

Lifestyle Communities Development Application for the UMCH Site

Questions from City Council Members

LC Responses in red – As of January 14, 2021

QUESTIONS FOR LC

Connection to Overall City/Community Goals

1. How will the project contribute to the city's goals of sustainability and connectivity?

The answers to these questions start with the development of a plan for the Tucker Creek Preserve. With its filing the applicant did not assume too much in the way of use or design based on believing a collaborative approach with city professionals and the community would be necessary. The applicant's assumptions are that Tucker Creek should be permanently preserved as green space, conveyed to the city, if desired, with uses and design to come from working directly with the city. Similarly, the applicant has produced a site plan with a level of street, sidewalk, path system and green space connectivity, but desires to work with city professionals to finalize such design elements.

Community Engagement

2. How does the applicant plan to engage the community about their proposal?

The applicant is scheduling multiple meetings with citizens who have sent written comments or called the city staff to provide input on the development proposal. (Numbering approximately 100+ and counting.) These meetings will begin before the initial January 14, 2021 planning commission hearing (5 meetings held to date) and will continue after this meeting and as planning commission meetings progress until all residents who want to speak directly to the applicant team have been provided with the opportunity. These initial meetings will use the zoom format and will be scheduled in one-hour sessions on a first come, first scheduled basis.

The applicant will also meet with identifiable groups who have shown interest in the application, either in person or via zoom as desired. The applicant's representatives are open to direct contact from Worthington residents and will direct such inquiries or comments to the subject matter professional members of our team for answers if questions are not immediately answerable. We will also continue to evaluate the best format for such neighborhood outreach under the current social distancing practices and as the Covid situation evolves.

Cost/Affordability/Accessibility

6. What percentage of residences will be available for low income housing?

The residences are planned for market rate housing.

7. What percentage of residences will be built to universal design standards?

<https://www.section508.gov/create/universal-design>

The project as constructed will comply with city ordinances and other applicable laws.

8. What will be the estimated market prices for the housing that is currently being proposed?

- 24 Single Family Homes – Targeting empty nesters - \$550,000 to \$650,000.
- 94 Townhomes for sale - \$250,000 to \$450,000
- 72 Townhomes for rent - \$180,000 to \$250,000
- 540 apartment units - \$180,000 to \$250,000
- Rents will average around \$1337.00 per month

Energy Provision & Use

9. What is the typical energy performance of these developments (energy -electric, gas and water use per person or energy use intensity) - commercial, retail and residential? <https://www.energystar.gov/buildings/facility-owners-and-managers/existing-buildings/use-portfolio-manager/understand-metrics/what-energy#:~:text=For%20most%20property%20types%20in,floor%20area%20of%20the%20building>.

Code requirements related to energy performance and standards will be met. Developing a total energy and utility usage profile for a specific development would take significant resources and time and is beyond the scope of a typical zoning application filing. Further discussion and clarifications on this subject are needed to understand the expectations and scope of answers that would be most responsive.

10. What is a typical energy performance (EUI) of a single-family home built in the 1960s? What is your source for this information?

Not a question related specifically to the project and will take more time to address.

11. What is a typical energy performance of an office/commercial building built in the 1970s or 1980s (EUI)? What is your source for this information?

Not a question related specifically to the project and will take more time to address.

12. Will all the properties/residences have separately metered utilities directly billed by the utility provider and not third party?

Utility metering and billing is yet to be determined

13. Will there be any electricity sub-metering utilized on this site?

Utility metering and billing is yet to be determined

Impact on Schools, City Services & Neighborhoods

14. What has been the impact of similar projects upon the school districts in terms of students added and tax dollars generated? Please note any specific projects used to consider the impact.

The applicant has made assumptions about residential real estate property tax generated to the school district and the information is included in its Economic Impact Analysis provided separately. The Analysis projects \$162 million in property taxes for the Worthington City Schools District over a 30-year period. The applicant has significant experience with rental and townhome developments in other communities and believes student yield number for these unit types to be very low. In Central Ohio, LC's percentage of school aged children in its communities are as follows:

LC New Albany -- about 3% of residents are school-aged children

LC Hilliard -- about 4%

LC Gahanna -- about 2%

LC Dublin -- about 2%

These percentages represent total residents per each community, (not total students per units).

Each community, school district and product mix are different, but the data documents that LC Communities historically do not attract families with school-aged children.

Such school impact projection information needs to be confirmed and compared to the experience of the Worthington City Schools District and the applicant has requested information exchange with the District for this purpose. The applicant has benchmarked the Olentangy Local School District (OLSD) against its housing product mix because OLSD has been a high growth district and expertly tracks its student population growth and yield from specific housing product types. The OLSD Student Potential Analysis Report 12/2/2020 (page 35 attached) includes the following student yield data:

Housing Type	Total Residential Units	K-12 Student Count	K-12 Student Yield
Single Family	22,291	17,922	0.81
Apartments (Rental)	5,467	962	0.18
Condominium (Detached)	631	249	0.39
Condominiums (Attached)	5,336	791	0.15
Duplex	43	14	0.33
Luxury Condominium (Detached)	335	17	0.05
Manufactured Home Park	225	97	0.43
TOTAL	34,328	20,052	0.58

Based on the OLSD experience and the applicants own experience with apartments, townhomes and empty nester patio style homes with mainly first floor living, the expected student yield from the site housing is expected to be low with the school tax revenue generation expected to be significant. As stated, these conclusions are preliminary and need to be reviewed and analyzed by the Worthington City School District.

15. What are the estimated number of school aged children who will live in this new housing vs the overall anticipated property tax generated for the school district? Children/school tax revenue of site

LC Worthington site and application of OLSD Assumptions

540 Apartments

72 Townhomes Rental

612 rental units @ .18 student yield OLSD = 110 students

118 Single family – 94 Townhome Owner Occupied and 24 Empty Nester Homes (Treated like detached/attached condo product in the OLSD)

@ .17 OLSD Condo/Patio Home/Empty Nester Homes = 20 students

730 Units at LC Worthington yields 130 students (.178 students per unit)

130 Students to Educate at full build out, based on applying OLSD assumptions.

The site yields a projected \$5.4 million per year in school property tax (\$162 million in school tax revenue / 30 years)

*Some students at the site may not be new to the district, but no assumption has been made about this factor by the applicant and the school district should review this question.

** Further information on the average real estate tax revenue portion of the cost to educate each student and comparing average property tax yields of Worthington residences are to be requested from the WCSD.

***All the above assumptions and calculations are to be reviewed for accuracy with the Worthington School District and represent the applicant's preliminary analysis only.

16. What has been the impact of similar projects on local resources such as fire, EMS and police and tax dollars generated for those entities?

It is not clear at this time if such studies have been completed on other mixed used or LC projects as far as the applicant knows. Generally, such compact development is recognized as significantly less costly to serve for emergency services based on new construction techniques, a significant younger demographic in a portion of community and reduced travel time on site.

17. What has been the impact of similar projects on the real estate value of neighboring properties? Please note any specific projects used to consider the impact.

The project represents new real estate investment of approximately \$197 million, with individual housing product price points comparable or above the average values in the community and adjacent properties on a cost per square foot basis. The applicant will review data related to similar projects in comparable suburban locations for consideration as time permits. The impact of these projects and the neighboring real estate values will need to be studied further in order to make comparisons and fully develop this answer.

19. How would traffic throughout the city, but particularly on Evening Street, be impacted? What assumptions are being made in terms of vehicle count, etc.? What is an acceptable level of degradation, if any? Details please.

A separate Traffic Impact Study was completed for this project and attached to the application. The TIS is currently under review by the City Engineer and the City's outside traffic engineering consultants. Vehicle counts are provided and dispersion of traffic assumptions are documented as part of the TIS findings. Required improvements to mitigate traffic are also part of the study's findings. Final traffic mitigation, controls, accesses, improvements and assumptions are subject to the final configuration and unit count/type of the project, but a general picture of the dispersion of traffic can be seen based on the initial TIS findings. City engineering representatives have requested updates to the study and additional information and analysis. Challenges identified by City representatives include: 1) The impact on Evening Street, 2) The impact on High Street, Worthington-Galena, Crandall intersection, 3) Further review to make sure impacts on High Street and any mitigation solutions are well coordinated with emergency services.

20. How many school-age children are estimated to live in the development? Based on what assumptions? And, if claiming that existing residents will inhabit the new units, then what

are the secondary impacts? Which schools would the children attend in this new development? How would this likely impact redistricting?

See answers to questions 14 and 15 above for the first two questions. Such estimates are only the applicant's projections at this time and the applicant is requesting review of this information from the Worthington City School District. The applicant believes all new development attracts some existing residents in a given community, and believes there is pent up demand for alternative housing in Worthington. However, in this case the number of families with school children moving into this development will likely be low. This is based on the housing design, target marketing to both young professionals and downsizing active adults/empty nesters groups, outdoor living spaces and amenities that are not designed for families with children. As stated, the school district may have more information on how many existing families with school children the site will attract. The school district will need to answer questions about attendance locations and redistricting impact.

21. The UMCH property is in the Architectural District. Our City Code (1177.01) states that a primary purpose of the District is "... to promote the stability of property values and to protect real estate from impairment or destruction of value for the general community welfare..." How would a high-density development impact property values, both adjacent and throughout the city? I realize that studies exist that tout the benefits of high-density mixed-use developments on nearby property values, but as far as I know these are based on revitalization projects in distressed areas, and thus not applicable. Are there any comparable contexts we can cite? Also, let's speak with residential real estate agents, etc., and get their assessments.

A core belief of the applicant is that \$197 million in new real estate investment will have a positive, or at least neutral impact on property values. Infill and mixed-used re-developments on a larger scale in central Ohio, such as Dublin's Bridge Street and Grandview Yard, have not had a negative impact on overall property values in those communities. More neighborhood scale mixed-use developments in communities such as Upper Arlington and Bexley have not harmed property values overall. Further analysis of sub-markets near such mixed-use projects as **Kingsdale, Lane Avenue and Bexley Gateway** would be needed to gain a "micro-review" of residential re-sales and values near such projects, but overall market trends point to positive results. Walkable access to shopping amenities, entertainment venues, restaurants, services or work opportunities remain highly appealing in many older communities and to many in the market for housing.

22. What will be the traffic impacts in the city under the current proposal?

See answer to 19 above.

23. What impacts will the current proposal cause to the school district with more families potentially moving into this area?

See answers to 14, 15 and 20 above.

25. Is there analysis of the economic activity driven by residents living within the local community?

The applicant has completed a baseline Economic Analysis on tax revenue, jobs and property values but did not look at this specific question. Standard multipliers exist that can be utilized and reviewed. It is believed that locating hundreds of residents and daytime workforce at this core city location will support both commercial and retail activity at this site but also the City's existing core business district within walking distance. Lifestyle Communities residents have an average household income of \$107,000 across the company's communities, have reached an average age of 29 and are coming up on their top spending years. The site is also expected to attract a significant number of empty nester and active adult residents with significant financial resources.

Land Use

26. What percentage of commercial vs retail space is being proposed?

This will be determined by market factors and the mix is unknown at this time. The applicant has attempted to find a reasonable balance of commercial and medical uses and allow for retail uses as the market gains direction.

A threshold of density that mixes in residential and office space, with existing retail uses in downtown Worthington is key to increasing demand and energy of this area of High Street. Retail, restaurants and other services thrive with a combination of disposable income and density. We believe this development and hundreds of new residents within walking distance of the City's downtown will bring positive opportunities to existing Worthington businesses, shops and restaurants.

It is clear that coming out of the pandemic office, commercial and retail markets will need additional strategies to be most viable. Retail trends were already shifting away from storefronts and facing challenges in many locations. Retail has been profoundly impacted by the pandemic. While office use is the most lucrative for the City from a tax revenue standpoint, location, demand, and now changing workplace habits – another huge impact of the pandemic – are limiting factors. The assumptions from past decades about building speculative, higher end office space and attempting to attract users are dated. Alternative housing options, like senior living facilities, empty nester housing of all types, apartments and townhomes are in high demand as the region continues to grow, and as young professionals and empty nesters seek alternatives to single family homes. This sets up a different approach in which a critical mass of residential rooftops and vibrant live, work, shop and play environments attract employers because their key employees want to live near

work. All indicators are that the post-pandemic office market will place a premium on offices that can provide live, work, play, shop amenities nearby to attract workers out of their homes. Office space will need to be surrounded by restaurants, shopping, services, entertainment and social opportunities to pull workers back. Being able to walk to work will also continue to be attractive and lower the cost of living and improve the quality of life for workers. This site has the potential to meet all these trending demands.

Multi-Modal Transportation & Traffic

28. Will there be incentives for people to travel by public transportation? (e.g. Trade parking space requirements for bus pass and or covered/indoor bike parking?)

<https://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/business/biz-columns-blogs/development/article246561293.html>)

Transit Node Development: This development concept places density on a key corridor for the region, raising the potential to use economies to create a larger transit hub for the area:

- Timed/Scheduled shuttle services to downtown, OSU, Columbus events, other – OSU – gameday, Baseball, Soccer, Hockey, Theatre/Arts, Easton, Polaris.
- Short-term vehicle rental hub location. (Don't have to own cars)
- Ride share/Uber-Lyft Site Hub.
- Conventional transit service

The applicant will seek opportunities to work with the city and regional transit authorities to fully explore all transit and alternative transit options.

29. How wide will the sidewalks be?

5 feet or city specifications.

30. How wide will any multi-use paths be?

8 feet or city specifications.

31. Will there be designated bike boulevards?

Not as planned. Path systems are multi-use.

32. Will there be covered/indoor bike parking within apartment complexes?

Bike racks are outside, within green spaces, near mailbox locations and inside garages. (5 racks in north garage and 2 in south garage.)

33. How will multimodal travel be incentivized throughout the development?

Outside of placing housing in proximity to workplaces, coordination with transit authorities, and site design such as sidewalk connections, the path system and bike racks, the applicant is open to

other ideas to incentivize multimodal travel.

34. How will cut through car/truck traffic be minimized and pedestrians and bikes prioritized?

The sites many access and outlets to the public road system will helps disperse traffic in a manner that is reasonable. Placing housing on a transit corridor such as High Street and near work and entertainment locations also helps alleviate daily vehicle trips and auto use. In addition to coordination with transit authorities, and site design such as sidewalk connections, the path system and bike racks, the applicant is open to other ideas to incentivize multimodal travel and limit existing neighborhood cut through.

Preservation of Trees, Greenspace & Public Areas

39. How many trees will be planted, and how many different varieties will there be? What will be the different varieties of trees?

NOTE: SEE PUD DEVELOPMENT TEXT from LC application filing for answers about tree quantities, replacement standards and proposed crediting, as follows:

I. 1705 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

1. Tree Preservation and Replacement

City of Worthington, Ohio, Codified Ordinance Section 1174.05(c)(2)(B) *Development Standards- General Requirements: Natural Features*, requires all healthy trees 6" caliper or larger be retained or replaced with a total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree.

The applicant has prepared a tree survey of all trees (deciduous and evergreen) 6 inches caliper or larger, with species and condition noted. Trees were measured per industry standards - diameter at breast height. Based on the applicant's site plan, the Tree Survey Table provides a tabulation of anticipated trees to be removed and a tabulation of all unhealthy trees (unhealthy, poor or dead condition). Total tree caliper to be removed is 6,264 inches, less unhealthy, dead and poor species of 1,069 inches yields 5,195 inches of replacement required. Tree removal is a total of 365 trees: 29 dead, 28 poor condition, 2 ash trees and 306 additional trees to be removed. The applicant intends to provide as many replacement trees on site as practical and per acceptable industry standards and as allowed to facilitate healthy growth.

On the Open Space, Pedestrian Connectivity and Amenities Plan, approximately 5.7 acres of treed area along Tucker Creek will be maintained as a "Natural Features Preservation" area per code and conveyed to the city.

Tree Replacement:

Tree replacement shall be provided by the following means with additional options for tree replacement provided with a detailed landscape plan at Final Development Plan, as necessary:

- Street Trees: Street trees will be provided on all private or public streets at a ratio of 1 tree per 40 linear feet of street. Trees may be equally spaced or grouped. All street trees shall be a minimum 3” caliper at installation. (Approximately 284 trees at 3 inches = 852 inches)
- Alley/Parking Lot Island Trees: A minimum of 30 alley/parking lot trees shall be planted with a minimum of 2.5 inches caliper at installation. (30 trees at 2.5 inches = 75 inches)
- Open Space Tree Plantings: A minimum of 80 trees shall be planted in open space areas. (80 trees at 2.5 inches = 200 inches)
- Buffer Plantings: A minimum of 10 trees (proposed combination of ornamental trees and shade trees) shall be provided between the storm water pond along Evening Street and apartment units in Subarea 2 (10 trees at 2.5 inches = 25 inches). A minimum of 8 evergreen trees shall be provided between the east property line of Subarea 3 and the Assisted Living/Nursing Home use (8 trees (6 foot ht.) at 3 inches = 24 inches.)
- Other Locations: Other on-site or off-site locations acceptable to the City's Service and Engineering Department, with such placement credited against applicable fee in lieu payments. The applicant shall work in good faith with city departmental staff to find off-site tree replacement locations as follows: Replacement trees can be located in off-site roadways, such as parkway trees or median plantings, at locations acceptable to the City's Service and Engineering Department. Replacement trees can be located in off-site parklands in locations acceptable to the City's Parks and Recreation Department. Replacement trees can be located in other off-site public property locations in acceptable locations as determined by the appropriate city departments. Areas in close proximity to the LC-Worthington/UMCH site and to locations with the most visibility to Worthington residents shall be given the highest priority for consideration for tree replacement by city departments under this plan.

Tree replacement required under this planned district text is as follows, after applied credits as detailed above:

Caliper Inches of Tree Replacement Required:	5,195 inches
<u>Less Caliper Inches of Replacement Trees (detailed above)</u>	<u>1,176 inches</u>
Balance of Caliper Inches of Tree Replacement Required	4,019 inches

The “Balance of Caliper Inches of Tree Replacement Required” which is 4,019 inches based on the number credited after application of the first four bullets above is counted on a basis of \$150 per caliper inch (\$554,400) and such amount shall be credited against the dedication of Tucker Creek Preserve acreage to be considered by City Council as a proposed substitution and waiver of the code based tree replacement fee in lieu standard that would be otherwise applicable to this site. (See rationale for crediting below.) It should be noted that at this point, the target credit number is only an estimate, and the need for crediting would be adjusted if the applicant and city agree to off-site locations for replacement trees as outlined above.

Tree Replacement Standards:

Tree replacement shall meet the following standards:

- Street Trees shall be a minimum of 3-inch caliper at installation.
- Deciduous Shade Trees shall be a minimum of 2.5-inch caliper at installation.
- Ornamental Trees shall be a minimum of 1.5-inch caliper at install for single stem or 6 foot height at install for multi-stem. Multi-stem tree caliper inches shall be credited for the aggregate total of all trunks.
- Evergreen Trees shall be 6-foot height at installation.
 - A 6-foot tall evergreen tree shall count for 3 caliper inches.
 - For every foot in height greater than 6 feet in height, an additional 2 caliper inches shall be added. (e.g. A 7-foot tall evergreen = 5 caliper inches, e.g. A 8-foot tall evergreen = 7 caliper inches)
- The dedication of Tucker Creek Preserve may be counted toward the fee in lieu for tree replacements. See Public Area Payments Section.
- Fee-in-lieu for Tree Replacement and/or the number of trees replaced off-site shall be based on a \$150 per caliper inch standard as proposed for substitution and waiver approval by City Council for this site only.

Rationale: The unique location of trees on this site makes it impossible to replace all code required caliper inches on site in a healthy manner and for optimal tree growth and survival. Full on-site replacement is not feasible and would result in crowding on the site. The code standard provision for fee in lieu of replacement as written would operate as an unreasonable burden on the property if the fee in lieu is paid, and, in any case, whether such fee is paid or replacement of such caliper inches occurs off-site, there is no nexus to benefit the property. This raises fairness and legal questions under Ohio impact fee law. Therefore, the applicant proposes a fee in lieu and/or a more reasonable off-site replacement value standard of \$150 per caliper inch, combined with a crediting against the value of both trees preserved within Tucker Creek Preserve and the Tucker Creek land conveyance to the city as a substitution and waiver of section 1174.05 (c)(2)(B). The applicant is committed to a reasonable and balanced tree replacement standard that includes on-site replacement, off-site replacement, and crediting in order to meet the spirit and intent of the code, while resulting in fairness. The applicant will work in good faith with city departments to find other off-site replacement locations on public lands, which would reduce the amount of crediting taken against the proposed Tucker Creek Preserve conveyance. However, based on the number of trees to be preserved, the number of trees preserved within Tucker Creek Preserve and the value of Tucker Creek Preserve as a public donation, crediting to off-set fees is reasonable and appropriate.

40. How will the reserve at Tucker Creek be restored, removing invasive species and adding native species?

The applicant did not assume any design, use or programming of the Tucker Preserve area, believing this is best coordinated with city planning, but is open to dialogue and city preservation, conservation and sustainability goals.

41. How will the reserve at Tucker Creek be accessible to and by the public? What kind of trails, bridges and or other amenities will be provided throughout the reserve?

The applicant did not assume any design, use or programming of the Tucker Preserve area, believing this is best coordinated with city planning, but is open to dialogue and city goals.

42. What type of other public amenities will be provided in public spaces throughout the site?

See site plan Sheets 9 of 22 in the application for public amenities listing and public space planning.

43. What is the total land area that will be available for public use?

There are no restrictions on public uses of the open spaces on the site. Open space amounts to 10.1 acres or 26.7% of the site.

44. Loss of trees. Let's see a concise listing (not just the map) of type and size.

A standard tree survey was completed with the application. Map references and concise listings of diameter, common name, and condition were supplied on the tree legend. Total trees removed, caliper inches and trees to remain are listed. (Page 18 or 22 on the Plan Sheets)

Sound Transmission

45. Will the sound transmission loss between living spaces be better than current minimum design requirements? What will be the design STC value and how will this be verified during construction? <https://www.ecohome.net/guides/2278/understanding-sound-transmission-in-buildings/>

LC buildings are designed to meet or exceed code standards.

Storm Drainage – Water Quality & Quantity

46. How will the site storm water be designed to stay on the property? What 'green' principals are employed for achieving this storm water plan?

See Plan Sheets 21 and 22 for details and preliminary storm water design to date.

47. What is the projected impact on water runoff, in terms of both volume and quality? Effects

for both traditional, annual precipitation patterns, as well as extreme events (e.g., 100 year)?
How are the calculations being made?

Follow up with our engineering firm to provide calculations will be necessary to answer this question. The site will meet regulatory standards for storm water quality and quantity controls.



IW Intranet.url

48. What water quality impacts will occur for Tucker Creek during construction and after completion of the current proposal?

Follow up with our engineering firm to provide impacts will be necessary to answer this question. The site will meet city and OEPA regulatory standards for storm water quality and quantity controls.

Note: The answers above are subject to supplementation and adjustment as the current application evolves.

4852-0213-8583.1