

Canal Winchester

*Town Hall
10 North High Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

April 30, 2018

6:00 PM

Committee of the Whole

*Bruce Jarvis - President
Mike Walker – Vice-President
Jill Amos
Will Bennett
Bob Clark
Mike Coolman
Patrick Lynch*

A. Call To Order

Jarvis called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

A motion was made for a brief recess at 6:03pm by Coolman, seconded by Lynch. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 5 – Coolman, Lynch, Amos, Jarvis, Walker

Bennett arrived at 6:03pm.

Meeting was reconvened at 6:07pm

B. Roll Call

Present 6 – Amos, Bennett, Coolman, Jarvis, Lynch, Walker

A motion was made by Amos to excuse Mr. Clark, seconded by Walker. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Amos, Walker, Bennett, Coolman, Jarvis, Lynch

C. Also In Attendance

Mayor Ebert, Matt Peoples, Lucas Haire

D. Items for Discussion

18-042

Invocation at Council Meetings

- Presentation by Councilman Walker

Walker: Thank you Mr. Jarvis; this has been working on me for while a while; I have been on council for over two years; every council meeting one of us lead the pledge of allegiance; I can't help but get goose bumps every time when we get to the part, especially, one nation under God; when deputy Walker, I rode with her a few weeks ago; she was so excited that we were able to put in God we trust back on the vehicles; the cruisers; at one point I may have walked away form; the further I walked away the closer I got to coming right back to where I am today; I'd like to start with, we have three branches of government which we all know; the judicial, the executive and the legislative; the legislative branch sits with the senate; there is fifty in the upper chamber; the house of representatives in the lower chamber with 435; there is prayer every day before they open; since continental congress in 1774 is how far this goes back; May 5th 2014 the Supreme Court, it was challenged to have prayer in a legislative body; May 5th 2004 the Supreme Court said, "it's the fabric of our society, it can continue and it will continue"; and it is continuing; the executive branch obviously is our president of the United States; Bill Graham has for 7 presidents give prayer invocation at 7 inaugurations; President Eisenhower, President Johnson, President Nixon, President Regan; President George W. Bush, President Clinton; and President Bush and President Trump; I checked with some local council; Columbus city council has an invocation before every city council meeting; Lancaster, Reynoldsburg, I don't need to name them all; there are several; I talked to Mr. Hollins, about this before I stared; I asked for wisdom and who do I go to; that's where I went was to Mr.

Hollins obviously; He had said that most council meetings and several legislative bodies much higher than ours, he has witnessed and been a part of the invocation that have been given at those legislative bodies as well; so what I'm asking today is that we consider asking for divine intervention to be a part of our meeting to look for wisdom from God through prayer; where to get our information; the best wisdom that we can get while we move this city on and make decisions for generations to come; I feel deep in my mind and my heart this is the right thing to ask and it is council's decision; and at this point I think that I've covered October 11, 2017 the federal court rules that congress can continue to open its sessions each day with a prayer upheld by the house and ability to pick and choose; I don't know all of these answers if letters go out to all of the churches in the city for invitation for clergy to come in and give invocation; I do know that Reynoldsburg was one that they choose sometimes to have a different council person; so I don't know; but we're going to find out here soon through Mr. Hollins where we go with that; but at this point I'd just like to open that up for discussion and any questions;

Jarvis: All the details or the mechanics of how something like this would work are where I think maybe not of the questions would be; conceptually it's on firm legal ground which came as a surprise to me initially; I assumed the time in history that we live in something like that would just not be feasible to do; but it's clear that there is case law at very high level that says it's possible; therefor its within our decision making authority as to whether that would be something we would want to do as a policy; I'm personally a believer but I think there is a practical side to doing something like this as well; it is a pause before you get into the business at hand and you know we've all witnessed it or been a part of the angry mob that is up in arms over some issue or whatever; it does remind them and us as well that there is a higher power; we're all kind of in the same boat together; I just wanted to share that;

Coolman: I as well have been a part of certain professional meetings; while they may not have been led with invocation, they have been opened with a moment of silence giving tribute; Jarvis: how did they frame that when they had a moment of silence; Coolman: it's a moment of silence for if there has been a recent tragedy, to mention he victims of a recent tragedy or for your own personal needs; Jarvis: I'll share another story with you guys; I'm sorry to interrupt but I need to get this off my chest; on September 11, 2001 I was in Washington at the time; at the next council meeting after that event I was present with council and I had asked that we have a moment of silence to mark that occasion; and when the minutes were done that never really came out; and I though well if I said something about it, it was going to look like I was shooting for effect and it wasn't form the heart; so I left it alone; but that bothered me ever since then; if you look at the minutes for the first meeting after that event it looks like we were completely oblivious to what happened; I don't know what that has to do with anything I just had to get it off my chest;

Amos: I personally don't have a problem with it; we say prayer at a lot of things that we do; in Scouts it's one of our general foundations and I've raised my kids that way; for me it's become part of our normal thing that we do; we talk to God on a regular basis;

Lynch: I'm kind of indifferent myself; I do believe in power of prayer; whether that's necessary here; whether it's a moment of silence; to me it's a very personal thing; it's certainly not a public thing; but I would go either way with it; it doesn't matter either way;

Walker: I think they both have a different; a moment of silence is typically during 9/11; invocation I think is something different;

Lynch: it depends on the individual; everyone tends to have their faith in different ways;

Walker: and that's why we possibly might hear from Mr. Hollins on this;

Hollins: Mr. Walker's first problem is he said he was looking for wisdom and turned my direction; it sort of went downhill from there; I did dig up some research that we had done earlier in 2014 and updated it a little and got that memo distributed here; as Bruce has said its pretty straight forward; it's the establishment clause you would think would prohibit it but the courts have been pretty consistent that as long as it's not anything but; like it says lend a little gravity to the occasion and reflect value is long part of our nation's heritage sort of sets the right tone for a meeting; but you can got too far with it; at some point it turns into what they say threatening damnation, denigrating non-believers, preaching conversion; at that point in time you've crossed the line; as long as it's meant to serve the purpose of setting a respectful tone in the meeting that's just fine under the establishment clause; procedural items you would want to think through whether a council member would lead the invocation or the moment of silence or if it would be a policy you would invite in, on a rotating basis perhaps, local clergy; I know that's what some other communities do; and from a process standpoint as you think through that I'm not quite sure who is on the rule committee this year but I think the next step would require looking back at your rules of council which set forth the normal agenda and adding this to the agenda and probably providing a few guidelines per this memo as to the intent of having an invocation to set the right tone; I would be hopeful that we could get that in your rules of council as well; if you're interested I think this is something that you would delegate to the rules committee to come back to you with a proposed amendment to the council rules;

Coolman: after you do that then it goes back to agenda;

Hollins: if the council rules were amended to now add this as an agenda item from that point forward we would put it on the agenda;

Lynch: is this something that has to be voted on by the whole group;

Hollins: yes, it would come back in either resolution or ordinance form as an amendment to your council rules; the rules committee, what it does is look at those rules from time to time; review them to see if they need updated or changed in any manner; we did that with the committees when we decided to stop having separate committee meeting and just do everything as a whole; that was a rule change we made brought up before council; and council changed the rule; that was I think the last time we did it;

Walker: if we were to put a letter out to all of the churches in the city here I would imagine they, from what I understand in looking out to other cities that they would love to be a part of that; matter of

fact I've heard even if you have a list you can't repeat the same one more than once in that year or more than twice without having the others come through that you've invited;

Hollins: two of the communities I'm familiar with; do you have a ministerial association;

Amos: Gender Road Christian church pastor is the one who;

Hollins: Lithopolis, Canal Winchester Ministerial Association; sometimes you just contact them and ask them to fill the slots; then that way they can fill it up for you and its turns out to be non-discriminatory at all; I would think that anybody that's a member of the ministerial association would jump up;

Jarvis: the draft policy that I looked at on this subject said the very same thing; a participating clergy person would not be in the position to say well there's only way and it has to be x, y, z; it has to be in a general kind of a sense; there's some ground rules for them as well; but if in general council feels that this would be something for rules committee to look at to figure out what the ground rules are and the specifics I think that would be a help to staff because they would most likely be making those contacts and answering questions; what we need here is someone to make a motion to forward this to rule committee;

Motion was made by Walker, seconded by Lynch to forward this to rules committee

Hollins: Do we know who rules committee is;

Lynch: yes; let's plan to get together in the next week or so and go over stuff.

18-043

Westport Homes Representative

Hollins: The chair members of council – this really is an outgrowth of some ongoing discussions we've been having with Westport about a potential development; it really goes beyond potential development, that's why we decided to come to talk to council at this juncture; it relates to the residential development standards which would be applied not just with respect to this subdivision but with any new subdivision and we haven't had one; obviously these were adopted in 2006; thereafter in 2008; we've been seeing some residential development but largely it's on already approved and platted developments; mostly Westchester at this point; there was still a backlog of residential lots; as well as Canal Cove which occurred prior to 2008; in discussing and sitting in on a few of those meetings, there was a level of frustration about staff doing its job because of the current residential standards; the current proposal has fallen short on some of those specifics in the development standards; the developers are saying that this will be a 300 thousand dollar product; we're trying to bring a quality development and some of the residential development standards that its felt we are not living up to may be things that sort of reflected an aesthetic that is now 12 years old; I'll let them tell you about that; I don't need to argue their case; if that was the issue, if we're getting frustrated between developer and staff because of residential development standards we thought we need to go back and talk to council; that's not going to be something that were going to be cable to resolve without going to the source of the residential development standards; a little history on those, and Bruce may remember this, I don't know if anybody else goes back this far; these

were an outgrowth of a frustrating application, on the same piece of ground if I remember right it was Rockford back in those days; they felt they were getting some things that they were asked to compromise on from planning commission and they got a little frustrated and we finally worked through all that and got something approved; after that application standards were developed because we were and then forwarded onto council; they felt they were asked to do something that was somewhat diametrically opposed to what planning commission asked; they got a little frustrated; we finally worked through all that and got something approved; after that application the standards were developed because we wanted to get out to the development community our expectations if you brought a planned residential district application forward; it was meant to help guide the drafting of planned district texts and plans where they came from; we've come full circle; they're out there; maybe the first time trying to serve their intended purpose of helping get the development community our expectations; development community is here listening and I guess the question is do they need a little update to reflect the market and council; do they still reflect council's expectation by and large; that's the best introduction I can give and at this point

Jarvis: I haven't looked at this in quite a long time and when I did look at it I felt that it didn't really go far enough; I mean it's pretty high level; but then I also consider the history is that someone comes and they almost always seek some sort of a variance that sort of drives them in the direction of a prd; when everybody sits down it kind of starts over; this might be starting point but I don't know who would use these standards in the level of detail that they are; just to come in at say, R3 and build everything by the book; I can't recall when that has ever happened; if they all end up going prd anyway are these standards of any use in that process;

Hollins: that was the original intention although I don't think we've had a prd maybe since we adopted them; they were intended to sort of be our, if you're drafting a planned district, here's a help in drafting a text; and if you depart from these justify it or tell me what benefit I get in trade off for not meeting them; but it was before these that we had no real guidelines if someone was going to build something other than a straight R3 type of subdivision; we didn't have any guidelines to tell them and we went through both planning commission and council on this and tried to get on the same page; here's our expectations for planned districts;

Jarvis: if you don't mind Mr. Haire have you been through this process of prd from the ground up; is this document of any use in that process;

Haire: we haven't been through that process since I've been part of canal Winchester; this is the first time we're getting into it; I think Gene's summary is correct' this is the baseline and if you're going to deviate from these, just like any deviation from our standards you need to tell us what the benefit is from that deviation; how it benefits the community; Jarvis: hypothetically, do you think that's sufficient detail for someone to start a prd design process;

Haire: it's a starting point but it's up to council; obviously there's a lot of new council members; I think maybe there's one council member that was here in 2006; so maybe it time we look at them again and make sure it still reflects the standards that you think are desirable for our community; we've had a number of planned developments over the last twenty years; we're to the point now where most of

those are either built out or will be built over the next five to six years; so were going to see more requests for new subdivisions coming in; we set a standard twenty years ago for what we want our community to be; we need to start thinking about what we want that standard to be for the next twenty years;

Lynch: I would agree with you 100%; it seems the biggest concerns our community has is safety development and taxes; in all that stuff seems to narrow right down to zoning; zoning and how we zone our community; it helps drive what kind of money we're making and how much our schools are being burdened etc; so to put together some kind of planning commission to figure who we want to develop this community from here forward I think would be huge; but it can't be just council; what I would propose is maybe put something together two or three members of council, two or three members of zoning, get somebody from the school board on this; have each person on council appoint one citizen that can be part of this group; of course get yourself and Andrew involved and then from there we can put together a comprehensive plan to steer the development of the community both residential and commercial standards; look at the whole thing holistically; we've done it with parks; we've done it with the Old Town; let's do it for the whole community; the whole town; we could call this very simply a CW 2020 plan; we could just basically use the tag line a vision for the future; and that can be the guidelines that we go forth with over the next 5 to 10 years; Bennett: it would be the 2040 plan; 2020 is only 2 years away; Lynch: no, 2020 vision; it's a play on words; Bennett: sorry I thought you were talking about the year 2020; Lynch: well it can be both; this whole plan needs to be put together before that year and implemented before the year 2020; it's like a guideline; we've been through these things before it's not something that can be done in a couple of meetings; it's going to take a lot of research to get something like this put together; but I think we take a look at where we're at and what we have; what other communities are doing; what other communities are doing right; and let's try to mirror some of those techniques, some of those guidelines, here in this town;

Jarvis: Mr. Lynch, I think this was done a long time ago as well and this was before Mr. Hire and I think it was before Mayor Ebert came on, a master plan that sort of addressed the same thing; the existing land that is in the city corporation limits already has a zoning category and that's laid out and I don't know what the process would be to change those; usually its initiated by the property owner if they want to change it somehow; this master plan was more of a strategic tool in that it showed areas that were not part of the city at the time and showed areas for future annexation and things like that; with a proposed zoning category that went along with it; maybe that's what you're talking about; a dusting off of a product; a discussion that would involve revised version of that; Lynch: I think it's a combination of both; taking a look at what's in our footprint and taking a look at what can eventually be outside our footprint of the town; Jarvis: I think it might be helpful if that master plan in something that we could take a look at just for a starting point to what level of detail;

Haire: master plans are all based on what you want to look at; Jarvis: we're talking about the existing one right now; Haire: do you want to talk about land use only; do you want to talk about infrastructure; do you want to talk about access management; thoroughfare planning; do you want to talk about utilities; I mean we're talking anywhere from Hilliard spending a million dollars down to

Pataskala spending forty thousand dollars to do a plan; or anywhere in between depending on what we want to evaluate; I'm sure it can be scoped any way and it might be price prohibited; I do have something that has already been prepared; I haven't seen it in a long time but I know it exists somewhere in the artifacts; Haire: so the last time council officially adopted any plan was in 1999; then in 2005 there was an update that apparently was controversial and was never adopted by council; Jarvis: I don't recall the circumstances on that if I was even around; I don't remember he controversial part; is that something you can send out to council; I think what Mr. Lynch is saying is valid; that every so often plans need to be revisited; if it's something that's going to bring the house down because it's going to cost a million dollars to do obviously we can't go there; but I think the discussion part of it would help as a tool to see how things looked back then; I'll bet you some its change but not all of it; is that something you could provide council; I guess the 20025 revised version knowing that it's not official; that would probably be the best one to look at; Hollins: I know we've updated some of the other plans and we've done a CEDO to land use plan; Luke is probably right the last time we've done a comp plan that takes all of those elements at a high level into consideration is not even this millennium; we do have, and since Jack actually put a suit on for us, I'm impressed, they may want to wind a little bit of comment at least form the developers side; we do have a pending application; we're not here to take any action on that; and I think they'll tell you the same thing; to give you their initial thoughts on residential development standards if you would like to hear any input at this point; Jarvis: absolutely, who is prepared to speak;

Tom Hart; Zoning Attorney representing Westport Homes: we really do appreciate your time tonight; we'll try to be efficient; I think you've already kind of framed any issues, Mr. Jarvis and Gene pretty well; we understand were in a planning commission process so we expect to conclude that process before coming back to you for anything formal; this is a non-binding presentation done by us; we don't expect any answer; we expect to do our job there and come back here if were fortunate; Jarvis: Mr. Hart, does that mean we're going to be speaking at kind of a hypothetical level; Hart: yes sir; Jarvis: that's good; I'm comfortable with that; Hart: as Gene said we've run into some standards where Westport is trying to deliver what it believes is housing at high value that meets the market conditions and meets changes in the market; really over the past decade we have really seen surging one of those big items in empty nester housing; empty nester housing is really not deliverable under your 2006 standards both lot standards and some of the architectural issues; that is what we want to talk about; we've kind of run into those standards as we've proceeded through the process; staff has been very clear that we're going to stick to these standards and its clear we don't have staff support; they're very honest and very frank about were they're coming from because that's the code; I think Mr. Jarvis, you also hit on a really important point for us and that is we think of this as a planned district; we think of the code as a starting point for us to propose things and then defend them and justify why they're different than the base code; we do want to make sure that everybody sees it that way; we are struggling with that point; were running into some base code standards that will not allow is to deliver housing of the value that exceeds the market and we think is good housing; I'm going to shut up and let Jack present the housing and the value if that's okay; the only other point I'll make I also work for Rockford, M.I. Epcor and maybe a couple others in terms of folks that may or in the past have been in this market; so this is not a Westport issue, it's a building industry issue in terms

of how we've evolved as an industry in terms of what we're trying to do with housing and the standards from 2006; so with says if it's okay; Jarvis: I'll ask again and the reason I'm a little cautionary is you understand that this is a body potentially hear an appeal if things didn't work in your favor at a planning and zoning level; therefore we shouldn't be discussing any specifics about your project at hand in my opinion because it's out of sequence; Hollins: whether we legally totally agree I think we're doing this as a matter of principal; what would come before you is in effect a rezoning; it's a legislative issue; its only subject to referendum not appeal; but still that's the legal issue; I think we wanted approach this in a more global basis; The development is what actually raises the issues; to the extent as an illustration; I think tonight we're here to talk about the residential development standards and the process if we need to update; anything this or broader; Hart: I would like to go on the record and say that we know this is not a zoning hearing; it's not a zoning hearing on what's pending in zoning and planning commission; any feedback we get is not binding; we'd like your opinions not about this zoning but about the architectural standards that we are struggling with generally; Hollins: Tom and I have had that discussion in prep for this; you can go 180 degrees the other direction and nothing is binding tonight; I know Tom well enough to know that he does a bunch of work for other builders and it would be helpful to get the word out to the development community overall not just Westport as to what you expectations are; Jarvis: am I correct in assuming that you're crux of your problem has to do with density; about empty nesters are looking for smaller square footage product; Hart: the current application we have meets density; it's not necessarily density; its more lot size and lot building envelope, setbacks and things like that; specific architectural issues are treatment of the garage; its items like that; Jarvis: so those issues do tie directly back to the standards; Hart: it's 2006 we're choking on; Hollins: as an example the one on the right is the empty nester product; what's on the other side of the woods and the stream is single family; one question that I had when looking at this I think this goes back to the process in 2005 and 2006; I think we were thinking about single family residential; we can get into the weeds with this if you want; I'm not so sure because a lot of empty nester product is going to look pretty uniform; things in here about not having the same model next door; I'm not so this was intended to go toward the Epcon type of product/the empty nester type of product; but that's a question for council; Jarvis: so you're saying there could be another type of category; Hollins: yes we may want to have residential standards for an empty nester product; I'm not sure that was a big issue back in 2006; Hart: I'll just comment that back in the day, back then the empty nester housing market was all multi family; Epcon first started breaking up the quad, the four unit building, and putting these single units detached single family home in a line rather than in a quad probably around 2010; Jarvis: and that's a trend you see staying for a while; Hart: like my hair color and yours; it's an overwhelming market surge; there's a lady that I can't avoid, and I can remember her name; she does this downsizing radio add every morning as I get ready for work; her name is Cathy Cairo and she's a full service realtor serving the downsizing market. MORPC has documented it; it's a downsizing trend; I will say this, that some of the challenge were having is also on the traditional side; single family lots; we're challenged there as well; Hollins: believe it or not density wasn't the issue there;

Jack Mautino; Division Executive of Westport Homes: Thank you for your time this evening; illustrative purpose only; it's so illustrative it's not even the actual plan; most importantly what I want

to talk to you about is just as a home builder and the difficulties were having meeting the standards in 2006; when I first asked Lucas to point me to one of the communities which these standards have been adopted and IO could look at the architecture of that, he admittedly said there isn't one; we've been the beneficiary of Canal Cove; when Dominion Homes decided to sell that community we were able to purchase the remaining lots in Canal Cove; the remaining acreage there; and we've been able to and we've been fortunate to sell roughly 60 homes on the last 30 months; the average sale price in Canal Cove just in backlog today is roughly \$315,000; we looked at the resale market in Canal Winchester last year; we only looked at Canal Winchester/Canal Schools; what we found is that in Canal the resale of just four bedroom homes, there were 144 of them that closed last year, and the average sale price was \$233,000; so we've got the data that supports that if you wanted to see that; the new home construction was significantly above what was being resold in the marketplace; in today's market, generally speaking in central Ohio, it is roughly 30% more expensive to do a new home than it is an existing resale home; we then looked at outside the Canal, Canal and what I mean by that is outside of Canal is Canal proper and Canal Schools if you go to just outside of Canal Winchester district but still Canal Schools that average sales price drops down to \$209,000; so you can see clearly that there is a lot of homes being built in the area that are sub the Canal price point; the Canal Winchester price point as well; what we found most difficult, there are a couple of key items in your code today that make it almost prohibitive but I understand why they were written in 2006; the first one that jumps out at us is that the garage must be four feet behind the body of the home; four feet behind the body, not the porch but the body of the home; in 2006 there were a couple builders that were putting garages 20 feet out in front of the home; and then building behind it; they were called snout houses; I've been in this business now for nearly 30 years; I've been in central Ohio now for 27 of those; building homes in central Ohio; I understand why it was there but in today's architectural standards what we're seeing is the garage is now becoming the more prevalent front door of the home; if you think of how were designing homes for today were coming in from the garage there's a mud room, boot benches, its more elaborate than the actual foyer; because you're putting those areas in behind the garage itself it doesn't allow for that garage to be back behind the house; I'll give you an example; I do have some books that I can hand out if I can these are just some elevations of homes that would not be approved or not allowed to be built with today's code; first off, these are from a community called Riviera; Riviera gold course up in Dublin; it was purchased by Virginia Homes; they sold the vast majority off to M.I.; I believe there are 80-85 homes that are constructed in Riviera today; I could not find one home built in Riviera that would meet the Canal Winchester 2006 code; not one; the average sale price of these homes is in excess of \$700,000; to give you an example; this our traditional single family; this home here would not qualify; this was our parade home this year; the parade of homes up in Cheshire Woods just closed it today as a matter of fact for \$550,000; that one would not be permitted to go in Canal Winchester with the standard; the reason why is because the garage is more than 50% of the front of the home; three car garages integrated in the home would be covering more than 1/4th; not a single home on this board would be approved; with garages today what we've found id that the garage gas become more and more upscale; they're becoming an architectural element of the home; of which we propose the same thing; no more of the twelve flat panel; you're seeing craftsmen, you're seeing windows in garage

doors; you're seeing porch lengths that are complimentary to the styles of craftsmen; gallery; farmhouse; traditional; so again not one of these homes would be permitted; Mayor: I got a question; one that home that you just closed on for \$550,000; what makes that \$550,000 there and not here; Mautino: it was a \$150,000 lot; it was a parade home which I way over accessorized; that's where we get \$550,000; it was on the Olentangy school system on a 90 foot lot; the lot was \$150,000; Mayor: so they will pay more for lots then; Mautino: based on location, yes; this home here would price between \$350,000 and \$400,000; Jarvis: going back to that drawing you said that house would not be approved within this city because of the surface area of the garage doors or number of garage doors; Mautino: correct; Jarvis: Would it meet the standard as far as the degree that it protrudes from the house? Mautino: This one, actually, not on the body of the house; but from the porch, yes; no, to answer your question; Walker: Because it's 4 feet in front; Mautino: Because it would not be 4 feet behind this main element of the home; Lynch: The porch does not count in that calculation, so it had to be behind where the front door is, not from the front edge of the porch; Jarvis: If I saw a top-down elevation of that property, it might help a little bit; Haire: I've got one pulled up here, we're talking about 1646 Renberry Drive? Mautino: That's the one in, yes – Haire: The one in Molina? It appears that the home is more than 4 feet in front of the garage, the home and the porch; bedroom 2 sticks out in front of the home; Hart: Oh, does it, by 4? Haire: There's no dimensions on here, it looks like it; Mautino: Same thing with these homes; none of them would be permissible; this would be just my last example of what I would call a traditional, single-family home; through discussions with staff, what we were proposing was putting in larger front porches on all of the homes, architectural style garage doors, dimensional shingles, complimentary coach lights and exterior lighting fixtures, concrete driveways; once we get more into the lifestyle series, this is the empty nester product that we call our lifestyle series, obviously age-targeted; these homes, we were talking about duplication; there's actually multiple elevations for these homes, similar to what we do with our traditional single-family, so it's not just the repeating the same product over and over again; this is one of the Hayden elevations, and this is a Hayden elevation; same house inside, may vary a little bit just to get the porch elements on it; it's something in which we can go ahead and alter the elevations; obviously, this is a very, very popular product in today's market; downsize, for something a little bit smaller; there are maintenance packages – mulching the beds, pruning the trees, that's all taken care of; the buyers own the property itself, it's on public streets, but we have put a maintenance package together for the different traffic patterns; what we have found with these buyers is that they downsize, but they don't downscale; they are very affluent, and they have the resources to buy all the fancy hardwoods, the granite countertops, and so forth; Lynch: Where are you building, where's an example of the communities that you have these empty nester's homes? Mautino: Broadstone, which is in the City of Columbus; we started this project, which is off of East Broad Street; those were smaller lots, 50-foot lots; we were working with staff, and they asked that we add porches to our lifestyle product as well, so we went back and designed porches; Lynch: Other than Broadmoor, where else have you built these? Mautino: There would only be one other one, it's just coming out of the ground right now; Lynch: Have you done a lot of these empty nesters? Mautino: Not here in central Ohio as much as we have in Indianapolis, there's a big market in Indianapolis; Coolman: Jack I'm sorry – if you've already mentioned it, I missed it, I'm sorry; how long have you been promoting the lifestyle style of home?

Mautino: I would say that we started it in 2015, sold through it very quickly; our next development is Broadmoor Commons off of East Broad Street; what we've found is that we've created pods within the community, but that is just coming out of the ground, they're just starting that; this would be the 3rd proposed development for central Ohio; in Indianapolis for the past 4-5 years; Lynch: How many developments like this are in Indianapolis? Mautino: I would say upwards of 15; Coolman: In this style of architecture? Mautino: Yes; Coolman: The floorplans – how old is the floorplan that you've been using for the interior, same thing, same age group? Mautino: Some of these floorplans could be as old as 3-4 years, some could be brand new; to give you an example, there's Barrymore, this home right here - this is a brand new plan; we're constantly looking at our product; I guess we're beginning to – Mr. Haire has told us routinely that the 2006 standard does not allow us, we have to adhere to the 2006 standard; as Tom pointed out, we're not designing homes to where the garages sit 4 feet behind; I don't know a developer today, I don't know a homeowner today that is offering that in a traditional single-family-type product; Jarvis: This product here falls short because of the same thing? Mautino: Yes, the same thing; the garage is not 4 feet behind; these porch widths would be – I mean, the garage doors would be okay, because they're two-car garages; the one thing with a ranch product as well, that's in your code, is I believe that the home cannot exceed 30% of the lot, lot coverage; in all my years, I've never seen the change recently of the ranch becoming more popular again, it's back; what's difficult with the ranch, is to meet the square footage requirements, and to have a width requirement of, let's say, 40-48 feet wide, it's got to be a ?; the ranch has a big footprint, so once you put that big footprint on a lot that only allows for 30% coverage, then you're not ?; Walker: Just curious Lucas, if that was a side-load, I'm just curious, is that the same rule for a garage, if it was a side-load garage? So if it's a side-load or the front, it's the same? Haire: Yes, the code does not distinguish between a front-load or side-load in terms of location; it does require that 20% of their garages are side-loaded garages; Hart: We can't side-load, the lot size is too narrow; another key issue – to be fair, staff has been more open-minded and more flexible about this; in your 3 standards, your minimum lot requirement is 14,400 square feet; that's a lot that's 120 by 120, and you can do different variations of that; in our traditional single-family, we have now 75-foot, 80-foot, and 85-foot lots; we are right around a quarter acre for a traditional single-family; there's no way to even come close to that – we are at half of that for the empty nesters, because these people don't want to mow, they don't want to take care of a yard anymore; it's all the lot envelope issues, the side yards, the rears, the fronts, and that lot coverage; it's a combination of things on the empty nester; Jarvis: I think you made a good point about how things are changing, and the standards don't apply to all situations; these came – everything you read in our standards is a result of trying to deal with some problem that we have been presented with in the past, and all of this is in the past now; maybe a 20-year solution to a 25-year-old problem; I think you've raised some interesting issues that will continue with some internal discussion about this; I don't feel like there's anything unique about Westport with what we were just talking about; I don't know what the solution is, or how to make any improvement in that; I understand that right now, we are kind of at an impasse; I think the way it was designed is not necessarily meant to be a good, comfortable fit for anybody, but to start that conversation of 'if you're willing to do this, then we are willing to do that', as we were talking about earlier; I'm not sure what that is, I don't even want to know what that is right now; that's your point –

Lynch: I work with a lot of empty nesters throughout Columbus, in a lot of different neighborhoods – Dublin, New Albany; if we're at 30% coverage for a house on our lots, what are these empty nester units, what is the average coverage per lot would you say around town? Mautino: It's probably closer to 35-40%; Lynch: Now that's just the house footprint itself, that doesn't include the hardscapes? Mautino: Yes, just the house itself; Lynch: 35-40 is the average, you would say? Mautino: Yes; to the mayor's point, we would – as home prices continue to escalate, land costs continue to escalate, development costs; I would expect the single family to be somewhere in that 350, pushing 4 range, starting in the low 300's; the active adult product would be on the low side, 265-280, probably pushing 300; Jarvis: Gentleman, I do appreciate your time very much; Mr. Mautino, I don't know if you've had a chance to sign in, if you wouldn't mind; I think council – these standards were the product of planning and zoning initially, and then adopted by council? Hollins: That is a good question, but just like our zoning code, I cannot imagine we didn't take these through Planning and Zoning first; we probably started with staff, and then ran it through Planning & Zoning, who brought it up to council, but we can figure that out for you; Haire: It looks like there was a committee put together to develop these standards; I don't know who appointed the committee, but I have the committee members that were a part of that, it included council members and Planning & Zoning; I think that was a result of some of the difficulties that they went through with approving the Rockford development, because there weren't expectations; Rockford was asking for a lot of things that Planning & Zoning and council weren't comfortable with at the time.

Terry Andrews, Westport Homes: What I was trying to find out is if Frank Elmer perhaps was in that committee? He was involved – Haire: I don't have Frank Elmer on here, I know Frank Elmer; Andrews: I was trying to find out what he may have had to do with that; Haire: It was Planning & Zoning administrator at the time, the Development Director at the time, Leah Turner, Larry Phelps, Mike Vasko, Bobby Mershon and Jeff Miller; Hollins: Planning & Zoning, council, and the mayor; Jarvis: If that needs to be initiated by council, then would you let us know? I don't want to jump ahead of myself, does council feel that the standards need to be viewed in light of some of this information, with the passage of time? Bennett: Mr. Jarvis, I think – as we were listening here this evening, I pulled up our Olde Town plan that we just recently approved; under action items #5 – 'Diversity Housing Options', we have in there 'allow increased density for various styles of housing to attract boomers and millennials'; 'utilize high-quality architecture to promote local charm'; I think there are some, if you look into this a little deeper, I think this is maybe the next step of that, putting this committee together to start to take action on coming up with a new set of standards, to address what trying to attract empty nesters, millennials; Jarvis: At the very least, it's a different animal; you can't put them together to create that category of whatever standard; Lynch: What is being built now and what was being built back in '05 are completely different things; Amos: If nothing more, I think additional conversation to just take a second, look at it, just to look at it ourselves and be able to ask questions or offer suggestions; Jarvis: We might have a special composition of a couple of council people, couple of people from Planning & Zoning; Hollins: It's completely up to you, on the other area plans we've even brought in somebody from outside, if we need help on how to draft up standards; that's the motto we've used, that being said, it's completely up to you; it would be a special task force maybe driven by council, so I'd think you'd ask Planning & Zoning to maybe give you some volunteers, and

then maybe consider who else might be helpful; Jarvis: So we'd facilitate it from this level, or would staff be involved? Hollins: Whatever you'd want, if you want staff to give you some sort of direction; Jarvis: I think that would be appropriate, since the meeting spaces would have to be scheduled; we want to get the ball rolling on that, the feeling is that it needs to be looked at again and modernized; we would like a composite scheme that would involve staff members, couple of council representatives and a couple of Planning & Zoning people; maybe it's one meeting, or two; Coolman: Bruce, what I think is important is that we as a council should get together, as Joe mentioned, for further discussion, just so we as a unit know where we want to go; Amos: Is it possible to meet, and then have representatives go to the meeting to discuss; Hollins: Absolutely, it's something we could do at your Committee of the Whole meetings, or work sessions, if you want to kick that around a little bit; you can do it however you want to get that word to your representatives; it's really a cart blanche in how you want to form this; Jarvis: It could be a Committee of the Whole meeting, but the next meeting is going to be 2 and a half-3 months from now; Hollins: What did you have before, what do you call your regular meetings? Walker: Work session; Hollins: It could be a work session; Jarvis: So you would like to form a consensus here before the task force comes together, to form a position? Amos: I just think we all have some opinions, so rather than sending two people, gathering all of our ideas or thoughts from everybody would be great before we have a committee formed; Jarvis: Okay, so at some point it goes down to 2 people, right? Coolman: Yes, absolutely; Jarvis: To 'send the play in'; Amos: I think we'd like to start the drafts, and then we'll send the players; Jarvis: Okay, makes sense; alright, so if we could make sure that from the next council meeting, under old business, a discussion regarding – I don't even really know how to word this; an attempt to come to consensus on what, if any, changes that need to be made to the residential standards; I'm sorry, I could probably think of a better way to word that; Hollins: I'd say 'continuing discussion on updating residential standards'; I'm going to take one more – can you hold up your now outdated site plan? I just want to – personal preference, nothing more than that, one thing, believe it or not, if you take that little triangle of land that's southwest of the creek and add it to this, I think we're almost, we are at 50% open space; as you're looking at that, we encourage, I think – I don't know if it can be across the board required of everybody, and it's hard to believe looking at that; you add that to what you're looking at, and I think it's 50% open space by our calculations; just to throw that in the mix, if that's an aspirational goal on everything we see, we would rather cluster stuff and leave that very valuable open space sometimes like that; Jarvis: Currently we don't hold that property; Hollins: The seller of their property has at least talked to the other landowner about potentially acquiring that, if that helps; that's one where you'll get some push back from the development community, but damn, if you can get 50% open space on all of your single family, it will open it up to a lot of creativity on what you can do with the rest; am I wrong about that? Hart: Yes; (unintelligible); Hollins: Okay, with the slightly smaller – and again, that's the point, do you want to trade off 70-foot lots for 50% open space? Anyway, we just haven't discussed open space at all, but look at this site, and tell me that that isn't a creative way to save that stuff; Jarvis: It's a great idea, for all of the 5 minutes it lasted; Hollins: Thanks for your indulgence.

Jarvis: That brings us to the end, but I would like to make a couple of general comments, and open the floor up a little bit based on those comments; according to council rules, a Committee of the

Whole meeting – I think there's a little bit of confusion maybe, and I share that sometimes, over what the Committee of the Whole meetings are used for; for example, Mr. Walker had the first bit about the invocations several weeks ago; I felt that it was kind of a council policy issue, therefore it did not belong in the regular working session forum and a general council meeting; I recommended that he bring that to this forum; the way the council rules state committee of the whole meetings, it says 'the purpose is to review, investigate, and recommend council action in all long-range planning, potential capital improvement projects, and any special topic as determined by council'; I guess that last line you can kind of drive a truck through, but the sentiment is there; I would add to that policy type of issues, because they just don't really fit well at the other meetings; 'Committee of the Whole be held as needed, but no less than quarterly'; we should be having these 4 times a year, so if you've got something, the worst case scenario is that there will be a 3-4 month period before we hear that out; but the time in-between is needed because a lot of times it requires staff to do the background searching; we need time ourselves to do our own independent research; then you're ready for it at that time; I will take the hit for this meeting in that I know that there were some additional topics that probably would've been on the agenda, if they had been made far enough in advance, and nobody ever really understood when that was; I never said 'hey, get your ideas in by such-and-such day' so that they can be considered for this meeting; probably because I'm a little rusty in this position also; like I said, that was my fault, I apologize for that; having said that, I will open the floor a little bit, if you have any additional issues that you think need to be discussed in this forum, maybe to be picked up and discussed in more detail later on; just to make it surface tonight, if you want to, this would be the time to do it; if you could keep it under 5 minutes or so – I won't get my watch out, we'll have to keep it short and carry it over to the next one, because no one is really prepared for it; I think the mayor made a good point that the agenda is made for these things so that people will show up based on their interest on the topics, because these are advertised; if it's a topic that's not even on the agenda, they don't know it's happening; to be out there in the open, they should be scheduled I would say probably a month in advance; anyway, I open the floor to anybody that's got anything.

Coolman: Isn't it traditionally, the scheduling for the Committee of the Whole meetings, aren't they usually the fifth Monday of the month? We only have so many months in the year that have a fifth Monday; that's the general guideline we follow, correct? Jarvis: Yes, that's true – sometimes it falls on a holiday that trips that up or whatever; Bennett: I guess, is it, and I know there's no items for new or old business on this agenda, where on our general council meetings, our work sessions even we have that as a sort of catch-all, so that we can bring up things that maybe aren't necessarily scheduled; we bring up items all the time in old or new business that aren't on the agenda; Jarvis: That's true, but they have a quality to them that they're usually about public safety, or something – an expenditure, or something like that; when you look at what's coming in the Committee of the Whole, it's kind of a strategic, long-range policy types of things; if it fits in that category, then it should probably be in a Committee of the Whole, or in the agenda; nine times out of ten, we're going to need some staff support on that; either to poll information, or to show some facts; to be fair to them, we need to let them know far enough in advance; what you say is true, in a regular meeting, when there's something going on – you just saw somebody almost get hit in an intersection or whatever, you have the public safety concern that you need addressed as soon as possible, then that's the place to bring it

up; Amos: So where would items that we would have that are new, or we're trying to bring to the city, to the group – what's the time for those to be presented? Jarvis: It's going to depend a little bit Jill; if it's a policy kind of thing, it's probably not on fire, this would be the place; I'll go back to the council rules; 'review, investigate, and recommend council action in all long-range planning, potential capital improvement projects, and any special topics as determined by council'; Bennett: The special topics sort of covers our leisure, basically; Jarvis: There is some judgement, this as close to black and white as we get; I just wanted to see what council rules say about these meetings; Lynch: Why don't we look at this a little more closely in the rules committee; as far as coming up with some better verbiage as to what can and can't be applied here or at old and new business during our regular council meetings; maybe we form it as if you have a topic that's coming up, you put it in the form of a bill that you can write up on that topic, and then distribute it to everyone for a thorough review prior to the meeting, and then it can be added to the agenda in a formal matter; Jarvis: That makes sense; Lynch: It gives people a little heads up to be able to research, and formulate some kind of comments, opinions or whatever on said topic; Jarvis: I don't care really what comes out; I'm just trying to prevent confusion surrounding this, and I felt some myself; what can we do to clear that up for ourselves and whoever replaces us when we are gone; Mayor: If you're going to go through the trouble of writing it up as a bill, why don't you just make it an agenda item? Lynch: Or that, yes; Mayor: It would be much simpler; Amos: How far in advance should agenda items be submitted? Mayor: It depends on what the agenda items are; if you have something that Luke has to research, and is going to take some time, it could be two meetings from now; Coolman: That's why I was saying earlier – I think it's important that number one that the rotation of these meetings fall on the 5th Monday of the month, and not every month has five Mondays in them, so you can guide yourself by the calendar; number two, I think Amanda Jackson does a great job in letting us know; she let us know for this meeting at least three meetings prior that 'hey, I need your ideas'; we can go back and read them in the minutes that she put it out there that if you have items, please get them to me; Jarvis: Yes, and I should have reiterated that; some of you guys have not been here too long, and some of us have maybe been here maybe too long, and forget about how it works; it's a question of 'I've got this issue, where do I take it, and when do I get it out there, and how do I get it onto the agenda?'; I just want to make sure everyone feels comfortable about the answer; Mayor: We don't want to complicate things; we want to make it as simple as possible, and still understandable; Jarvis: Ideally – Mayor: No we can make it simple, there's no ideally to it; if we want to make it simple, we can make it simple; Lynch: Mayor Ebert, I agree with you; Jarvis: It's just basic communication, we're not speaking Greek here, we're just trying to say 'if you have this kind of an issue, is it better to hold it' – in the case of Mr. Walker here with the invocation, I didn't feel that that was something that would be a work session topic, but it was something that we could have an open discussion on, therefore it belonged here; that's my way of thinking, and I wanted to try and find the writing that said 'this is where you take this kind of thing'; I was just using a gut feeling with Mike; I'm just trying to cutthroat with these guys so that they understand if they have a similar issue, they can ask me and I can give them my opinion, but it's just my opinion; Amos: Forgive me, in the school board world, we can add items to our agenda all the way up to the day before; we are constantly changing our agenda, and changing things on it; this is new, it's different than how I handle the board agenda;

Jarvis: It's put out there to the public, and there's notices; Amos: We do the same, we put ours out to the public, and we put notices out; Jarvis: How do you reconcile that, the changes to last minute? Amos: Amanda posts ours on Friday, and we post ours on Friday, and then they have the whole weekend; Jarvis: As long as it happens the last business day before; Lynch: It's called an addendum to the agenda, simple as that; something that's added last minute; Amos: As long as we do it before the Friday posting, that's the way it works; Jarvis: Mr. Walker made a good point in that the other goal is to not over-complicate the agenda for the work session; in general, there's more stuff there; if you want to go all night, then you get something like this, where there's one of those rolling discussions; that's the purpose of these work sessions, at least to me; so that you didn't tie up a regular meeting for hours while you kick stuff around; I ask everybody to use your judgement, ask the mayor or ask each other, or check with the administration to see if that topic fits better here or over there, and we'll work it out; Mayor: Amanda is your Clerk of Council; if you're not going to funnel through your president, it needs to go to her first; Amos: The only reason I even forwarded my message to Lucas was that in her message it stated to contact Lucas or you; it's a learning curve, that's what her message pointed us to; Bennett: When there are clerk of council issues, and Amanda is on vacation, who is our go-to contact? Mayor: For what? Bennett: For anything council related; Mayor: You go to your council president; Jarvis: I concur; I may not have the answer, but we will work it out; it's a matter of back stock; Mayor: If Amanda is being hit by all 7 of you, that's not fair to her; so you funnel through your council president, and then they get together, which we do, and discuss what you guys would like to see or do.

E. Adjournment at 7:32 p.m.

A motion was made by Bennett, seconded by Lynch to adjourn. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Bennett, Lynch, Amos, Coolman, Jarvis, Walker