



Real People. Real Possibilities.™

## **AGENDA**

---

# **Committee of the Whole**

**6:15 PM Monday, May 22, 2023**

**Council Members**

**Omar Tarazi, President**  
**Cynthia Vermillion, Vice President**  
**Les Carrier**  
**Tina Cottone**  
**Peggy Hale**  
**Pete Marsh**  
**Andy Teater**

**Michelle Crandall, City Manager**  
**Diane (Dee) Werbrich, Clerk of Council**

**City Hall, Council Chambers | 3800 Municipal Way, Hilliard, OH 43026**

---



Real People. Real Possibilities.™

## Committee of the Whole - May 22, 2023

	Page
<b>1. Call to Order</b>	
<b>2. Roll Call</b>	
<b>3. Approval of Minutes</b>	
A. March 27, 2023, Committee of the Whole <a href="#">03272023 COW Final</a>	3 - 11
<b>4. Business</b>	
A. Charter Review Discussion	
<b>5. Items for Discussion</b>	
<b>6. City Manager Updates</b>	
<b>7. Adjournment</b>	



Real People. Real Possibilities.™

**CITY COUNCIL**

**March 27, 2023**  
**Committee of the Whole Minutes**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by President Omar Tarazi at 5:30 PM.

**ROLL CALL**

<b>Attendee Name:</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
Omar Tarazi	President	Present
Cynthia Vermillion	Vice President	Present
Les Carrier	Councilman	Present
Tina Cottone	Councilwoman	Present
Peggy Hale	Councilwoman	Present
Pete Marsh	Councilman	Present
Andy Teater	Councilman	Present

**Staff Members Present:** City Manager Michelle Crandall, Acting Law Director Jessy Shamp, Assistant City Manager Dan Ralley, City Planner John Talentino, Community Relations Director David Ball

**Others Present:** Jamie Green and Michael, planning Next

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

President Tarazi asked if there were any corrections or changes to the March 13, 2023, Committee of the Whole meeting minutes. Hearing none, the minutes were approved as submitted.

<b>STATUS:</b>	Accepted
<b>AYES:</b>	Tarazi, Vermillion, Carrier, Cottone, Hale, Marsh, Teater

**BUSINESS**

**A. COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE**

(See attached presentation)

Vice President Vermillion stated on page 19 of the Community Plan where it talks about existing land for low to medium density housing use and it states residential low density is 24 percent and medium density is 2 percent for a total of 26 percent but then below it says 36 percent for 2021 single-family low/medium density and asked for clarification on those numbers. Mr. Curtis replied the difference in the numbers is associated with the change in land use from 2011 to 2021 and the number in the first table is the overall percent of that use and the change is 36 percent. Vice President Vermillion reported on page 34 there were some suggestions like establishing neighborhood housing task forces, which sounded wonderful and asked if that is something Council would be involved in. Mr. Ralley replied that Council would certainly be involved in the process but the task force suggestion in the Plan needs to be defined further and Council's involvement, in light of recent discussions, is appropriate and what should happen. Vice President Vermillion identified that the Plan also talks about providing renters with renter's right information and asked if that is something the City would be involved in. Mr. Ralley responded that is what they are suggesting and that the City will excerpt some efforts to either put together the information ourselves or work with a third party to have that kind of information distributed more broadly but is yet to be defined as to what the best method to do that is. Vice President Vermillion remarked that is an awesome suggestion because often renters have no idea what their rights are. She said it also talks about possible rental licensing and asked what that would look like. Mr. Ralley replied there are communities in the United States that essentially have a licensing program for any rental units and tends



Real People. Real Possibilities.

to be something that is utilize most heavily in college towns where there are real issues with not just the number of rentals but the transient nature of the population renting apartments. He noted that this is something that some communities are starting to discuss and entertain in light of the move in the market place toward the acquisition of single-family homes to convert into rentals. What typically happens, is that there is an annual licensing fee that pays for the inspection program itself to ensure those properties do not have code violations and are safe in terms of their occupancy. Vice President Vermillion asked if that is City staff driven to get that going. Mr. Ralley replied that is something that warrants a broader discussion if that is something the City wants to pursue and is a topic that does not come without a few pitch forks in the audience because there are people who will feel very strongly about how the City regulates that. This is also something not predominately done in Central Ohio is also something that may warrant further conversation as the City goes through that process. Vice President Vermillion asked if most of these ideas came from the committee members. Mr. Green (inaudible - taken from close captioning) replied they also interviewed a lot of stakeholders in the process and they had idea as well but there are items in the plan they saw that the City had an opportunity or a challenge and (inaudible) because people know that there is an outcome that they want but are unsure of how to get to it so they tried to fill in those. Vice President Vermillion asked if the 56 percent of income tax is lower than it has been in the past because she thought it used to be above 60 percent. Mr. Ralley replied they can do some research and provide that answer.

Ms. Cottone asked if the zoning changes will be reviewed incrementally by area or all at once. Mr. Ralley replied that the zoning changes are for each of the five focus areas and they are looking at those in a segmented fashion but he anticipates that they will run on very similar time lines in terms of their completion. The question is how quickly the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council can digest some of those things and talk about them the way they need to be discussed openly. Ms. Cottone mentioned that she enjoyed reading the Plan because it is fascinating and exciting. She is looking forward to walking through this with everyone.

Mr. Teater asked when the City institutes significant changes in zoning are existing properties grand fathered in and how does it affect what is going on right now. Mr. Talentino replied existing uses and circumstances that were legally established can continue like they are and it is when the change is made that the new code becomes effective which is typical for code changes. Mr. Teater asked if the new code would be effective on those properties with a change of ownership or change of business. Mr. Talentino replied that if someone wanted to make an addition to a building, for example, or take a building down and redevelop it or put a new use in and a new conditional use would come to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council and is when they would start looking at where they do not meet the current code and if there are opportunities to be more compliant with the current code. Mr. Talentino noted that sometimes it is give and take and other times it is very clear what has to be done and Council has seen some of those examples recently. He added by changing the Code it would allow developers or property owners to do what is recommended in the Plan and there will be incentives to do that which will make it easier for them to come into compliance with this. The hope is the Zoning Code provisions would encourage that but sometimes allowances have to be made whether it is a variance or an adjustment on something to make a really good Plan work and has been done in the past with some of the City's bigger developments. Mr. Talentino continued that the hope is to streamline that a bit and make it easier to do that. Mr. Green added the City would not be breaking new ground if you just did the rezoning. He mentioned about 20 years ago in the City of Upper Arlington they did the first plan in 40 years and as part of that process at the end they started the code before the plan was adopted and rezoned all six non-residential areas at the time. Mr. Green pointed out that to what it did not mean anything until someone wanted to do some new development and that is what you see on Lane Avenue, Kingsdale and other places.

Mr. Marsh stated on page 30 an idea that he thought was interesting and unique was to encourage interim uses on intended redevelopment sites and asked what that looks like or how that logistically happens. Mr. Green replied the interim uses and they have had projects where redevelopment was not quite right to happen. For example, someone might bring shipping containers in and then they provide some electricity and basic infrastructure but actually with the relatively low cost they use those to devise



Real People. Real Possibilities.

and define some critical place activity and usually they are painted in really strong, fun colors and are celebratory in that regard. He noted the cases they have been familiar with they have been a terrific novelty but do not do what you need them to do to that land fiscally versus just with a fence around it and can generate interest in what is going on. Mr. Curtis mentioned there is a provision in the existing Code for allowing some of those types of uses in certain areas. Mr. Marsh stated so as the code changes are worked through, the City would still be able to allow some of these temporary units. Mr. Curtis thought that temporary uses are allowed today and is not necessarily the example Mr. Green gave but there could be quite a few things and thought given to what types of uses and in what areas really would help to become a catalyst for some sort of redevelopment in the future. If the market is not quite there today, it could demonstrate that a particular site could be beneficial for future redevelopment. Mr. Green added that the rules are really important about this and not setting a precedent for things like this that you do not want to get out of control. He noted if it would be helpful to Council, they could provide some images of what some of this looks like. Mr. Marsh stated on estimating the economic impact of the different types of development and he knows work from home is still relatively new and there probably is not a lot of data on it but it was mentioned in the Plan if there was a way to improve the economic return in some residential areas if you were to somehow encourage work from home and asked how that would be done. Mr. Green replied what they are seeing is that communities that have top-notch amenities like the new community center or what the City has done in the Old Hilliard District, people want to be in places like that where they can get out of their apartment unit. If you were trying to attract more people who would work from home, you have to have really strong amenities and that is not the amenities in their building, but the community amenities. He thinks that work is really important. Mr. Greene mentioned in the City of Dublin last year, their revenues from stay at home workers was off the charts in terms of what they were seeing and they did not do anything special to recruit them, it just happened. The key that many people see is the amenities strategy and promoting that amenity strategy. Mr. Marsh commented that another thing he thought was interesting (page 41) was about estimating long-term maintenance costs to double, which shocked him and asked if they could give more detail on how to either change that trajectory or how to be better prepared for it. Mr. Curtis replied to be clear that is showing a future state, in theory, taking the infrastructure the City has on the ground today and when it is in a state where it needs regular maintenance or perhaps replacement, that is what the annualized outlay needs to be to keep up with it in the future relative to what is currently being spent. It is completely theoretical but completely based on what is already in the ground today and what they think the long-term costs will be to maintain that existing infrastructure and is not adding to the existing infrastructure. Mr. Green stated this is in the future so the infrastructure cost will be higher because there will be more to maintain and the City will be a bigger place in the long-term. Mr. Curtis said that was incorrect and clarified that this is not factoring in additional growth and is just looking at what is already there so you are not having to spend what you would need to spend because most of the infrastructure is relatively new and not in a state where it needs as much maintenance or replacement but eventually it will be there. One of the big takeaways is to maximize the infrastructure you already have by approving and promoting uses that are going to bring in more revenue. He continued that certainly there will be additional infrastructure in the future and there may also be technology changes in the future that may some of the existing infrastructure less costly to maintain. In general, infrastructure costs do rise over time but sometimes it is possible to extend the life of the infrastructure. Mr. Curtis restated that this is based on infrastructure in the ground already. Mr. Green added that since we are discussing the long-term future and infrastructure, the density by which you develop, the amount of road miles that are required per house go up at a low density development. The other part is the City has a number of subdivisions that have really wide curb-to-curb dimensions, wider than is what is needed in those areas so as Council is looking at the future and the zoning and standards, it is not just about the design but what does it take to take care of it. He added decisions are sometimes made with unintended consequences and is one that needs to be balanced. Mr. Ralley stated that is such a good question and if Council thinks back a few months ago when they were talking about sewer lift stations and not just the expense the developers put into the sewer lift station but then forget about the long-term costs of that which turns out to be a 7 figure sum over year 25. One of the points that came out of the economic analysis was that in many subdivision areas around year 40, you start to see the signs that the infrastructure is starting to wear down and needs to be replaced and is visible in some of the City's older subdivisions. There is a long-term expense to these items the City owns particularly when it happens in areas that are not income producing and become a bit of a burden to the City. Mr. Ralley



Real People. Real Possibilities.

reported that colored some of their thinking as they were going through the discussions not just about residential versus commercial but even a bridge over I-270 which not only has an expense today but has a long-term expense that the City is solely obligated to maintain it in perpetuity. Those are decisions that they are trying to impress upon the whole decision-making process when talking about infrastructure. There are definitely long-term costs that the City is not adequately funding right now in terms of roads and there is a lot more that you cannot necessarily see that the City needs to be preparing for as the community ages.

Ms. Hale thanked Mr. Talentino and Mr. Ralley for meeting with her this morning and answering a lot of her questions. She stated she likes the idea about the gateway art with the railroad and later on around Scioto Darby and asked if that would be turned over to the Public Arts Commission (PAC). inaudible. Ms. Hale reported on page 52 where it talks about mixed use developments. EV3 states establishing density bonuses that allow for additional building area lot coverage or height and development projects that include vertical mix uses where most of the use is in non-residential. She stated it appears that if you do not build residential then we will give you residential, which is confusing. She noted that for mixed use it looks like the recommendation is to never go more than 40 percent residential and have to have at least 60 percent of some sort of commercial and asked for an example of what that might look like. Mr. Ralley replied he could give a couple of examples but all of this is yet to be defined in terms of how the City structures the Zoning Code. There are certainly places where the City can think about the potential for additional density. Old Hilliard for example, where perhaps the existing code allows certain things to happen up to 52 feet and perhaps we are willing to allow, and he has seen communities do this, an additional floor on the building itself in exchange for something they really want like office space or parking. Mr. Ralley feels that the concept of density bonuses needs to be defined but is essentially trying to get something the City really cares about in exchange for something the developer might be able to monetize that development further. Ms. Hale said they could potentially get an extra floor and with that density bonus still have 40 percent residential. Mr. Ralley replied or it might be flexible in terms of what those percentages are and this is all conceptual. The density bonus can happen in a variety of different ways but the key for the City is saying what is it that we really want out of this perhaps it is parking, office space or first floor retail that we are really excited about. The density bonus concept is one that says that you are permitted to do X but you could do X plus Y if you give the City this other thing the City really wants. Ms. Hale asked if those recommendations would be written into the Code if it was approved by Council that no more than 40 percent would be residential. Mr. Curtis replied it is not a zoning recommendation and is just a recommendation of the Plan and that 40 percent is put in there primarily as a benchmark and the point is that you do not want to allow those density bonuses for additional residential development. What the City would want to get, like Mr. Ralley stated, some other community beneficial amenity or some use like commercial or office that will generate revenue for the City. He added they are trying to avoid the intent of allowing additional density for the purpose of getting residential and that is not the intent. Mr. Talentino explained that it is possible to include that in the Zoning Code that 40 percent, for example, but it is unusual because there is not anything currently and they use the current Comprehensive Plan does have recommendations similar to that where a certain development should have and is a guide. For example, if it says you have to have 40 percent residential, 10 percent retail and 50 percent office and this one only has 36 percent office and would be kicked out and there is a balance there and are they close to it. If it is codified, it is stronger but more rigid as well and it depends on what Council wants to do and what the magic number is because there is not a magic number for every development but a range. He added it is an important consideration because the City does not currently have that specifically mentioned in the Zoning Code and the City tends to get those when there is a Planned Unit Development at the rezoning time. They will know more about what those percentages are and then those could be written into the zoning text on a case-by-case basis and not the Zoning Code. Mr. Talentino explained there are difficulties doing it this way as well, but there is no one best way to do it and a range of things to include when they start to do the Zoning Code rewrite. Ms. Hale stated on Page 61 there are a lot of roundabouts and asked if they were theoretical since some of the roads do not exist yet or are they in the planning stage. Mr. Curtis replied the map is identifying potential roundabout locations and is theoretical and conceptual based on anticipated traffic volume and future development. He added it has been the City's practice that whenever an intersection needs to be improved that it would be a roundabout as opposed to a signalized intersection which is what this is indicating. Mr. Curtis said



Real People. Real Possibilities.

that at some point in the future when development takes place, there is likely going to need to be an intersection improvement, which most likely will be a roundabout. He added there would also be a study for each specific intersection before any improvement would be made or programmed. Ms. Hale directed them to Page 74, MC 14, second paragraph, it talks about study congestion and multimodal access and then the second sentence stated "potential priorities may include forestalling Cemetery Road widening to six lanes". She continued that from what she saw the City is not going to widen Cemetery Road or is she misunderstanding because she thought it was being kept at four lanes. Mr. Ralley replied that he believes that is generally correct and the one area talked about for long-term potential for needing to widen would be very close to I-270 in the area on the other side of the railroad tracks to the east. Ms. Hale noted the main drag through Cemetery Road to the west of I-270 will be kept as four lanes with the medians.

Mr. Carrier stated there is not a definition of flex employment space in terms of density and on (page 26) the mixed use areas there is a target mix between 70 and 80 percent non-residential and 20 to 30 percent residential there is a flavor for the neighborhood mixed use development and asked what the mix is for a flex employment development area. If you look at the map on page 21, that is probably 10 percent or more of the City's land area and asked what the definition of that is. He continued it is vague because in the beginning it says it is appropriate for employment intensive uses, corporate office, light industrial etc., and then the second paragraph states it could be campus or mixed use settings, connected pedestrian networks and shared parking, which his similar to what is being proposed at TruePointe and asked if that what all of that means. Mr. Talentino replied the intention for the flex employment is to not have residential and on page 20 it is listed under one of the non-residential areas. He noted the flex part of that is the ADS, R&D, Engineering, etc. is an example of what the City is hoping to have but could also be something smaller like a contractor's workshop so it is still employment based but is not supposed to be a residential area and is flexible in terms of its office percentage. Mr. Carrier stated there are apartments in the flex area. Mr. Talentino agreed. Mr. Carrier continued that actually distinguishes where that would be located and would be a village mixed or urban mixed use if it were to have residential in it. Mr. Talentino agreed and explained that flex area on the future land use map are the areas that are currently industrial zoned or historically that way and the idea is to make more of those. There are portions of the PUDs along there that are appropriate for that, which might be a good niche for the City in terms of the types of businesses that we can attract and have the land for and there is demand for. He added the hope is to get a variety of those types or some of the technology incubator type businesses the City has will grow into spaces like this in the flex area. Mr. Carrier mentioned he has another question, which is around the foundation of the entire study and the approach and asked who designed the actual goal of the planning process. As he understands it, the goal is that we use the foundation of fiscal impact on City tax revenue as the goal for creation of the plan and asked if that is a misstatement. If you look at the Planning Commission executive summary you will see the analysis of fiscal impact of land use and is cool to see the different types of impact and revenues generated from different use types. If you look at the analysis on the fiscal impact of land use in Hilliard and use that as a foundation to create the actual Plan, per their recommendations and is what he is understanding and asked if that is correct. Mr. Green replied they are informed by the fiscal realities of a municipality in the state of Ohio. Mr. Carrier commented that is how they came to the goal that they wanted to maximize that land use within the City to maximize the revenue to offset with what Mr. Marsh noticed which was the big holes in the maintenance of our infrastructure. Mr. Green replied, in terms of maximizing, they know if there was an infinite demand for office space, Hilliard would not be a community of just office space and would have to have workers, people and retail to serve their daily living. If it says maximize, that needs to be adjusted because they want to improve the fiscal health of Hilliard and their recommendations are driven by wanting to improve it. They want to do well with what the City has but it is not to the exclusion of other quality of life and having a complete community. Mr. Talentino said to maximize revenue with a full range of use. Mr. Carrier then asked if the group had a recommendation regarding allowing density bonuses for residential in the Darby Accord area. Mr. Talentino replied our Code currently allows it and the Darby Accord Manual allows it. He continued the area that transfers development and whatever is transferred from there should be somewhat similar to what they have by right. Mr. Carrier stated the perversion of that, in his opinion, is if you look at Sugar Farms who bought a chunk of land across the street and made a big square out of it and then they are stacking it in there on top of each other and he does not think that is what someone would think of when they think of the Darby Accord area. He noted you want the conservation green



Real People. Real Possibilities.

space and the ability to live and network within the space and what the density bonus creates because developers are pretty slick but you want that green space incorporated into the development like Heritage Preserve than to give density bonuses outside the contract area and is a real struggle for him as to why the City would do that. He continued that one argument is to build a greenbelt but in a way are setting ourselves up for density inside the Darby Accord that might be mixed use residential or urban mixed use which does not make a lot of sense to him. Mr. Talentino replied that you could not get the densities that would be in the mixed use area in the Darby because there is a maximum density in the Darby when you talk about the overall site. Areas that get developed will be denser than the areas that are not and the goal is to maximize the open space area by clustering the development area in a smaller area. Mr. Talentino stated that Mr. Carrier's points are well taken and explained that the areas that have had density bonuses for land that is outside like Anderson Meadows who got a key piece for the Clover Groff stream restoration on the south side of Roberts Road and the reason the one at Tarlton Meadows became attractive is because it enabled the developer and the City to get parkland that could be expanded in a large capacity and attractive to someone like the Metroparks to create that area. He noted that is where staff would get guidance from Council on how they want to do it moving forward. Mr. Carrier asked when the Darby Accord is zoned, can the City zone out multi-family which has been what Brown Township has been asking the City to limit out there. Mr. Talentino replied when it is rezoned, it could absolutely be done and can approve a zoning plan consistent with what you are recommending. In the Darby area, whatever the intent is, the City can hold them to that.

Ms. Cottone stated to follow up on what Mr. Carrier was mentioning (page 144) regarding the Darby area it states "to keep at or below 1.0 dwelling units per acre" and asked what that unit means. Mr. Talentino replied that it does not specify the unit and is just a number of dwellings and noted the Darby Manual does not even specify that but talks about equivalent residential units and apartment units count less than single family detached house does. Commercial is different as well and there is a formula for that. He added it does not specify that, but Council could certainly specify what the intent is. Ms. Cottone referenced page 147 still regarding the Darby area - evaluation criteria, community facilities, it has "dedicate land for the future site of a public facility, for example, a school, fire station, etc." and asked if that is in addition to the land the City sold to the Township for the fire station or is this an additional give. Mr. Talentino replied that he believes Council completed an implementation part of this with that sale. He added what just happened is what is contemplated here and is to find or dedicate land to at least allow the land for that, which happened quicker than the passage of this and is fully within what is recommended. Ms. Cottone then asked what the implementation time line is for the Plan in real time or how are we going to see these changes happen, what comes first and who makes those decisions. Mr. Talentino replied in terms of the Code or when development come in. Ms. Cottone replied the Plan. Mr. Talentino replied some of these things probably will not happen in the ten years of this plan before it is updated and some like the fire station are happening now since that land has been dedicated now or sold and is available now. He explained there will be developments that come in right on the heels of this and staff has started on the Zoning Code update, which will be one of the first things that happen in this next year. Most of this depends on the development community to bring something in and then staff will compare that with what this Plan says. Ms. Cottone asked if some would be City initiated. Mr. Talentino agreed. Mr. Green reported in the back of the plan there is a matrix of implementation that shows an anticipated time frame and there are things that should happen within the first year or two and goes out in different increments. He added that is where the departmental work programs come into play and where the Directors and City Manager should be annually saying this is what the City is going to spend their time on because the Plan says they should do it. Some of these will require funding, some do not, which may drive actually when the City is able to do these. Mr. Green said they try to give a sense of when they think these things should happen and some are sequenced but we tried to identified as much as they could. Mr. Talentino clarified that the Plan shows the build out scenario for the whole City and all will not be built out in 10 years but provides guidance for any development coming in on what it will look like.

Mr. Carrier asked if there are any similarities between the current Plan and this proposed one. Mr. Talentino replied that there are similarities but the current Plan really more hoped for some of the things to happen but did not give specific ways to make them happen. It was not as specific in terms of mixed used type development or redevelopment and this Plan takes it a couple steps further by making it clear





Real People. Real Possibilities.

on how you do that and why. Mr. Carrier added in what areas and things like that, correct. Mr. Talentino agreed and stated this Plan is more updating what the City is more likely to see and how to take advantage of it. He noted the City has some open areas that are not developed in strategic areas, which is a plus and something other communities do not have in strategic areas. The City has some opportunities and the Plan looked hard at that and asked what does the City want to have in the changing environment, which is completely different than the current Plan. Mr. Talentino continued that the Darby area is similar in terms of density and Cemetery Road. Mr. Carrier interjected that the Plan is tightening up the rules on what is green and what is not. Mr. Talentino agreed and said Cemetery Road is a real new look at what could be. It recognizes that it should be commercial but what does that look like and is a significant departure from the current Plan but consistent in terms of that it needs to be upgraded. Mr. Carrier asked how many residential units because he knows the population growth the City has had in the past ten year, but how much, in terms of units has the City grown since the last Plan to this one. Mr. Curtis said he will have to get back to Mr. Carrier with that number. Mr. Green reported that he thinks there is a really strong connection about the values that are expressed in the current Plan and in this Plan and there has not been a major value shift in what they are talking about. He does believe that some of the development the City has had and the success the City has had in Old Hilliard in the last 10 or 11 years has made people think differently about the possibility of more vitality. There has been some evolution, but the core is pretty much the same.

Ms. Hale referenced page 97 and stated that the City recently spoke with the residents on Norwich Street who were talking about an overlay to keep part of Norwich Street residential and it looks like Norwich Street is the same shade as the mixed use. She asked if there was a conclusion with how that was going to play out. Mr. Talentino replied that there was conclusion in talking with the residents on how that would happen and there has been considerable discussion but the City has not received an application to do it. The reason Old Hilliard District mixed use residential is showing as similar because that is still the recommendation but what could change is what is the actual zoning of that and is a different step than this. That would come through the actual changing of the Zoning Code or like Ms. Hale mentioned, creating an overlay district on top of that so that it is still the same underlying zoning district and is still recommended and still meets the intent of the Old Hilliard District mixed use residential but is a restriction on some uses in a specific area. That is still possible but very unusual for Council to take that step as opposed to the property owners. He clarified that for Council to do that unilaterally without responding to an application. Mr. Talentino added they are encouraging the residents to apply and staff will get them through the process on how they can do that but that application has not been filed. Ms. Hale referenced page 156 - PS 7 filling in the gaps in the trail network, which was kind of a long-term plan but when reading through the mobility section it seems the City is already working on a lot of the trails. She explained that in her mind that is ongoing unless that is referring to the bigger ones that the City is going to try and connect like down to the Quarry Trail Metro Park or some of the downtown ones. She asked how should that be interpreted. Mr. Talentino replied that some of the smaller gaps that the City knows about and as developments come through they are able to close some of those but for example, the bigger ones like a Dublin Road bike path will take some coordination but is still something that the City is participating in. He explained that some of the gaps can be closed as development comes through and others will require a CIP project. Ms. Hale said the status is currently going but the time frame is that it is going to be a really long time to actually complete it. Ms. Hale mentioned some of the public comments that have been received and some of those were asking why the City did not focus south of the roundabout on Main Street going south on Hilliard-Rome Road and asked if they could address that. She noted those comments were received on the Talk2Us Hilliard. Mr. Ralley replied that one of the things they talked about early on was trying to focus our efforts and if you look at the 2011 plan there is a huge number of recommendations and the individual recommendations tend to lost a bit of value when there are so many different ones out there. He added the Cemetery Road concepts that are mentioned, they fully intend and can apply to other areas. Mr. Ralley said so not just along that section of Hilliard-Rome Road or Main Street going towards Ten Pin, for example, but also Leap Road could look, at some point, look very similar to the south side of Cemetery Road is where they are talking about some of the townhouse style residential. He continued that it felt like the City wanted to have these focus areas where they saw the most potential for redevelopment but some of the concepts as they are developed, they see them bleeding over into some of these other areas and he thinks the commercial area on Main Street is



Real People. Real Possibilities.

one of them where you could see some of the same concepts being borrowed from Cemetery Road and could just as easy apply to pieces of Main Street. He added the extension of the zoning district in the Old Hilliard District area out to the roundabout is another bigger bullet item in that list as well. Mr. Curtis added the future street network map on page 61 received a few public comments regarding the appearance and safety of Main Street and is one of the recommendations in the Mobility and Connectivity Chapter and number 3 talks very generally about safety and mobility enhancements along Main Street and Hilliard-Rome Road, really that entire corridor from the entrance to the City to Old Hilliard to try to improve the entire corridor from a transportation standpoint. As Mr. Ralley said, that could also include land use but they really wanted to focus on the Cemetery Road corridor as a demonstration of what that could be.

President Tarazi said he has one concern as he was reading through this and he knows the future is impossible to predict but it seems to him that if you went back in time someone could build a mixed use development with a single story or one or two above and the housing level above could support the business below if you are about the cost of capital and the cost of construction is low enough then someone could get a low level of rent on the first floor and therefore, they do not have to generate as much business and then the whole thing works. He continued when the cost of construction and capital is increased over time, more density needs to be added to generate added foot traffic for a business to offset the additional expense. His concern is in the Plan there is mixed use of one to three stories but since things are so much more expensive someone would have to go five or six stories to accomplish the exact same economic outcome that could be done before with one to three stories and asked if that has been thought about. Mr. Green replied that President Tarazi is not off base but he knows that the whole housing development market is a bit uneasy right now and many residential developers and builders he recently met with expressed just wanting to stay in their lane and continue doing what they have been doing. This was purely residential and not mixed used and he thinks that what President Tarazi mention is part of the reason. He added it could be challenging and it will be hard to predict what is actually going to happen economically but should not be a reason to now express your intention in this document. If there is a disconnect between what the City is trying to compel to happen versus what the market is willing to do. President Tarazi agreed and said if there are high interest rates and construction costs get worse, and if the City says the max someone could do is three stories and that is not economically viable anymore then nothing happens and it depends on what is economically viable. He noted but if interest rates come down and the cost of construction decreases is a different story and depends on what the future hold and how what we plan affect whether nothing happens or the Plan needs changed. Mr. Green agreed and said that is the reality of the environment that we are in. He commented that President Tarazi is absolutely right to have in the Plan that was brought forward to Council this kind of development approach because there is a direct correlation to that and the knowledge economy workers and they want to be in those mixed use environments. President Tarazi asked how many stories is Bridge Park in the City of Dublin. Mr. Green replied it is six stories. President Tarazi asked if it could have been viable with three stories. Mr. Green replied he does not know the answer to that and that was a developer that took greater risk than normal because there is no precedent for a new development doing anything like they chose to do there. It would help developers to have more good examples of the kinds of things you actually want to see here. He noted that what they want is predictability so they will come to the City if they think they can do this. President Tarazi asked if they have talked to the developers about the viability or feasibility of what they are putting forward right now. Mr. Green replied they have conceptually but not specifically about Hilliard. They have tested them in this kind of pattern and in that kind of scale and there has not been a sweeping that is crazy because they want to do good work and if they think they can do good work here, they would be interested. Mr. Green said they are pushing them in all sorts of ways to try to figure out what they are doing. They are working with 15 jurisdictions in Licking County in response to Intel and housing is the fundamental issue for them and that is about talent so they are trying to figure out what they are willing to do in some unusual places and they are thinking about it a lot. President Tarazi said how much gets done in 10 years and is there a sense of what is the realistic addition of housing units given the realistic nature of this Plan. Mr. Green replied they do not have a number of units projected but it is an incredibly strong housing market right now. He mentioned that would be an interesting exercise for them to do with staff. Mr. Green reported approximately six months ago the Business Industry Association (BIA) produced their housing estimate for the region which is a 10-year estimate and would be easy to see what share might Hilliard get and what configurations in these different residential components might



that consume. President Tarazi said the City has been asked to add a certain percentage and asked how does that relate to that and might be useful to see based on this Plan if the City will be over or under. This also ties back to what is realistic to be constructed and land purchase. Mr. Carrier added that is why he asked about the history of what the City has added from the last Plan because you can extrapolate what you can expect from this one. President Tarazi replied that may or may not be true because the construction conditions in the last 10 years were very different than they are right now. Mr. Green reported that if Council is interested, they could, before the April meeting, do a simple analysis of the BIA's projections for the next 10 years. Mr. Carrier remarked that information would be very helpful.

President Tarazi thanked everyone for attending and their hard work.

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION - NONE**  
**CITY MANAGER UPDATES - NONE**

Mr. Carrier, seconded by Ms. Hale, moved to adjourn the meeting by Voice Vote.

<b>MOVER:</b>	Les Carrier
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Peggy Hale
<b>AYES:</b>	Tarazi, Vermillion, Carrier, Cottone, Hale, Marsh, Teater

**ADJOURNMENT – 6:58 PM**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Omar Tarazi, President  
Council Committee of the Whole

\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane Werbrich, MMC  
Clerk of Council

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_