

Anderson Township Economic Development Committee

March 22, 2016, 3:30 p.m

Anderson Center Large Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Members present:

Amy Broghamer, Bill Chester, Steve Feagins, Gregg Fusaro, John Halpin, Julie Hein, Kevin Kaufman, Paul Kitzmiller, Donald Nickerson, Zach Peterson, Scot Prebles, Jeff Rosa, Chris Sontag

Members absent:

Nicole Hunter, Joe Mayernik, Mike Paolucci, Jim Tippmann

Others present:

Josh Gerth (Trustee), Steve Sievers (Staff), Sarah Donovan (Planning & Zoning Co-Op)

Mr. Sievers called the meeting to order and asked for individual introductions since there were new members in attendance, and others who were not with us at the January meeting when members provided more detailed backgrounds on their history with the Township.

Mr. Fusaro stated the minutes from the last meeting, on January 26, 2016, were in the packet. Mr. Fusaro asked for any corrections, additions and questions. Dr. Prebles moved, Mr. Kitzmiller seconded, to approve the minutes. The minutes were adopted.

Mr. Sievers announced that the updated "New Resident Guide" was recently updated. Copies are available for members and staff can provide extras for distribution across the community. He outlined how these are distributed to over 80 locations across the community to help market the Township. They are provided to local real estate offices and apartment communities, and are sent each month to those purchasing a home in the township.

Mr. Sievers also provided an Anderson development update, reviewing the information that was provided in the packet, and asked if there were any questions. He indicated additional discussion regarding the proposed subdivision developments, Mayerson, and Skyline would occur shortly as he had images and plans for these development to discuss. The February version of *Anderson Insights* included a feature on the current and upcoming developments in the Township. He concluded by asking if there were any questions or comments.

Dr. Prebles provided an overview of the Forest Hills School District construction activities. He responded that work is currently on time and under budget. They are bidding work at 95% of their estimate and then providing alternates as funds are available. He outlined the construction work occurring at each school, noting that the largest expenses are for improvements at Anderson and Turpin (\$26 Million respectively) and a new Wilson (\$13 Million). He commented that they are still searching for a home for their transportation services, including 80 buses, to move those from the Anderson High School parking lot. Over ten locations across the Township have been reviewed and their staff is currently focusing on the current Administrative Office area, with some possible access out to Wolfangel Road. They realize that this is not the desired location in the heart of Downtown Anderson and all the development that is occurring in the vicinity.

Development Review Updates

Subdivisions - Nordyke Estates, The Oaks of Anderson, Parkside at Riverview Estates

Mr. Sievers provided an overview of a number of ongoing development proposals, which were grouped into three areas: new subdivisions, Stonegate, and Skyline. First, with subdivisions, plans were shared regarding several subdivisions. These included the following, with respective details:

- Nordyke Estates – 5 lots on west side of Nordyke Road near Nottingwood (where access is provided) and opposite Koszo – This was approved by the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission last summer and is being developed by Drees. Lots would be at least 14,000 square feet.
- The Oaks of Anderson – 12 lots on east side of Eversole Road opposite Chesnut Ridge – This was approved by the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission earlier this month and is being developed by Zicka. The underlying zoning allows for 10,000 square foot lots, but they likely will be more than 20,000 square feet.
- Parkside at Riverview Estates – 20 lots at the eastern terminus of Ayers Road, on the north side – This was approved by the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission last summer and is being developed by Zicka. It is now one of three “phases” of a proposed Parkside development, and would likely be the last developed, but is noted as Phase A. The minimum lot size is 1 acre lots per the underlying A-A zoning.
- Parkside at Riverview Estates – 32 lots at the eastern terminus of the former Ayers Road, heading north, just before the extension that became Riverview Estates – This is scheduled for review by the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission on April 7th or May 5th and is being developed by Zicka. This is one of three “phases” of a proposed Parkside development, and would likely be the first built but is being referred to as Phase B. The minimum lot size is 1 acre lots per the underlying A-A zoning.
- Parkside at Riverview Estates – 42 lots on the south side of Hopper Road, opposite Innisfree – A planned unit development overlay is being sought for approximately 23 of the lots, those furthest to the south, as they are not all 1 acre in size, as required by zoning. Instead, the developer is seeking to construct these lots on approximately 25 acres, so the overall density is no greater than 1 unit per acre, hence the PUD overlay request that is being reviewed by the Township’s Zoning Commission on March 28th. If this PUD is approved, the applicant is seeking to have the full subdivision, including these lots and the balance of the development (which allows for lots to no less than 20,000 square feet, to be reviewed on April 7th or May 5th by the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission). This is one of three “phases” of a proposed Parkside development, and would likely be the second built. Hence, staff is referring to it as Phase 2.

Commission members noted how combined this totals 111 lots, which would likely be upscale in nature, especially the lots in the Parkside development. Questions were raised about the development review process, including whether any required zone changes, and how storm water is handled with new development. Discussion also surrounded other subdivisions under development, namely the Fox Brooke Place and Hunter’s Run subdivisions near Clough and Bruns. This pertained to how the price points for these respective single family developments relate to what is currently available in these and other subdivisions, which are mainly built out at this point.

Mayerson – Nagel Road

Mr. Sievers provided background information on a development proposed by The Mayerson Company, who built and owns Stonegate Apartments, for a new multi-family community on the west side of Nagel Road, south of Stonegate Drive. Much of this nearly 9 acre tract is owned by Anderson Township, and a purchase and sale agreement was reached with The Mayerson Company last year. Mayerson seeks to construct up to 182 units, mainly 1 and 2 bedroom (12 of which being 3 bedroom units) in three buildings. This includes below grade parking, some surface parking, and covered parking. The primary access would be off Nagel, opposite Pineterrace with a secondary access through the Township's Operations Center, out to Beechmont Avenue by Applebee's and Fire Station 6.

Mr. Sievers indicated a pre-submittal meeting was held for the proposal on February 23rd and there was a lot of feedback, especially from the surrounding neighborhoods on the east side of Nagel Road. Concerns included the introduction of additional multi-family housing in this area, the need for multi-family housing, the height of the structures, traffic on Nagel Road, the location of a proposed dog park, and impacts on the school system. No zone change has been requested, as this meeting in February was voluntary and is the first step in the development review process. At this point, site plan changes are being considered by the potential applicant, including the addition of turn lanes on Nagel Road (for this community, Pineterrace and Stonegate), reducing the height of all buildings to 3 stories or about 35, removal of the dog park to provide open space about 400' deep along Nagel Road, and additional research on multi-family housing needs and analyzing data from Stonegate.

Members raised a number of questions, focusing first on multi-family need, rent amounts, and whether these could be Section 8. Mr. Fusaro indicated that there are no longer new Section 8 housing complexes, due in large part of the cost of such development. Mr. Fusaro stated that Section 32 program may provide an option, but in markets like Anderson and other desirable communities, the cost of development, government regulations, and subsidized rents leave a gap in financing. The cost of construction greatly impacts the necessary rents to cover costs; thus, this type of housing produce is generally being introduced in more affluent communities where such rents can be achieved. Members noted it's difficult to predict the future, but it was felt that the widespread introduction of Section 8 or subsidized housing into communities rested more with the general demographic or market trends in an area.

Other comments rested related parking counts for 182 units, trends or statistics at Stonegate, accessibility and access in this area (vehicular and pedestrian, etc.). Mr. Sievers stated that the prospective developer is still working to address questions and comments, and some additional information was submitted. Staff is reviewing this and will send it out to the committee, to more general multi-family housing trends in the community and experiences at Stonegate. This will also be helpful to larger discussions on housing types with the comprehensive plan update and in relation to other developments such as One Anderson Place. All other information related to this proposal is available on the website and he encouraged members to review this information to continue our discussion at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Gerth stated that he was interested in committee feedback on this. He felt that the Committee had talked for a long time about housing needs in our community and this sought to address to areas, younger housing and empty nester options. Mr. Sievers added that the early work of the committee, which was part of Property Advisors' work for the Committee in 2009, touched upon the need for more "rooftops" to add demand for retail, restaurants, etc.

Additional questions were raised the target market, using the Avalon development in Eastgate as a suburban-urban example with similar design. Mr. Fusaro stated in that situation, like Anderson, it was the first in Eastgate in years. It was targeted at young professionals, with rents around \$1,200/month, but they have seen an older clientele than expected.

Mr. Sievers added that there has only been one multi-family building constructed in the Township since the early 1990s. This was the 12-unit building at Stonegate, built around 2007. Otherwise, the most recent non-single family development was the Wittshire Glen condominium development in the early 1990s off New England Club Drive. Stonegate was initially developed in the early 1970s, with a townhome development pattern. A subsequent phase in the late 1980s introduced a development pattern with separate living levels or stacked units. There has been no other rental housing constructed in about 30 years.

Dr. Prebles inquired about the secondary access to Beechmont and relationship to other uses, including the new Forest Hills School District Administration Building, which will be occupying the former Coldwell Banker. Mr. Sievers stated this entailed a new driveway that would border the north and west portion of the Township's Operations Center campus, and would then connect to the east-west Anderson Accessway. This provides connections to Beechmont in two locations (including the traffic signal at Applebee's). This drive would go through the existing Township storage area and recycling center, which has been discussed for relocation, and would still accommodate overflow parking for the school district offices.

Mr. Chester asked about the procedure for selling the land. Mr. Sievers noted that townships can sell land with a unanimous vote of the Board of Trustees. Thus, public bidding is not required.

Mr. Chester asked about other uses for this property, and whether offices were considered. Mr. Sievers stated that economic studies of this property started as long as 10 years ago, when the Township studied future uses on this site. Ultimately, the opinion was that the penetration of office or retail this far north would have impacts on the surrounding residential areas and also pull demand from Beechmont and other non-residential areas. Also, in the last couple of years with an emphasis on housing needs, the Township felt this site may be well suited to address this gap. The Mayerson Company, as an abutting and longstanding owner, has expressed interest in developing this site for a decade or more.

Skyline

Mr. Sievers provided background on the proposed Skyline development on the south side of Beechmont Avenue between their existing location (which they lease from UDF) west toward Salem Road. The three adjacent properties were purchased by Ron Rosen, an Anderson resident and the franchisee, who is seeking to build a new Skyline with his offices on the second floor. Mr. Sievers presented the site plan and building elevations, noting Mr. Rosen has worked very hard to address the Township's requests with this redevelopment. This entailed building placement, use of materials, and access to Beechmont.

Speaking of access to Beechmont, Mr. Sievers reviewed the access proposal, which seeks to reduce curb cuts not only on this property but also on that to the east (UDF). This development has spawned UDF to begin considering what they may choose to do with their property, both with their store and the adjacent retail center, which they own. Mr. Sievers stated that with this, discussions have occurred regarding cross access and all parties are working together. This proposal, which entails a planned unit development request, will be reviewed by the Township's Zoning Commission on March 28th.

Members were very supportive of the direction, noting how this will be a dramatic improvement to this area and show reinvestment into this neighborhood. Mr. Sievers commented how they are now talking with UDF about a proposed layout or configuration of redevelopment in this area and will continue to keep the committee updated.

Update / Report on 2015 Committee Initiatives

Due to time, Mr. Fusaro suggested that we forgo the committee reports at this time and encouraged members to review the summaries that were in the packet. Instead, he hoped to briefly shift the conversation to next steps and initiatives for 2016 and beyond, which he hoped to continue at the May meeting.

Next Steps / 2016 Initiatives

Mr. Fusaro stated he really hoped that members would begin thinking about the direction of the committee. The existing subcommittee initiatives are important and continue to guide our efforts. However, he wondered what other ideas were out there, especially for new members. Suggestions or comments raised by the committee included the following:

- Mr. Fusaro commented about the possibility for future enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian connections in the community. He urged the Township to continue to look to efforts to look at bikeways and other infrastructure that could help to foster or connect development with regional and local trails, or bike lanes such as on Beechmont.
- Mr. Halpin commented that the Senior Center and senior or public services, such as recreation, in general are important. It was suggested perhaps we could gauge why do people move or stay here and what can we do to strengthen and market those aspects of our community
- Mr. Hein commented that a greater effort may be undertaken to educate our community on amenities and resources that we have available.
- Mr. Sontag suggested perhaps we can assess why residents leave the community, or for what activities, needs, and how can we look to provide those here in Anderson.
- Mr. Chester suggested that traffic improvements on Beechmont and other areas may be in order, to maintain the vitality of this and other corridors

Again, Mr. Fusaro stated that we would like to continue discussion on future initiatives at the next meeting. Mr. Sievers will pull this information together and we'll attempt to make this a focus of our May gathering. In the meantime, subcommittee meetings will likely be scheduled to help advance current committee initiatives.

Mr. Fusaro announced the next meeting is set for May 24th at 3:30 p.m., unless a special meeting is called. Mr. Sievers stated that we are tentatively planning to meet at Mercy Hospital. Dr. Feagins indicated they would like to host this and discuss the changing nature of health care, then the Committee can then briefly tour the new tower as well.

The meeting closed at 5:09 p.m.