



Philip C. Laurien, AICP, Executive Director

\*MINUTES\*  
**Thursday, September 27, 2001 at 7:00 PM**  
**Delaware Joint Vocational School Auditorium**  
**1610 St. Rt. 521, Delaware, Ohio 43015**

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

- Call to order
- Roll Call
- Approval of August 30, 2001 RPC Minutes
- Executive Committee Minutes of September 19, 2001
- Statement of Policy

**II. VARIANCES (none)**

**III. ZONING MAP/TEXT AMENDMENTS**

- 44-01 ZON Porter Township Zoning Commission – Comp. Land Use Plan review
- 34-01 ZON Harlem Township Zoning Commission – text amendments

**IV. SUBDIVISION PROJECTS**

<u>Preliminary</u>	Township	Lots/Acres
01-98.3.A/B Sage Creek, Sect. 3, Ph.'s A & B acres	Berk./Gen.	20 lots / 51.50
19-01 Sheffield Park acres	Genoa	235 lots/214.10
11-01 W/D Rivercrest, Section 1 acres	Liberty	11 lots / 43.13
 <u>Preliminary/Final</u>		
18-01 The Gates at Hoover No. 2	Genoa	02 lots / 06.64 acres
 <u>Final</u>		
38-95.2 Shellbark Ridge, Phase 2	Genoa	33 lots /15.37 acres
16-00.1W/D Woodland Hall, Sec.1, Ph.'s 1 & 2	Liberty	38 lots /94.46 acres
37-00 T Trotters Gait	Liberty	38 lots /60.27 acres
38-00.14 Walker Woods, Section 14	Orange	34 lots/ 12.72 acres
09-00 T Burnt Pond Farms	Scioto	17 lots /39.28 acres

**T=TABLE REQUESTED, W/D = WITHDRAWN**

**V. EXTENSIONS**

- 35-00 Anaconda Marlboro 05 lots / 29.53 acres

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

- Thoroughfare Plan – Tabled at August 30, 2001 DCRPC meeting

**VII. POLICY / EDUCATION DISCUSSION (none)**

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

**■ Call to Order**

Chairwoman Foust called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**■ Roll Call**

*Representatives present:* Don Poland, Robert Hedrick, Fred Fowler, Debbie Martin, Don Wuertz, Steve Burke, Chad Antle, Chris Bauserman, Dale Simpkins, Leslie Warthman, Cy Schmidt, Wilbur VanHouten, Holly Foust, Charles Heimlich, Dick Gladman, Bill Thurston, Marvin Miller, Jeannette Curren, Bonnie Newland, Kevin Moran, and Larry Starling. *Alternates present:* Tom D'Amico and Karen Koch. *Arrived after roll call:* Jim Ward (R), Tom Hopper (R), Shawn Leininger (A), and Lowell Hetzner (R). *Staff present:* Phil Laurien, Paul Deel, Scott Sanders, Da-Wei Liou, Bob Sochor and Stephanie Matlack.

**■ Approval of the August 30, 2001 RPC Minutes**

*Mr. Gladman made a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting, seconded by Mr. Miller. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

**■ September 19, 2001 Executive Committee Minutes**

**1. Call to order**

*Chairwoman Foust called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Present: Holly Foust, Dick Gladman and Leslie Warthman. Absent: James Ward and Steve Burke. Staff present: Phil Laurien, Joe Clase and Stephanie Matlack.*

**2. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes**

- a. **August 24, 2001 – Mr. Gladman made a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting, seconded by Mrs. Warthman. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.**

**3. Old Business**

- a. **Office Space** – Mr. Laurien stated that he is still working on options for office space.

**4. New Business**

- a. **Financial / Activity Reports for August 2001**  
The Financial report was presented:

**Ending balance as of 07/31/01 \$624,918.98**

<u>Receipts</u>	<u>August</u>	<u>YTD</u>
General Fees (NPA)	\$ 1,815.00	\$ 10,395.00
Inspec. Fees (Transfer)	\$ 120.00	\$ 1,460.00

Fees A (Site Review)	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,300.00
Membership Fees	\$	\$122,017.00
Planning Surcharge (Twp. Assist.)	\$ 811.49	\$ 36,444.46
Charges for Services A (Prel. Appl.)	\$ 2,100.00	\$
78,803.13		
Charges for Services B (Final Appl.)	\$21,650.00	
\$121,486.20		
Charges for Services C (Ext. Fees)	\$ 300.00	\$ 3,750.00
Charges for Services D (Table Fees)	\$ 1,200.00	\$
5,800.00		
Charges for Services E (Appeal/Var)	\$ 300.00	\$ 2,100.00
General Sales	\$ 666.90	\$ 4,250.90
Health Dept. Fees	\$ 2,510.00	\$ 10,180.00
Soil & Water Fees	\$ 350.00	\$ 3,125.00
Other Reimbursements	\$	
Other Reimbursements A	\$	\$ 33.00
Other Reimbursements B	\$	\$
Canceled Warrants	\$	\$
Inter-fund Revenues	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$32,323.39</b>	<b>\$ 402,144.69</b>
<b>Balance after receipts</b>		<b>\$657,242.37</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>\$44,702.10</b>	
<b>End of August balance</b>		<b>\$612,540.27</b>

*Mrs. Warthman made a motion to approve the Financial report for July, seconded by Mr. Gladman. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

- b. **September RPC Preliminary Agenda** – Mr. Laurien presented the preliminary agenda. There are 2 text amendments, 2 Preliminary applications, 1 Preliminary/Final application, 5 Final applications (1 has requested a tabling) and 1 extension request. Mrs. Warthman stated that the engineer for Shellbark Ridge, Phase 2 has not presented her with a revised plat. They are using the signature sheet previously signed prior to the revisions.
- c. **Thoroughfare Plan** – Some alternative scenarios may need to be put through the computer models. Mr. Laurien asked Bob Gable

from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources to attend the September 25<sup>th</sup> Thoroughfare Plan Question & Answer meeting to clarify ODNR’s position on new bridges over the Olentangy Scenic River.

Mr. Laurien stated that some of the alternatives should be moved to the County Plan (from the City Plan) and some should be moved to the City Plan (from the County). The County does not have jurisdiction of planning within the City limits (and visa versa).

- d. **2002 Budget meeting schedule** – A special meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 3<sup>rd</sup> at 8:30 to review the proposed 2002 budget.

**5. Other Business**

**a. Contract Updates**

- (1) **Kingston Twp.** – Introductory meeting was held, will start regular meetings later this month
- (2) **Concord Twp.** – Introductory meeting was held, will start regular meetings later this month
- (3) **Trenton Twp.** – Introductory meeting was held for Zoning Commission, will start later this year or after the first of the year
- (4) **Village of Sunbury** – will start after first of the year
- (5) **Berkshire Twp.** – contract signed to revise the zoning code, work has begun

6. **Personnel** – Mr. Laurien introduced Scott Sanders to the Committee. He will be filling the vacant Planner I position. He received a Master’s of Science degree in Planning from the University of Tennessee.

Bob Sochor will begin working on 9/24/01 to fill the Planner I / GIS Operator position. Mr. Sochor has a Bachelor’s degree in Geography from Kent State University. He has 3 years of GIS experience with the Del. Co. Sanitary Engineer.

**7. Adjourn** –

Having no further business, *Mrs. Warthman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Gladman. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

***There will be a special Executive Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 3 at 8:30 a.m. to discuss the proposed 2002 DCRPC Budget in the 2nd Floor conference room at 50 Channing Street, Delaware, Ohio, 43015***

***The next regular Executive Committee meeting will be Wednesday, October 17, 2001 at 8:30 a.m. in the 2nd Floor conference room at 50 Channing Street, Delaware, Ohio, 43015***

**■ Statement of Policy**

As is the adopted policy of the Regional Planning Commission, all applicants will be granted 10 minutes to make their formal presentation. The audience will then be granted up to 10 minutes to speak, at which time the chair will allow questions from the members of the Commission. This policy was adopted by the Regional Planning Commission to provide for the orderly discussion of business scheduled for consideration.

**II. VARIANCES** (none)

**III. ZONING MAP/TEXT AMENDMENTS**

**34-01 ZON Harlem Township Zoning Commission – text amendments**

**Applicant:** Harlem Township Zoning Commission

**Request:** Amendments to the Harlem Township Zoning Resolution.

**Staff Comments**

The Harlem Township Zoning Commission is proposing minor revisions to the Township Zoning Resolution. The changes are as follows:

**Agricultural Residential District (Article VII)**

An addition to the purpose section (7.01) states that this district is also intended to provide for large lot single family residences on 5 acre lots or larger. The previous text did not provide for residential uses.

**Minimum Lot size: (Article VII, VIII, and IX)**

The Minimum lot size must now adhere to a **net** acreage requirement that excludes road rights of way and easements. In addition, the minimum lot size in the Farm Residential District (Article XIII) will increase from 1 acre to 2 acres. Since 1 acre will no longer be permitted, the 150' frontage requirement has been deleted (2 acre lots will continue to be required to have 175' of frontage).

**Staff comment:** The township should define net acre in Article IV Definitions. As proposed, it is unclear whether right of way or easements are to be excluded or not. Also, is the intent to allow ponds to be calculated as part of the lot or is it the townships desire to exclude ponds from the net acreage?

It should also be noted that the 1988 Harlem Township Master Plan does not clearly define a minimum lot size although it appears that a goal of the residents was that lots should be a minimum of 1.25 acres. If it is the desire of the township to require at least 2 acres then the Master Plan should be amended in conjunction with these text amendments.

**Building Dimension (Floor space requirement)**

An increase in the minimum floor area is proposed for:

Single family dwellings \* (Article VII, VIII, IX, XI, and XII)

Dwelling type	Current	Proposed
	Sq. ft. (1 <sup>st</sup> floor above grade)	Sq. ft. (1 <sup>st</sup> floor above grade)
1 story	1,200	1,500
1 ½ story	1,500 (900)	1,875 (1,125)
Earth-berm and underground **	1,200	1,500
Split-level	1,600 (1,000)	2,000 (1,250)
Bi-level	1,600 (1,000)	2,000 (1,250)
2 story	1,800 (900)	2,250 (1,125)

\* Garages must have a minimum 480 sq. ft. (currently 240 sq. ft. is required)

\*\* Currently not provided for in Article VIII, but is added in amendments.

**Apartments and Multi-family structures (Article XI, XII, XIV, and XV)**

Type	Current	Proposed
	Sq. ft.	Sq. ft.
One (1) bedroom unit	800	1000
Two (2) bedroom unit	900	1125
Three or more bedroom units	1000	1250

**Density (Article XI)**

The maximum density for Planned Residential developments has been reduced from 2 units/acre to 1.5 units/acre. All density bonus criteria/incentives have been

deleted.

**Staff comment:** Harlem Township is still primarily an agricultural township and much of the existing infrastructure cannot adequately support high-density developments. In a rural township, 1.5 units/ acre without sewer may still be too high. Golf Village in Liberty Township is 1.5 units/acre with county sewer.

**Miscellaneous**

The remaining amendments include minor editing and deletion of page references.

**Staff Recommendation**

The *staff recommends conditional approval* of the text amendments to the Regional Planning Commission, the Harlem Township Zoning Commission, and the Harlem Township Trustees, subject to staff comments.

**Commission / Public Comments**

Mr. Cy Schmidt explained that the amendments being requested were small and have all been recommended by the Zoning Commission.

**Mr. Cy Schmidt made a motion to recommend approval of the text amendments to the Harlem Township Zoning Resolution, Mr. Poland seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.**

-----  
**44-01 ZON                    Porter Township Zoning Commission – Comprehensive Land Use Plan review**

**Applicant:** Porter Township Zoning Commission  
**Request:** Review and comment on the proposed Porter Township Comprehensive Plan 2000.

**I. Procedure**

Ohio Revised Code 713.23 (5) states a duty of the RPC to “ review, evaluate, and make comments and recommendations on proposed and amended comprehensive land use ... plans of local units of government and make recommendations to achieve compatibility in the region.”

**II. General**

The Porter Township Trustees and Zoning Commission initiated an update to the 1985 Porter Township Comprehensive Plan by contracting with the Delaware County Regional Planning Commission (DCRPC) as provided by ORC 713.23 (4). The plan has been the subject of 12 months work by a land use

steering committee of Zoning Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals, landowners and residents. A draft text and map have been revised and sent, with the unanimous support of the Zoning Commission, to the DCRPC for our statutory review.

**III. Executive Summary of the Porter Township Comprehensive Plan 2000**

Porter Township has experienced modest to slow growth while being in the northeast corner of the fastest growing County in the State of Ohio. Its’ projected 2.72% annual growth rate from 1990-2000 was half the rate of Delaware County as a whole, and slower than the state of Ohio overall growth rate.

**A. Key Characteristics of the Porter Township Comprehensive Plan 2000**

1. Porter Township is a rural community with a strong agricultural base. Approximately 84% of the township is in agricultural production or undeveloped.
2. Population grew from 1,345 in 1990 to 1,696 by the 2000 census, an increase of 26%.
3. Single family residential use accounts for 11 % of the lands. Commercial/industrial activity is low with less than 0.5 %.
4. With the arrival of Del-Co water in 1997, increased lot split and minor subdivision activity occurred.
5. Agricultural acreage has decreased slightly in the last two decades as new lots have been created. Loss of farmland is a concern regarding growth and land use.
6. Traffic is not a significant problem, but as additional vehicles are put on these roads the functional classification begins to change from farm-to-market to collector and arterial streets. Collector roads need to be widened, but some narrow roads are considered part of the scenic character. Many of the township roads are unimproved or gravel.
7. Porter Township has significant natural beauty in its ravines and creeks that need protection.
8. There is a variety of housing for different income level families in the township. 89% of all housing is in very good condition.
9. There are 600 housing units within Porter Township, all single-family.
10. The Polaris area eight miles south of US 36 has been a huge job and traffic generator for Delaware County. As land becomes more scarce and expensive there, northerly commercial expansion up the US 23 corridor, along the US 36 corridor, and at the US 36/ I-71 interchange

- becomes more viable. This in turn encourages further sprawl into the northern communities of the County.
11. Access management principles to limit curb cuts can help prevent the deterioration of the State Highways in Porter Township.
  12. There is adequate potable water supplied by the Del Co Water Company, but summertime lawn watering taxes its ability to maintain treatment and pressure. A significant percentage of residents are still dependent on wells.
  13. Delaware County does not provide sanitary sewer to Porter Township, nor is sewer expected anytime in the foreseeable future.
  14. The Big Walnut School system is growing at a similarly slow to moderate pace as the township.
  15. Porter/Kingston Fire District provides fire protection with on-call volunteers.
  16. There is a small township park, and Big Walnut Creek provides passive open space and recreation.

## **B. Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan**

### **CATEGORY: COMMUNITY VISION**

#### **Goal # 1**

**To retain rural character, and maintain economically viable agriculture.**

#### Objectives

- A.) Keep a friendly atmosphere for agriculture by considering flexible agriculture/open space zoning and maintaining views/vistas from road – large open areas and woods.
- B.) Establish/maintain deep Township road setbacks.
- C.) Maintain narrow two lane roads.

#### **Goal # 2**

**To make the vision for future development as inclusive as possible**

#### Objectives

- A.) Permit a variety of housing options.
- B.) Gain community wide acceptance of comprehensive plan and zoning amendments.

### **CATEGORY: ENVIRONMENT**

#### **Goal #3**

**To preserve woods and forestland**

#### Objectives

- A.) Require reforestation of cut trees in new developments.
- B.) Adopt flexible zoning/subdivision techniques that encourage retained forests.

#### **Goal # 4**

**To preserve a high degree of environmental quality**

#### Objectives

- A.) Maintain high quality stream water.
- B.) Discourage super high-density agriculture.
- C.) Adopt regulations establishing lighting standards for the protection of celestial observation.

#### **Goal #5**

**To define appropriate areas for growth, while maintaining an environment conducive to wildlife**

#### Objectives

- A.) Prohibit residential/commercial development in 100-year floodplains.
- B.) Maintain and preserve wildlife corridors, streams/underpasses, grasslands/bird nesting areas, and significant wetlands as part of PRD's.
- C.) Use creative zoning to preserve large tracts of open land conducive to wildlife. (See Chapter 11 for description of wildlife).

### **CATEGORY- LAND USE**

#### **Goal # 6**

**To retain an overall low density**

#### Objectives

- A.) Make some areas of the township very low density to preserve farmland.

#### **Goal # 7**

**To provide appropriate recreation or managed open space**

#### Objectives

- A.) Establish bike/hike path.
- B.) Encourage expansion of the existing park and development of

recreation/park areas in PRD/PUD's.

**Goal #8**

**To allow appropriate compact commercial uses**

Objectives

- A.) Permit commercial uses around Olive Green, as part of a Planned District.
- B.) Permit institutional uses such as nursing homes as compatible land uses in residential areas with certain performance and environmental standards.

**Goal # 9**

**To avoid inappropriate sprawl**

Objectives

- A.) Avoid strip commercial development.
- B.) Delay/defer extension of County sanitary sewer.

**Goal # 10**

**To provide an articulate plan for the future**

Objectives

- A.) Revise Porter Township's comprehensive plan to current standards.
- B.) Revise comprehensive plan map with densities and land uses.
- C.) Blend land uses along borders with other townships.
- D.) Revise Township Zoning to conform to the Comprehensive Plan.

**C. Comprehensive Land Use Plan (map)**

The Porter Township Comprehensive Plan 2000 (map) embodies the policies and principles of the text of the plan and should be adopted in its entirety. If the township develops in accordance with the Porter Township Comprehensive Plan 2000, the ultimate maximum population would be approximately 14,000 with an aggressive farmland preservation policy and limited on-site central sewer (OEPA approved treatment systems). If agricultural lands were sacrificed for developments with centralized sewer everywhere in the township the population would be approximately 25,000.

**IV. Staff Findings and Recommendation**

- Porter Township has followed an appropriate planning process to evaluate

their goals and objectives for future growth.

- Porter Township has created a comprehensive land use plan map in ArcView and in paper form of at least 1"=1000' scale that is site specific with a land use and density recommendation for each parcel in the township.

Staff finds that the Porter Township Comprehensive Plan 2000 is compatible with regional planning goals and *recommends approval* to the DCRPC, Porter Twp. Zoning Commission and Porter Twp. Trustees.

**Commission / Public Comments**

*Mr. Gladman made a motion to recommend approval of the Porter Township Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

**IV. SUBDIVISION PROJECTS**

**Preliminary**

**01-98.3.A/B Sage Creek, Section 3, Phases A & B – Berkshire/Genoa Twp.'s – 20 lots / 51.50 acres**

**Applicant:** Trenton Land Co.

**Subdivision Type:** Single Family Residential

**Location:** East-side of Sunbury Road, about 6,200 feet north of Harlem Road, Berk./Gen. Twp.

**Current Land Use:** Woods

**Zoned:** Farm Residential District (FR-1) in Berkshire & Rural Residential (RR) in Genoa

**Utilities:** Del-Co water and private septic

**School District:** Big Walnut

**Engineer:** Bischoff & Associates, Inc.

**Staff Comments**

This is the third section of the Sage Creek Subdivision. The first 2 sections include 42 lots on 91.13 acres in Genoa Township and contain a private, gated street (Sage Creek Drive) connecting Sunbury Road to Trenton Road. Section 1 has been recorded while Section 2 is currently under construction. Section 3 will include a new street off of Sage Creek Drive to serve 11 lots (Phase B). The 9 remaining lots and a 4.44-acre open space reserve will be platted along Sage Creek Drive (Phase A). All streets within the development are private.

The lot sizes range from 1.37 to 3.61 acres. Three of the proposed lots are partially within Genoa Township. The development would utilize Del-Co water and contain individual on site septic systems, including several mound systems and some potential drip irrigation systems. The consulting engineer has been working with the Health Department for approval of all proposed systems.

The property is located on the east side of Sunbury Road along the north side of the Genoa Township line. This site is heavily wooded and contains a stream flowing from east to west, which ultimately feeds into the Hoover Reservoir. Surrounding land uses are single-family residences along Sunbury Road including the Sage Creek Subdivision under construction to the immediate south, agriculture and undeveloped land to the north, and the Hoover Reservoir to the west. The surrounding zoning is mostly Agricultural District (A-1) with scattered Farm Residential District (FR-1) in Berkshire and Rural Residential (RR) to the south in Genoa. Section 3 was rezoned to FR-1 last year (32-00 ZON).

A technical review was held on July 17, 2001, after which the applicant has addressed most of the required changes, except the following:

- Acreage of lot 55 is different on sheets 1 and 3.
- Access to lots 58 and 59 should be restricted to Sage Creek Drive.
- Sage Creek Drive is already platted in Section 1 and should not be part of this Section. Revise acreage totals as well.
- Lot 43 contains a building pad in a ravine within 10 feet of a seasonal stream.
- Lot 54 may be affected by 100-year storm and access to the house requires crossing a stream and steep topography. (Very Suspect)
- Lot 55 contains a building pad on 24% slope. (Very Suspect).
- Detailed grading plans will be required and reviewed at final engineering. Recommend a variance for lot 59 from 90' front setback to shift pad to the north.
- Building pad location on Lot 56 questionable. Could be moved to the north to avoid steeper slopes.
- All proposed finished grades seem low. This must be resolved prior to final engineering approval.

Additional comments:

- If lots 54 and 55 are not approved for on-site wastewater treatment or an appropriate area for a house cannot be identified, then they shall be incorporated into the open space reserve or the adjacent building lots.

- Phase B shall not be platted until Sage Creek Section 2 is recorded.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends *conditional Preliminary approval* of **Sage Creek, Section 3, Phases A & B** to the RPC, subject to staff comments and the submission of a revised preliminary plan.

#### **Commission / Public Comments**

Mr. Ed Bischoff with Bischoff & Associates stated that he agrees with all of the staff comments.

Mr. John Sabo (a member of the audience) stated that after heavy rains in the spring, those 20 leach fields would most likely cause damage to the stream that is in this subdivision. He asked why the applicant wasn't using a sewer treatment plant for that many lots. Mr. Bischoff stated that the septic systems were approved by the Board of Health. They do require curtain drains around the leach fields to keep from having the ground water get into the leach field. Mr. Sabo stated that being a plumber he has seen leach fields fail down Cheshire Rd. and Braumiller Rd. If you flush green dye into any of those septic systems, you'll see it in the river that it flows to. Mr. Burke with the Delaware City-County Health Department stated that he would be interested in getting those addresses from Mr. Sabo with questionable systems.

Mr. Bauserman questioned the requirement for a revised preliminary plan. Does that mean the applicant must return to the Commission for approval? Mr. Deel stated that they just need to submit a revised plan to the Regional Planning office.

Chairwoman Foust asked if all the staff comments were included in the comments provided at the Technical Review meeting? Mr. Deel said they were. Chairwoman Foust asked why we are recommending conditional approval with such a long list of corrections that need to be addressed. Mr. Bischoff stated that several of the comments have already been dealt with. The Building Dept. has now approved some of the building pads. The only comments that the applicant hasn't completely dealt with yet are the two lots that they are working with the Board of Health for leach system approval. If those lots do not get Health Department approval, they will become reserve lots. Mr. Deel stated that most of the comments were discussed with the Building Dept. today and feels they can be resolved.

Mr. Poland stated that in the amount of ground in this subdivision, Berkshire Township would not be in favor of a variance. The Township would prefer them to increase the size of the lots or do away with the lot.

***Mr. Miller made a motion for conditional Preliminary approval of Sage Creek, Section 3, Phases A and B, subject to staff comments. Mr. Moran seconded the***

**motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.**

**19-01 Sheffield Park – Genoa Twp. - 235 lots / 214.10 acres**

**Applicant:** Virginia Homes  
**Subdivision Type:** Single Family Residential  
**Location:** West side of Worthington Road, north of Jaycox Road, Genoa Twp.  
**Current Land Use:** Agriculture and two Single-family homes  
**Zoned:** Planned Residential District (PD-1)  
**Utilities:** Del-Co water and public sewer  
**School District:** Olentangy  
**Engineer:** CF Bird & RJ Bull, Inc.

**Surrounding land uses**

**West** – I-71 & 3.8 acre vacant parcel  
**East** – Vacant/Agriculture  
**North** – Large-lot Single-family homes, agriculture and woods  
**South** – Single-family homes

**Staff Comments**

Sheffield Park is a proposed subdivision of 235 lots on 214.10 acres on the north side of Jaycox Road, east side of I-71, and west side of Worthington Road, with approximately 12 acres on the east side of Worthington Road. There will be 85.13 acres of open space provided in 8 reserve lots (39.76 %), including 26.71 acres at the western end of the subdivision that will be dedicated to the Township. A new limited access collector road (Sheffield Park Drive) will be constructed near the west end of the property at Jaycox Road extending through the site to Worthington Road. A series of loop streets provide access to this new street. Jaycox Road will “T” into Sheffield Park Drive. Two stubs are proposed along the north property line for future development of the adjacent tract. Access to the 12 acres to the east will line up with the proposed Sheffield Park Drive to the west. This street will stub to the east property line for potential future extension. The development also utilizes 2 “eyebrows”, which have been approved by the Township. The plan also provides additional right-of-way on Jaycox Road for future improvements of the sharp “S” curve.

The site is rolling with ravines and some wooded areas. There are 4 storm water detention ponds proposed including 3 west of Worthington Road (1 existing pond) and 1 east. Delaware County Sanitary sewer can serve this site if the developer can

obtain an easement to a 21” interceptor at Big Walnut Road to the southwest (This off-site easement is shown on the plan). There is adequate capacity for the development density proposed according to the Sanitary Engineer. Del-Co water is available via a 10” line on Worthington Road and a 4” line on Jaycox Road. Del-co indicates that the static pressure at the high points of the property will be less than 50 PSI for homes above 979 elevation. While this is in the acceptable range (35 PSI – 90 PSI), it is considered to be low.

A technical review was held on September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2001, after which the applicant has addressed most of the required changes, except the following:

- Ramblewood Court should be a through street connection to the vacant land to the north.
- This plan will leave a devil strip that will prevent access to around 10 acres on Worthington Road. This should be eliminated. Note: The strip has been eliminated on the revised plan, but the right-of-way has not been adjusted.
- Building pads for lots 6-8 appear to be in a swale.
- Show stormwater routing path.
- Proposed finished grade elevations for some buildings indicating excessive differences from one lot to another.
- Lot 212 – proposed elevation of 961.0 appears to be a typographical error (981.0?)
- What happens to the portion of the original property that lies within the R-O-W of I-71? It appears to be overlooked.
- Is any of Worthington Road or Jaycox Road being dedicated?

**Additional Comments**

- Show building pad and finished grade elevation for lot 234.
- Show all existing structures and note which ones are to be removed, if any.
- Contact the Army Corps of Engineer for any required permits to develop areas around waters of the US. If a redesign is necessary, then a new preliminary plan shall be submitted for those sections affected.
- Contact Map Dept. for preferred street naming of Jaycox Rd/Sheffield Park Drive and for approval of new street names.
- What is to become of the portion of Jaycox Road that will be vacated to accommodate the “T” intersection with Sheffield Park Drive?
- The Rammelsburg property must be included within the boundaries of the subdivision (Lots 234 and 235). Lot 235 is the only lot permitted access to Worthington Road (existing driveway).



**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends *conditional Preliminary approval* of **Sheffield Park** to the RPC, subject to staff comments and the resubmission of a revised preliminary plan.

**Commission / Public Comments**

Mr. Andrew Gardner of Bird + Bull Engineering was present. He stated that a Phase 1 Environmental Study has been completed on this project. There is approximately 1.5 acres of wetlands and 4,000 feet of stream. He has had conversations with the Army Corp. of Engineers. He has received a letter from them stating that the applicant has contacted them and they are in the process of further assessing the wetlands to see what permits they'll need to obtain. Based on the Phase 1 study, the streams are covered by a national permit, provided they stay under 300' of disturbance. The plan provides for 2 culverts with less than 300' total. Regarding the "devil strip", the first street has been moved approximately 15' to the east to plat a 60' ROW (right of way) and allow for wider lots on the west side of that drive. The Map Dept. is in the process of reviewing the name Jaycox Road for alternatives. The triangular piece of property at Jaycox Road will be dedicated as ROW.

Mrs. Warthman stated that there is a revised preliminary needs to be submitted due to the fact that she has been guaranteed additional plat notations. Also, any permits needed to fill the ravine would require approval from the Township. The Township does not desire filling ravines. If there are two lots that can't be built, then they prefer to see the houses moved.

***Mr. Gladman made a motion for conditional Preliminary approval subject to staff comments and comments made by Mrs. Warthman on behalf of the Township. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.***

-----  
**11-01    W/D        Rivercrest, Section 1- Liberty Twp. - 11 lots / 43.13 acres**

**\*\*This application was withdrawn by the applicant.\*\***

-----  
**Preliminary/Final**

**18-01                The Gates at Hoover No. 2 - Genoa Twp. - 02 lots / 06.64 acres**

**Applicant:** Robert Weiler, Jr.  
**Subdivision Type:** Single Family Residential  
**Location:** East-side of Sunbury Road, about 200 feet north of Big Walnut Road, Genoa Twp.  
**Current Land Use:** Single-family home and woods  
**Zoned:** Rural Residential District (RR)  
**Utilities:** Del-Co water and individual on site septic systems  
**School District:** Westerville  
**Engineer:** Scioto Land Surveying

**Staff Comments**

This is the re-subdivision of two lots (Lot 5617 and 5618) from the previously approved The Gates at Hoover and an adjacent 2.07 acre parcel. The result will be 2 larger lots (3.46 and 3.17 acres). The original subdivision contains 12 lots on 25.58 acres with lots ranging from 2 to 2.5 acres. The lots are arranged around a 14' wide one-way private loop street that has been constructed and approved by the County Engineer. Both of the proposed lots will gain access from the private street, with the southern parcel gaining access via easement through the northern parcel. Vehicular access will be prohibited to Sunbury Road. There is a drainage easement on both lots, which is mostly floodplain. None of the proposed leach fields will be within the floodplain.

Surrounding land use includes the Hoover Reservoir is to the east, USA lands to the west, and scattered single family residences along Sunbury Road including Johnstown Acres subdivision to the south.

A technical review was held on September 18, 2001, after which the applicant has addressed all of the required changes.

**The applicant has presented to the RPC Office a Final Plat (mylar) signed by the various County agencies, a requirement for Final approval.**

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends *Preliminary and Final approval* of The Gates at Hoover, No. 2, to the RPC.

**Commission / Public Comments**

Mr. Frank Celio of Scioto Land Surveying Service was present to answer any questions from the Commission.

***Mr. Simpkins made a motion for Preliminary and Final approval of the Gates at Hoover No. 2. Mr. Moran seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0***

*Opposed. Motion carried.*

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairwoman Foust asked if there were any Final applications the Commission wished to have removed from the Consent agenda. There were none.

*Mr. Simpkins made a motion for Final approval of Shellbark Ridge, Phase 2 and Walker Wood, Section 14. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

**Final**

**38-95.2 Shellbark Ridge, Phase 2 – Genoa Twp. - 33 lots / 15.37 acres**

**Applicant:** Kenneth F. Danter, Highland Woods, Ltd.  
**Subdivision Type:** Single-family Residential  
**Location:** West side of Tussic Street Road, north of Maxtown Road, Genoa Twp.  
**Current Land Use:** Vacant  
**Zoned:** Planned Residential District (PD-1)  
**Utilities:** Del-Co Water and Public Sewer  
**School District:** Westerville  
**Engineer:** Bauer, Davidson & Merchant, Inc.

**Staff Comments**

The applicant is requesting final approval of Shellbark Ridge, Phase 2 in Genoa Township. This phase contains 33 lots on 15.37 acres and will complete the final leg of the Hawksbeard Drive connection from Old 3C Highway to Tussic Street Road. Hawksbeard Drive will include a boulevard entrance from Tussic Street Road. Phase 2 will also connect to Sherbrook Phase 9 to the south (Nightshade Drive). Wallpepper Court is a cul-de-sac extending to the west from Hawksbeard Drive. There are 3 open space reserves (1.71 acres) proposed including the boulevard entrance strip. The lots are typically 14,750 sq. ft. Shellbark Ridge received overall preliminary approval on February 21<sup>st</sup>, 1996, with 170 lots on 75.9 acres. Phase 1, 3 and 4 to the north and west are recorded.

**The applicant has presented to the RPC Office a Final Plat (mylar) signed by the**

**various County agencies, a requirement for Final approval.**

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends *Final approval* of the **Shellbark Ridge, Phase 2**, to the RPC.

**Commission / Public Comments**

*Mr. Simpkins made a motion for Final approval of Shellbark Ridge, Phase 2. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

**16-00.1 Woodland Hall, Section 1, Phases 1 & 2 – Liberty Twp. - 38 lots / 94.46 acres**

**\*\*Withdrawn by the applicant.\*\***

**37-00 Trotters Gait – Liberty Twp. - 38 lots / 60.27 acres**

**Applicant:** Timberrock LLC  
**Engineer:** Kurt Ziessler, P.E., Hockaden & Associates

**Staff Comments**

The applicant has requested to table Trotters Gait for 90 days for the completion of the private roads. This is the second table request of this application.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends *tabling* of Trotters Gait for 90 days, to the RPC. This application will be placed on the December 2001 RPC meeting agenda, unless requested earlier by the applicant.

**Commission / Public Comments**

*Mr. Ward made a motion to approve the 90-day table request for Trotters Gait subdivision. Mr. Gladman seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried*

signatures. This is the second table request of the Burnt Pond Farms subdivision.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff *recommends the 90-day tabling* of **Burnt Pond Farms**, to the RPC. This application will be placed on the December 20, 2001 RPC meeting, unless requested earlier by the applicant.

**Commission / Public Comments**

*Mr. Ward made a motion to approve the 90-day table request for Burnt Pond Farms. Mr. Gladman seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried*

-----

**V. EXTENSIONS**

**35-00 Anaconda – Marlboro Twp. - 05 lots / 29.53 acres**

**Applicant:** Vista Land Company, LLC  
**Engineer:** Frank Celio, Scioto Land Surveying Service, Inc.

**Staff Comments**

The applicant has requested a six (6) month extension of the Preliminary approval, due to being delayed by their contractor’s workload.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of the *six (6) month extension* of Anaconda Subdivision, to the RPC.

**Commission / Public Comments**

*Mr. Miller made a motion for a 6-month extension for the Anaconda Subdivision. Mr. Moran seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

-----

*\*Mr. Gladman left the meeting at 7:40 p.m. Current attendance 25.  
\*\* Mr. Lowell Hetzner arrived at 7:45 p.m. Current attendance 26.*

**38-00.14 Walker Woods, Section 14 – Orange Twp. - 34 lots / 12.72 acres**

**Applicant:** Planned Communities, Inc.  
**Subdivision Type:** Single-family Residential  
**Location:** North-side of E. Powell Road, east of South Old State Road, Orange Twp.  
**Current Land Use:** Vacant  
**Zoned:** Single-family Planned Residential (SF-PRD)  
**Utilities:** Del-Co Water and Public Sewer  
**School District:** Olentangy  
**Engineer:** Adam Long, EMH&T

**Staff Comments**

This is the continued platting of the Walker Wood Subdivision. Sections 14 includes 34 lots on 12.72 acres with lots ranging from 9,600 to 12,500 sq., ft. This section includes the extension of Maxwell Avenue from Section 8 (west) to Section 10 (east) and the connection of Reeves Avenue from Section 13 (west) with Maxwell Avenue. Charline Court is a proposed cul-de-sac extending to the north from Maxwell Avenue. This site was rezoned to SFPRD from FR-1 in April 1996 (case # 12-96). The preliminary subdivision plan for Section 13 and 14 was approved in September of 2000.

**The applicant has presented to the RPC Office a Final Plat (mylar) signed by the various County agencies, a requirement for Final approval.**

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends *Final approval* of the **Walker Wood, Section 14**, to the RPC.

**Commission / Public Comments**

*Mr. Simpkins made a motion for Final approval of Walker Wood, Section 14. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried*

-----

**09-00 Burnt Pond Farms – Scioto Twp. - 17 lots / 39.28 acres**

**Applicant:** John R. Chabria, Edward A. Kemmler Foundation  
**Engineer:** IEG Inc.

**Staff Comments**

The applicant is requesting a tabling of the final plat for 90 days to obtain required

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

▪ **Thoroughfare Plan – Tabled at August 30, 2001 DCRPC meeting**

*Mr. Miller made a motion to remove the Delaware County Thoroughfare Plan from the table. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.*

*Mr. Miller made a motion to postpone the Thoroughfare Plan vote until the October RPC meeting. Mrs. Koch seconded the motion.* Mr. Miller stated that in support of his motion, he wanted to point out that everyone should be aware that this plan has to be somewhat controversial due to the inordinate amount of time everyone has spent on it, the amount of public interest, and the amount of people's comments. When you have a situation like this you do one of two things. You compromise, which means you explore alternatives and see if you can peacefully come to some solution that makes everybody happy. Or, you let the attorneys settle it and a judge make the final decision. Any vote on the plan tonight would be premature.

Mrs. Martin recognized Mr. Miller's motion but pointed out that the alternatives (for Alt. 1) being proposed are all within the wide swath already on the Plan. She stated that voting on the Plan as is would not eliminate any of the alternatives.

Chairwoman Foust stated that each Commission member would have a chance to speak but before they speak a second time, everyone who wants to speak the first time has to have the opportunity.

Mr. Starling asked if it was the responsibility of the Regional Planning Commission to decide exactly where the lines are on the Plan or are they just approving the Plan. Chairwoman Foust stated that the lines are corridors, not specific alignments.

Mrs. Koch stated that it was her understanding that there are alternatives that can be considered to move the swath to an area that's not so disruptive to the citizens of Concord Township and Liberty Township. She asked the Commission to take time to consider anything that Mr. Laurien may present as an alternative. [Mr. Laurien presented some alternatives at a Question and Answer session held September 25, 2001.]

Mr. Ward said that he believes the swath is too large. He doesn't think it is fair to go forward without at least exploring Mr. Laurien's ideas of other ways of doing the routes without injuring SR 315, the Olentangy Valley and the river.

Mr. Poland asked if the new proposal that Mr. Laurien is proposing was included in what we have already spent \$5,000.00 in modeling? Mr. Laurien stated that there are several alternatives (not just Alt. 1) that he thinks could be reexamined. Both adding and moving/removing to try and still have a good network of roads but hopefully one that is less controversial. He thinks that the issue of the Scenic River (for him) is the most problematic. We have been told that Alt. 1 and Y are not going to be approved by ODNR at this time. He would like to have the consultants run some alternatives through the model and see if we can use existing bridge crossings or avoid bridge crossings and still have a network that the consultant and the County Engineer are satisfied with. He said that he has shown his proposal to the County Engineer. Mr. Laurien stated that 95% of the plan would not change.

Mr. Bauserman said that he doesn't feel it is appropriate for the Commission to table this discussion. The RPC has had 4 meetings to consider this Plan. Over 30 public meetings have been held over the past two years to get the Commission to this point. He saw Mr. Laurien's proposal on Wednesday and doesn't agree that 95% of the plan stays unchanged with his proposals. The alternative he proposes has already been discussed at length and drew more opposition than the current Plan. Mr. Laurien's proposal takes this road through the Stratford Ecological Preserve lands. (Mr. Laurien disagreed) Mr. Bauserman believes that the longer the Commission waits, the less likelihood of arriving at any kind of Plan. He also stated that the swath was put into the Plan at Mr. Ward's request. He believes the Plan before the Commission is a good plan that addresses the long-term transportation needs of Delaware County.

Chairwoman Foust stated that some of the traffic projections in 2020 on Alt. 1 are very questionable. Liberty Township's preference is for the Plan to be delayed for further evaluation. The Township has hired a traffic engineer to evaluate how this Plan affects and impacts Liberty Township. Some of the goals of the Liberty Township Comprehensive Land Use Plan are to preserve the ravines and the integrity of the Route 315 Scenic Byway corridor. Chairwoman Foust stated that about \$300,000.00 has been spent on this plan. She stated that it would be better to spend a little more money to consider other alternatives and answer some of the traffic impact questions than adopt a plan we aren't satisfied with.

Mr. Poland asked again if Mr. Laurien's proposal is the same as what was modeled after the Commission approved additional funding? Mr. Laurien stated that one of the several alternatives he has proposed would be to move Alt. 1 from the Cheshire Rd. extension back into the City of Delaware, which is where it was originally. It had been modeled earlier and worked well. It would be a Rte. 42 to US 23 connector. But that has never been modeled in conjunction with extending Ford

Rd. to the east from Liberty to SR 315, and to the west from its elbow to Section Line Rd., therefore providing another east/west collector and simultaneously model it with the Rte. 42 extension (Alt. 16), which would be a true Rte. 42 bypass from Rte. 42 across US 23 and out to SR 36. Those three elements have not been on the Plan simultaneously to see how they work. In terms of the Stratford Ecological Center, there is a small corner (approximately 14 acres) of lands owned by Dr. Warner that is in the north-east corner on the front side next to Stratford Woods subdivision. Mrs. Warner deserves a courtesy call. The delay in tonight's action would allow those conversations with Mrs. Warner and the organizers of the Center to see if that is going to be an impact, is that corner an acceptable one to them? It is not in the areas that they cultivate or their forested preserve. It is between the subdivision and US 23.

Mr. Simpkins presented his proposal from Delaware Township. This route would have SR 37 going south on Section Line Road to 36, then to the proposed Airport Rd. (one the City of Delaware said they'd build to the south of the old Airport Road.) to Rte. 42 (close to Slack Rd.) to the vicinity of Olentangy Rd. (in the City) then going diagonally north-east in the direction of Armstrong Rd. through the old Delaware Clay to Glenn Road. By doing this all the traffic from 36, 37 and 42 is sent east of town to the Glenn Rd. area. This would bring all the through traffic from east to west on a highway, eliminate the Central Ave. clearance problem at the overpass, eliminate the William St. railroad crossing in the City, reroute the quarry and Bunty Station Rd. traffic onto Rte. 42, and eliminate the crossing of the Olentangy Scenic River. He said that one house at the most would be in the path of this proposal. This would give the District 6 ODOT access to 36/37 and 42 from the back of their complex.

Mr. Starling asked if it would be possible to go forward with this Plan, include Mr. Laurien's and Mr. Simpkins suggestions? Chairwoman Foust stated that if the motion to continue discussion at the next meeting fails then the floor is open to another motion that could be made, seconded and carried. A motion to amend the Plan with specific amendments to it would be more effective than adopting it the way it is and looking at it later.

Mr. Bauserman stated that all the elements of Mr. Simpkins suggestions are already in the Plan. The relocated Airport Rd. and an extension from 23/42 over to Glenn Rd. are already in the Plan. The swath that is shown (including the Scenic River) as the study corridor area has opportunities in it to not cross the Scenic River to get to US 23. The text of the Plan acknowledges that it will be a difficult issue to address and overcome.

Chairwoman Foust suggested taking the swath out of the Scenic River valley since

ODNR has already said that they would not endorse such a crossing.

Mrs. Koch requested that the Commission reconsider the Plan and new ideas.

Mr. Ward stated that he originally thought the swath was better than the line but has seen alternatives that have changed his mind. He explained that he would not approve an Alternative that crosses the Scenic River.

The question was called to the original motion by Mr. Miller, seconded by Mrs. Koch that the Thoroughfare Plan be postponed until the October RPC meeting to allow time to consider alternatives. **HAND VOTE: 11 In Favor of postponing the Thoroughfare Plan vote, 15 Opposed to the postponing. Motion failed.**

**Mr. Bauserman made a motion to include the DCRPC staff recommendation of approval of the Thoroughfare Plan (8-12-01 version) from the August 30, 2001 DCRPC meeting and also 2 modifications: (1.) the text portion of the plan should be amended to the discussion of the sequencing of the Alternatives. It should state that Alt. 1 (Cheshire Rd. extension) should not be completed until the initiation of Alt. 16 (Rte. 42 extension up to Rte. 36/Glenn Rd.), (2.) the map portion of the Plan should be modified to remove only the portion of Alt. 1 that lies between Section Line Rd. and Rte. 42. Both of these modifications are being proposed to address the concerns about Alt. 1 being for "cut-through" traffic. Mr. VanHouten seconded the motion.**

Mr. Bauserman explained that if Alt. 1 were to be constructed before Alt. 16, Alt. 1 would take on more of the characteristics of a bypass. He proposes to do Alt. 16 before Alt. 1 is done. Chairwoman Foust asked if he meant complete or initiate the construction of Alt. 16. Mr. Bauserman said the text he read from said "Alt. 1 should not be completed until the initiation of Alt. 16". He said it could be modified. He wanted to make it clear that his intention is that Alt. 16 is done before Alt. 1. If the wording should be amended to better convey that he was willing to change it.

**Chairwoman Foust made a motion to amend Mr. Bauserman's motion to add that the entire swath for Alt. 1 be relocated entirely north of Bunty Station Rd. Mr. Ward seconded the motion.**

Mr. Ward asked why the Commission couldn't go ahead with the whole Plan with the elimination of Alt.1? Mr. Bauserman said that the Plan is not an "ala carte" menu, where you can pick the pieces you want. He said that every piece of the Plan that you move or remove has a secondary impact on the rest of the network that is being proposed. The need for a connection somewhere from US 23 to Rte.

42 has been established. He again noted that not all of the corridor (of Alt. 1) that is shown crosses the Scenic River to get to US 23. Once you get north of where SR 315 touches US 23, there is an area that you don't have to cross the river (to get to US 23).

Chairwoman Foust stated that Liberty Twp. has asked for time to further evaluate this Plan. They have hired a traffic consultant to work with the consultants to try to get some logical answers as to why some of the traffic counts look the way they do. Liberty Twp. agrees with the need for an east / west connector.

Mr. Laurien stated that he believes it is an "ala carte menu" in the sense that people are discussing and questioning if the alternatives are good or bad. He said that Mr. Bauserman has voted to amend a portion of the Plan himself. So he has taken an "ala carte" approach. Without seeing how that proposal models, it may also change the impact on this network of roads. Mr. Laurien explained that his proposal included the following alternatives:

- 1.) put Alt. 1 back where it was originally, which was a Rte. 42 to US 23 connector
- 2.) extension of Ford Rd. to Section Line Rd. to SR 315.
- 3.) keep Alt. 16  
(model the three alternatives above together)
- 4.) he has never seen a traffic count for what Alt. F carries at the end of Steitz Rd. – remove it if it doesn't carry a great deal of traffic
- 5.) Alt. Q (between Porter Central and Condit Rd.) is an approximately \$1.7 million estimated project. There are 1,000 trips per day with or without Alt. Q in 2020. The figures suggest the project is unnecessary.
- 6.) Alt. Y – requires another bridge crossing. From Mink St. Rd. to US 23 in the year 2020 carries 1800 in the western leg, 3000 trips at US 23 through a lot of farm land. This is somewhat suspect. If it is not needed this should be removed.
- 7.) Alt. 3 may not be needed if Alt. 1 is not on the Plan.

**Mr. Heimlich called for the question on the amendment to the motion. Mr. Starling seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion to call the question carried.**

(The amendment to the motion that is being considered is to move Alt. 1 entirely north of Bunty Station Rd.) **VOTE: Majority Opposed to the approval of the amendment. Motion failed.**

Chairwoman Foust asked if there was any further discussion on the original motion made by Mr. Bauserman.

**Mr. Starling made a motion for an amendment to Mr. Bauserman's motion that as the Thoroughfare Plan is adopted we continue to look at Mr. Laurien's ideas, Liberty Township's concerns and Mr. Simpkin's proposal during the corridor study phase. He also wanted it clear that a line hasn't been drawn for Alt. 1, just a corridor for further study. Mr. Cy Schmidt seconded the motion.**

Mrs. Warthman asked that the wording on Mr. Bauserman's motion be changed to state that Alt. 16 must be completed prior to Alt. 1 being started. Mr. Starling stated that that was already changed.

**Mr. Ward made a motion for an amendment to Mr. Starling's motion to eliminate Alt. 1 from the Plan until all the alternatives have been looked at and recommended approval on the rest of the Plan as is. Mrs. Koch seconded the motion.**

Mr. Brosius explained that in Roberts Rules of Order you can make amendments to motions. But at some point amendments defeat the purpose of the Thoroughfare Plan and the legal effectiveness of the Thoroughfare Plan.

**Mr. Starling called for the question on the amendment to the motion. Mr. Thurston seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion to call the question carried.**

Chairwoman Foust asked for the vote on the amendment to the motion made by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Starling. **VOTE: Majority Opposed to the amendment. Motion failed.**

Chairwoman Foust asked for the vote on the amendment made by Mr. Starling on the motion made by Mr. Bauserman to add that we continue to look at the concerns and proposals and Liberty Twp.'s concerns during the corridor study phase of Thoroughfare Plan. **VOTE: Majority For the amendment by Mr. Starling. Motion carried.**

Chairwoman Foust asked for a vote on the approval of the Thoroughfare Plan as submitted with the following modifications; (1.) in the text add that the sequencing of the construction on the Alternatives is that Alt. 1 not be built until Alt. 16 is completed, (2.) modify the map to remove the portion of Alt. 1 between Section Line and Rte. 42, (3.) continue to look at the concerns and proposals from Mr. Laurien and Mr. Simpkins and Liberty Twp.'s concerns during the corridor study phase.

---

**Mr. Starling called for the question. Mr. Thurston seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion to call the question carried.**

**Chairwoman Foust asked for a vote on the amended motion. VOTE: Majority For the approval of the Thoroughfare Plan as amended. Village of Sunbury Representative and the City of Powell Alternate abstained. Motion carried.**

▪ **Ohio GIS Convention**

Mr. Laurien congratulated Mr. Liou, GIS Manager for placing 1<sup>st</sup> in the Map Gallery Award (Spatial Analysis) at the Ohio GIS Convention in Columbus this week. He presented the comprehensive land use map of Shawnee Hills relating to how to allocate sewer taps, and legal vested rights.

**VII. POLICY / EDUCATION DISCUSSION** (none)

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

***The next meeting of the Delaware County Regional Planning Commission will be Thursday, October 25, 2001, 7:00PM at the Delaware Joint Vocational School North Campus, 1610 St. Rte. 521, Delaware, Ohio 43015.***