.

Mr. Hodge said he would have a discussion internally to discuss if that information will be shared.

Mr. Renner replied that he is also in complete agreement that the CIC should be removed from the agreement. He asked about a cap on the cost and a mechanism to deal with issues that may arise.

Mr. ** said the cap is in the agreement.

Mr. Renner replied that it puts it back on us that we may have to pay

more. Section 3 reimbursement. He asked if Schedule C was the agreement, he would like it in writing to say that.

Mrs. McGregor asked why should we be responsible for the work of boring, that should be on the developer.

Mr. ** that said that would be for doing work in the public right of way or on someone else's property.

Mr. Renner asked about section 4 with the vacation of North Street, it says no traffic study will be required. We need something. Some kind of engineering, statement.

Mr. Crawford said a traffic study would certainly show how this will impact the surrounding roads including the dead end.

Mr. Renner asked if that would be a problem.

Mr. ** said we thought it was overreaching, it's such a small street.

Mr. Renner replied that I'd like to see a public document that says yes.

Mr. Leeseberg says he thinks their engineer can make that statement and back it up with some data and that should be sufficient.

Mr. Renner asked about section B on page 5 under easements. Section D where it refers to section F. He said he has no problem with this but would like to hear from Mr. Daniels. He stated he is also fine with the relocation of public utilities.

Mrs. McGregor asked about the waiver of the fees, these would be fees collected for water and sewer tap fees, would we reimburse the TIF funds.

Mr. Blackford said he didn't think you can use TIF dollars for permit fees.

Mr. Ewald replied typically they're for new construction.

Mr. Renner asked about 6a, the performance date, is there a new date in mind as September 1 was missed.

Mr. Leeseberg asked the value of the project.

Mr. Maddy responded 25million.

Mr. Leeseberg said this will come back in 2 weeks.

