



# DELAWARE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

50 Channing Street, Delaware, Ohio, 43015 Phone 740-833-2260 Fax 740-833-2259

**Philip C. Laurien, AICP, Executive Director**

**\*MINUTES\***

**Tuesday, September 25, 2001 at 7:00 PM  
Delaware Joint Vocational School Auditorium  
1610 St. Rt. 521, Delaware, Ohio 43015**

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

**▪ Call to order**

Chairwoman Foust called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

**▪ Roll Call**

*Representatives present:* Don Poland, Robert Hedrick, Fred Fowler, Jim Ward, Debbie Martin, Don Wuertz, Chad Antle, Chris Bauserman, Dale Simpkins, Cy Schmidt, Wilbur VanHouten Holly Foust, Charles Heimlich, Bill Thurston, Jeannette Curren, Bonnie Newland, Kevin Moran and Larry Starling.

*Alternates present:* Denny Gobert and Tom Farahay. *Arrived after roll call:* Gary Spanner. *Staff present:* Phil Laurien, Paul Deel, Scott Sanders, Da-Wei Liou, Bob Sochor, Joe Clase and Stephanie Matlack.

**II. THOROUGHFARE PLAN DISCUSSION**

Chairwoman Foust explained that this meeting was being held to answer questions from the community and the Commission members. The consultants and Chris Bauserman, County Engineer and Phil Laurien, Director of the DCRPC would be available to discuss the proposed Thoroughfare Plan.

**Public Discussion**

Kathy Lydy (4275 S. Section Line Rd.) asked why the consultants have continued to ignore ODNR's policy that states they would not approve any new Scenic River crossings. This section of the river is vital to the overall health of the Olentangy Scenic River.

Valerie Croasmun of MS Consultants stated that they are not ignoring ODNR. This is a 20-year plan and the model shows a need for a connection in this area. A Thoroughfare Plan map shows a need for connection between roads. The next step is a corridor study that would further define what could be built, if it could be built, what it will be, and environmental concerns.

-----  
David Brown (1557 Bean Oller Road) stated that the majority of the plan seems to benefit the City of Delaware. The loop around the city takes traffic out of the City and puts it into the County.

Ms. Croasmun stated that the Plan was a joint effort between the City and the County. Mr. Bauserman stated that the County was ready to hire a consultant and heard that the City wanted to update their plan. The two offices decided to work together to hire a traffic consultant and share the costs. The City has no authority over the RPC's decision.

-----  
Mr. Fred Watts (4550 S. Section Line Rd.) said that the residents of Concord Twp. has written a letter to Mr. Spanner (Concord Twp. Representative to the DCRPC) requesting that he vote no on this Plan.

Ms. Croasmun said that they met with all the Township Trustees and Zoning officers at several meetings. All the meetings were publicized in several newspapers.

Mr. Watts asked what happened to the I-73 Plan that went behind Wal-Mart. Ms. Croasmun stated that the I-73 alternative was on the preliminary plan and did well in the modeling. I-73 would be a federal roadway and was not pursued by ODOT.

-----  
Ms. Cheryl Atriano (224 Stamford Dr., Powell) asked how is the Thoroughfare Plan road construction (Alt. 1) going to be funded? She talked to ODOT and they said they would not fund this project. The only area they would be interested in is where the Thoroughfare plan connects to existing state road ways not limited access roads. Mr. Bauserman stated that limited access is similar to an interstate, but that doesn't necessarily mean that the roadway would be built like the

interstate. It would mean that you couldn't get on and off it at anyplace you wanted to at driveway locations.

Ms. Atriano asked if it would be similar to Sawmill Parkway. Mr. Bauserman stated that the construction of the roadway would be very similar to Sawmill Parkway but there wouldn't be access points to it like Sawmill Parkway. The Plan is not proposing interstates to be constructed on these routes but it does propose an access management tool called limited access that would mean that these roads have a higher use for moving traffic but are for serving the access to the adjacent land. Ms. Artiano asked if Sawmill Parkway was considered limited access or controlled access. Mr. Bauserman said that it is controlled access as it is built now.

Ms. Croasmun stated that the funding issues are decided at the next step when you look at where roads might go. There are many sources of funding available. Mr. Bauserman stated that ODOT hasn't been asked to fund any of these projects. In the future is an application was made they have state and federal funds available for these types of projects.

-----  
Ms. Ellen Pattito (4135 Section Line Rd.) has heard in the media that there is a shortage of commercial for the growing population. If you can't keep stores downtown, why would you move them out to the country? If it is limited access where would you put the commerce along that roadway? Ms. Croasmun all the Thoroughfare Plan at this point is showing transportation needs and connections. The Townships and the planning commission identify the land use. Transportation and land use should work together. Nancy Reger from the Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission stated that she prepared the land use forecast for the Plan. In doing that, they reviewed local land use plans. In Delaware County commercial is projected primarily along US 23, the west side of Delaware City, at a small area at Cheshire Rd. In northern Liberty Twp. it's low density residential. They did not put in extra development to make these roads happen. They put in development that was likely to occur given the development patterns the County is experiencing.

-----  
Mrs. Barbara Williamson (755 Cheshire Rd.) does want commercial traffic going down their two-lane road. Ms. Croasmun stated this is not intended to be a truck route. Alt. 1 is a link east to west, which is a much needed connection. She

understands that ODOT is looking into 36/37 traffic.

Mr. John Gartland (920 Bean Oller Road) said the majority of traffic is in the southern Townships; Orange, Liberty and Concord. Most of these people want to go in and out of Delaware or Columbus, which is north and south. Very few want to go to London, Ohio or out 36 to I-71 and north. This by-pass will not serve the lion's share of the growth that is coming. The only thing it will serve is to get the trucks out of the City of Delaware and inflict them on them. Mr. Bob Lawler (Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission) did the traffic modeling for this Plan. If you begin at the 42 end of the Cheshire extension the traffic volumes are around 6,000 vehicles a day in the year 2020. As you move further east to the central part of the roadway the volumes climb to 14,000 and as you go further towards US 23 and the Olentangy River those numbers climb to 26,000-27,000 vehicles per day. What the model has found is that it is basically collecting traffic from Section Line Road and Sawmill Parkway and allowing that traffic to change direction from one of those north-south roads to another north south roads in a more efficient way. Alt. 16, which extends US 42 across the river, provides another potential alternative to move across the river and get back up to 36/37.

Mr. Allen Spencer (4308 Olentangy River Rd.) asked how this Plan would protect some of the ravines and naturally wooded areas they are proposed to go through. Ms. Croasmun stated that this is the first step in the process. The corridor study is a more in depth study, which would look at those kinds of things.

-----  
Mr. Ron Bishop (Bean Oller Rd.) stated the traffic count map shows 27,000 vehicles per day on Alt. 1 which is roughly equivalent to what is going on US 23 on the north side of Delaware (31,000). Ms. Croasmun stated that Alt. 16 continues to draw the through traffic on 42. In the future, the through trips will compete more with local trips.

-----  
Ms. Rita Brumley (1316 Bean Oller Rd.) asked if the consultants have actually run the model on traffic going from Section Line to 42? She stated that if you are addressing the traffic continuing on Alt. 16 then is the Alt. 1 connection to 42 really needed or can it just start at Section Line and continue east. Ms. Croasmun said that it was modeled with and without Alt. 16. The result of the model showed that there is a need for Alt. 16 but it doesn't replace the need for the connection down in the south (whether or

not that connection was south of the 315/23 intersection or north or south of Bunty Station Rd.)

Ms. Brumley asked why should a decision be made at this point when the road is not clear? Ms. Croasmun stated that the next step is important and will be done when the public offices can get to them. This particular link was shown in the southern Delaware Thoroughfare Plan (was more south then shown now). If it's not on the Plan then link options have been lost.

-----

Ms. Judy Brozek (West Orange Rd.) stated that the Regional Planning Commission (along with several other elected officials from the State and Townships) supported an application to make 11 miles of SR 315 a State Scenic Highway in 1997. Ms. Brozek asked that if there is an option to place the bypass in an area that is not in a Scenic Byway, why wouldn't that option be chosen? Ms. Brozek re-enforced that SR 315 is not the Scenic Byway. The Scenic Byway is the entire Olentangy River valley that extends to 900-foot elevation. Ms. Croasmun stated that the Thoroughfare Plan is updated every 5-10 years for revisions and updates, but there has to be a plan to work from.

-----

Mrs. Lynn Woolum (4264 Maynard Rd.) asked what phase did the original (Alt. 1) go through before it was denied? Ms. Croasmun stated that the original Alt. 1 was in a similar location as that in the 1987 Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Laurien stated that Bob Gable from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) was present to clarify ODNR's position on new bridges crossing a scenic river. Mr. Laurien said that he would recommend that Alt. 1 should be moved back into the City where it was originally (on the north side of the Ecological Center) and Alt. Y (also requires a bridge crossing) should be removed.

Mr. Bob Gable, Scenic River Program Administrator (ODNR) reiterated Director Speck's letter. The ODNR does not support new bridge crossings. There are primary and secondary impacts to the river with a new bridge crossing. The primary impacts are impacts associated with the construction of the road itself. Sedimentation from the construction, channel chaffing, embankment disturbances, etc. Secondary impacts occur when the road is done, which in the long run could be worse. With more development of road frontage lots there is more impervious

surface, more urban storm water run off, more effluent produced by developments and sewage treatment. The Olentangy River down stream is currently an exceptional warm water habitat stream (very high biological quality). This high quality is a product of its water shed. The adjacent land is still in pretty good shape; it's not overly developed, not being subject to a lot of clearing, and the land use is good.

Mr. Bauserman asked if Mr. Gable believes that the development in this corridor would be driven by the roadway? Do you think that the development won't come if Alt. 1 is not built? Mr. Gable explained that he doesn't think it won't come but the new road will promote new development. Mr. Bauserman said that the proposed roadways in this Plan are in response to the development. If no development occurs anymore then the Plan would not be needed.

Mr. Bauserman asked if a new bridge has ever been constructed over a scenic river in the State of Ohio. Mr. Gable stated that in his 10 years with the Scenic River program, he didn't believe that any new bridges had been built, there have been some re-alignments.

Mr. Farahay asked if Alt. 1 were moved to the City, could they build a new bridge? Also, if this is a pristine area why does the City of Delaware continue to allow building in the flood plain on Stratford Road? Mr. Gable stated that the Scenic River law gives the Director of ODNR approval authority over publicly funded projects not private land use. He also stated that he is on record of having objected to permitting development in the 100-year flood plain. Mr. Gable stated that Ohio is a home rule state therefore the ODNR Director's authority does not extend into the city. If they want to build a new bridge within their City limits, they could.

-----

Mr. George Speese, Chairman of the Thoroughfare Plan Task Force, said that they have focused their efforts in the area between Stratford and the Panhandle Rd. bridge but acknowledges the fact that the City and County need to work together. The original Alt. 1 went through Stratford Woods but was then relocated south of the City by the DCRPC, not the City. The City Task force supports a new interchange at SR 521 and Alt. "Y".

-----

Mr. Kim Cellar (4635 Millwater Drive), Liberty Twp. Trustee stated that he and

his fellow trustees oppose Alt. 1 in its current place. The Township is spending at least \$4,500.00 in an independent traffic study.

Mr. Laurien stated that he has an alternative plan for Alt. 1 but would like to have an opportunity to discuss it with the County Engineer and the consultants.

-----  
Mrs. Dana Bishop (1276 Bean Oller Rd.) stated that she opposes Alt. 1. She recommends looking for less desirable lands for this connection, such as along the power lines, where no one would want to build a home.

-----  
Margaret Meer (S. Section Line Rd.) asked if US 42 were widened and extended and went over the interchange that is being built now then picked up 36/37 going east would be a better option (Alt. 16). Mr. Speese stated that he doesn't believe Alt. 16 helps with West William Street. It helps some with East William St. and not at all with Central Ave. It would help get traffic from the industrial park to I-71.

-----  
Ms. Phyllis Hollifield (4344 Liberty Rd.) asked why is Alt. 1 listed as a City Road Alternative when others are County. Ms. Croasmun said that the Alternatives are labeled for distinction purposes.

Ms. Hollifield said that where Alt. 1 is now is just north of a watershed area. ODNR and OEPA are opposed to this Alt. Why keep it on the plan? Ms. Croasmun stated that Ohio doesn't have a lot of the laws to prevent the development that is occurring. The Thoroughfare Plan is proposed in response to the traffic projected based on those developments. The roadways won't be built unless there is a need for them.

-----  
Paul Adams (Bean Oller Rd.) asked if the modeling makes sense? Has anyone stepped back and looked at the outcome of the modeling and made sure it makes sense? Mr. Lawler (MORPC) said that the software is called TranPlan. This software is used by ODOT. MORPC works closely with ODOT to make sure the procedures they use for the modeling are accurate. MORPC does most of the

modeling in central Ohio. This plan has not been review by ODOT. There are manuals that the public is welcome to come and look at.

Mr. Adams asked what do they need to do to carry out the will of the people. Mr. Lawler explained that models are never perfect so they do stand back and make an objective view. Mr. Laurien stated that the people have come forward and made it clear that they are opposed to Alt. 1. He said that when the time comes to take a vote he hopes to be able to say that there is a plan that can be supported.

-----  
Mr. Mark Cameron (1944 Ford Rd.) asked if the bypass is planned to intersect the roads that it crosses? Ms. Croasmun said that this Plan shows corridors, not specific alignments. As it was modeled as a regional road for the county network, it was modeled as intersecting the major route except for SR 315 and the river area.

Mr. Cameron asked if it was taken into consideration (if modeled that way) of the impacts there would be on the north / south traffic? Ms. Croasmun said that the model is a planning tool. It doesn't go into detail (turning movements, etc.) until the corridor study.

Mr. Cameron said that there are two major existing north / south routes (Liberty Rd. and S. Section Line Rd.) and they move tremendous amounts of traffic, won't that be an impediment to that traffic if you put in intersections? But if you don't put in intersections and bridge them, then you'll create a bypass. Ms. Croasmun agreed.

Mr. Cameron asked that if this Thoroughfare Plan were adopted, what kind of an impact on future property use would there be. Ms. Croasmun stated that the zoning and comprehensive plans that are in place are what is planned. The consultants aren't planning the roads to allow the townships to build a bunch of roads to allow more commercial somewhere. This document is designed to plan roads based on what's been planned in your township.

Mr. Cameron asked if he owned a 100 acre farm that one of these roads was going to go through, and he wanted to split off a few lots, does the County have the ability to stop him and make him provide for future right-of-way? Mr. Bauserman said that if you wanted to split your land into 5 acre tracts or larger, you could do that today as you could in the future without any regulations from the County Engineer or any other government office (providing you have road frontage). If you were proposing a subdivision that was subject to the DCRPC's approval (and the Thoroughfare Plan has been adopted), the Plan would be one of the tools used to evaluate the proposal.

-----  
Mr. Bill Lanklin (Riverside Dr., south of Rte. 42) said that the north / south flow of traffic (Riverside Dr., Olentangy, Sawmill) will hopefully be a tremendous help to the flow. The east / west connector on Powell Road has failed. The Home Road traffic flow is failing. He doesn't believe this Plan will solve that problem. People aren't going to come north to go east or west.  
-----

Mr. John Werner (Liberty Twp. Trustee) complimented those involved in the planning of this document. He has a lot of questions regarding some of the traffic counts and hope those questions get answered by their hired consultant. He believes they need to re-analyze the input data and computer model and determine that what we are basing the decision on is with the most accurate information.  
-----

Mr. David Du Val (Berlin Station Rd.) asked if where the Alt. 3 crosses the R/R is at grade, overpass, or tunnel? Ms. Croasmun stated that the R/R do not do at grade crossings (typically) at this point. Mr. Du Val stated that the R/R was recently changed from a single track to a double track and has become a major thoroughfare for the trains.  
-----

Mr. Bauserman commented that the development would come whether the roads are built or not.

Mr. Laurien stated that the agenda for the regular DCRPC meeting would be very short. The Thoroughfare Plan may be taken off of the table if a representative votes to. Mr. Don Brosius (attorney for the DCRPC) stated that if it is not taken off of the table at Thursday nights meeting it would need to be readvertised and reintroduced to the Commission. Mr. Laurien stated that it could be tabled again at the Thursday meeting.  
-----

Mr. Dale Simpkins (Delaware Township Representative) proposed an alternative 36/37 by pass. (see attached). Mr. Brosius suggested that Mr. Simpkins present his

alternative at the Thursday night meeting also.  
-----

**Mr. Ward made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Cy Schmidt seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

*The next regular meeting of the Delaware County Regional Planning Commission will be Thursday, September 27, 2001, 7:00PM at the Delaware Joint Vocational School North Campus, 1610 St. Rte. 521, Delaware, Ohio 43015.*