

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE  
OCTOBER 16, 2017  
Auditorium  
6:30 PM**

Meeting called to order at 6:42 PM.

Present: David W. Anderson, Thomas R. Bullock III, John Litten, Cindy Marx, Ryan P. Nowlin, Sam O'Leary, Daniel J. O'Malley.

Also Present: Planning and Development Director Sylvester, Planner Katelyn Millius, Law Director Butler, Mayor Summers, Six members of public, deal Dilzell, Bonnie Sykes, a couple other members of the public) M. Hagan recording minutes

Chair O'Leary announces original letter from Mayor Summers, Planning Director Sylvester and himself regarding the Recommended Developer for the Mixed-use Development in the Downtown Lakewood site.

He summarized that the item was referred from last Council meeting indicating a recommendation from the citizens panel. How the recommendation was arrived at would be addressed. He said the process goes back all the way to the Community Visioning meeting last summer. He indicated the meeting was well attended and provided a lot of feedback; commercial, residential and retail, etc.

Mr. O'Leary indicated that the Committee would hear how the citizens panel and Planning and Development Department went through an objective analysis of the various proposals and which were the most "salient and productive for the community".

Mr. Sylvester referenced presentation on screen. (Documents shown on screen are attached)  
Mr. Sylvester indicated the arrival of the selection took a little over seven months to identify the best and most qualified developer to take on project. He indicated it was thorough, detail-oriented and why he was in front of Council now.

He continued that all that has happened to this point was that the citizen lead advisory panel has recommended to both Administration and City Council.

He introduced Katelyn Millius who served as project manager.

Stated this would be a re-wind to go back to February of 2017. Referencing Round One which is indicated as Request for Qualifications of entire process.

Mr. Sylvester indicated he was going to update Council on the process from February to the end of Round 1. He indicated this scheduled would be used next Monday for Round 2.

He referenced from his notes (on screen) that the statement that was repeated throughout the process -

Primary Goal of the Downtown Development Process To find and select the most qualified and best partner to develop the nearly 6-acre site in a manner that provides the maximum benefit to Lakewood.

He said he repeatedly highlighted, “maximum benefit to Lakewood”

Mr. Sylvester - (See Summary of formal actions by Council) – indicating Council votes on term sheet/development agreement will take the next couple months to work through.

Chair O’Leary indicated he wanted to underline that there would be a formal action required for the term sheet and then a formal action required for development agreement.

Mr. Sylvester indicated that Council can determine how it would handle that suggesting some bodies vote on one but not both, some both.

Mr. O’Leary indicated the multi-step approval was consistent with what Council had talked previously. Opportunity to approve both the developer and “broad strokes of that agreement”.

In indicated his intention was two-tier process (not just Council agreeing on term sheet and then authorizing Administration to enter into the agreement (materially similar to that term sheet).

Mr. Sylvester referenced Department’s work in creating a glossary of terms such as definition of Term Sheet, development agreement and other common phrases used throughout (Part of attached document in PDF at Cmte meeting. Council was provided and referenced above as attached to minutes)

Re-zoning of planned development entire site was indicated by Mr. Sylvester as of equal importance to Term Sheet and Development Agreement. (similar to McKinley)

(Read six steps) Either brought forward by a member of Council or from Administration on the docket – that “kicks off” two-stage review by Planning Commission, two-stage review by Architecture Board of Review,  
(Mr. Anderson Arrives here) .

After that – Comes back to City Council as a packet to consider the re-zoning of this parcel.

1. Introduction to Council to rezone property
2. Preliminary review and approval by Planning Commission
3. Preliminary review and approval by ABR
4. Final review and approval by Planning Commission
5. Final review and approval by ABR
6. Review and approval by Council

\*Review of mix of uses, site planning, setbacks, heights, design of buildings and public space, material selection, landscaping, parking etc. (A lot more) – likely in 2018.

Mr. O’Leary encouraged Committee members to bring questions forward as presentation continues.

Stakeholders’ roles & Responsibilities Today (see page)

Mr. Sylvester indicated the details of Scheduled would still need to be worked out. He indicated that it was likely a developer would like the term sheet to go through lengthy process.

Committee member Bullock asked about transfer of land/ownership. He indicated that he was for continued City ownership of public square portion. He indicated that was a moving part to understand in fuller context. He indicated he would prefer a chance to help shape the term sheet and development agreement; not just vote on it at the end when it’s presented to Council as an up or down vote.

Committee Member Bullock continued that it would be helpful to hear from the developer early on “almost as if we were the Planning Commission” or the Architectural Board of Review just to get public/Council interaction even if it’s raw, we’re flying from 35,000 feet.

Planning and Development Director . Sylvester indicated that regarding “ownership” – it was not likely in the Zoning process. That will be big part of development agreement. (2<sup>nd</sup> part – no problem – Developer can be brought into Council). Mr. Sylvester indicated the expectation is for Council to be involved and to provide input.

Thought best to walk Council through process for two meetings with Council and then beginning Term Sheet process Where Council is able to provide input to Planning.

Mr. O’Leary indicated that this was what he hoped to define earlier. He hoped Council would vote early on the selection the developer and approval of the term sheet and then again in the final development agreement as opposed to one vote up front which would then authorize a final development agreement substantially similar to the term sheet. I think the better approach is to have Council approval at both stages.

Stakeholders’ Roles & Responsibilities (left hand panel)

PANEL - Recommended Best & Most Qualified Development Partner(their line goes across both round one and round two)

ADMINISTRATION - Manage Process (two rounds as well)

COUNCIL – Provide Feedback & Engage in Process(two rounds as well also engagement with out Department)

DEVELOPMENT TEAMS - Respond to Process & Input (round one and round two)

PUBLIC – Provide Feedback through Website & at Public Meetings (started to be involved on February 6 when project was launched through feedback on our dedicated website, also through involvement directly with our Department,

(Mention that before that too at Community Visioning meeting last summer)

ABR & PLANNING COMMISSION – Round 2 Public Meeting & provide Feedback (held a joint meeting in auditorium)

THOMPSON HINE – Advise the City on Legal Terms & Development Agreement(started around round two)

LAKEWOOD ALIVE, Downtown Lakewood Business Association (DLBA), & Chamber of Commerce – Provide Feedback to Round 2 Teams (also met with final group of developers when they were announced in round two)

-----  
Changes a bit –

Administration – Manage Process, work with Developer on Design and Programming, throughout 2018.

Council’s role changes at this moment – which is to approve development agreement, Engage in PD Process, Approve Rezoning. (references full page - )

Mr. Sylvester noted that Public involvement is consistent across both charts.

Meeting 1 – Recap Round 1 of the Process

Meeting 2 – (October 23) Round 2 of process

Meeting 3 – identify next steps and respond to outstanding questions. Following Monday – work with Council to talk about next steps. Wanted to leave that open so Council can help inform as to how that process is going to go.

Chair O’Leary talked about scheduling – indicating he and Mr. Sylvester wanted to have flexibility should Council want to slow down a bit at a point and take a meeting to focus on issues or priorities. Providing a framework for discussions adding built in flexibility.

Mr. Sylvester referenced (see attached) page titled Timeline. Indicating key dates circled of important meetings – [OneLakewood.com/DowntownRFQ](http://OneLakewood.com/DowntownRFQ) also. (Key moments throughout last seven months) (Mr. Sylvester “...always use that as a resource as well”)

Round One started on Tuesday, February 6, 2017 – City released the RFQ – February 15, 2017, held a public meeting in Auditorium - about 150 people attended to learn about the process. Explained how subsequent seven months would go.

Pre-submission meeting held February 28, 2017. Toured site and former hospital facility - Qualifications were due on Friday, March 17, 2017. First Panel meeting on Thursday, March 30, 2017 – then interviews middle of April.

When started building the RFQ in late 2016 - key elements had in mind:

Built with Community Profile, Lakewood’s general makeup, population, density, private investment, (much more)

Two pages on site description, Talk about Cornerstone of entire project which is Community Vision, Development Objectives, (Original statement constantly referenced – challenge to City too) - Submission Requirements and Schedule also a part.

Community Meeting – August of 2015 – Most Important – held at University of Akron – Lakewood. Planning was able to create architectural renderings to begin visioning for the site. The renderings were not based on the market – just showing buildings that could be on the site to get feedback from the community. From that meeting – got the Development Objectives.

13 total

A transformative mixed-use development

Visionary architecture engaging and complimentary of the character and quality of Lakewood's building stock

Activate the streetscape

Multiple modes of transportation on site

Multi-functional outdoor community gathering space

Respond to shifting market conditions

Historical significance of the site

Environmentally sustainable development practices

Sensitive to the directly adjacent single-family neighborhood

Catalytic economic development project

Attract diverse businesses

Compliment available community housing options

Tangible returns on public investments

That February 15<sup>th</sup> was first community meeting – to explain process and welcome public in to both provide us feedback in person in our Department and also on dedicated website.

February 28 – representatives at Cleveland Clinic walked anybody interested in project around the facility. Walked through old wing of hospital and also site to give an idea of size and scale of the project.

Five of major points asked developers to submit.

Project Team

Relevant Experience

Approach

Financials

References

Opportunity to learn about history of developer

A detail of their team – what architecture were they bringing on board, who was financing project, has developer taken on projects like this in the past, what was their approach to the site, what were they thinking when they first saw. (Important when they "unpacked their vision". Did they understand Lakewood's history – did they understand where Lakewood wanted to go.

Provide financials – not specifically – but in terms of their strength to deliver  
Lastly – references – cities or organizations they worked with in the past.

Mr. O’Leary – great description for the FIRST ROUND – was more about “bandwidth and capacity” of the developer less about specific site plans - ex. What portions of the site do you see as potentially residential, which portions as potentially commercial, retail – etc. More broad overview. More who had more of the right kind of partnership approach to the project which came.

Mr. Bullock asked that of the seven was it found that any got tossed out because of the financials, or qualifications were not up to snuff regardless of what they were proposing – or was it no a “pass/fail” type of review – more this is a better fit.

On left hand side of submissions are the 8.  
Charter as a resource –

Developer to architect – to landscape – (have as reference in attachment)

Responses to RFQ – Submissions  
DLRC, NRP/Knez, First Interstate, Coral, Finch, Casto/NPR, Carnegie, Snavelly  
Interviews  
Round Two

See Attached:

Eight Teams Submit a Statement of Qualifications

Panel Members –  
Debbie Berry, VP of Planning & Real Estate Development at University Circle Inc.  
Tom Einhouse, VP of Facilities & Capital at Playhouse Square at Playhouse Square  
Sean McDermott, Chief Planning & Design Officer at Cleveland Metroparks  
Sam O’Leary, President of Lakewood City Council  
Joe Stewart, Retired Real Estate Executive at Jacobs Real Estate Services  
Bryce Sylvester, Director of Planning & Development at City of Lakewood  
Tracey Nichols, Project Management Consultants, Panel Advisor. (does not have a vote) –  
former Economic Development Director for city of Cleveland.

Panel’s Role –  
Feedback on Document, review responses  
Eight down to five -  
Help on questions to ask – meaningful questions –  
Round 1 Interviews  
Round 1 Evaluation – Evaluation criteria – recommendation for Round 2 –

Base on submission quality – (To Mr. Bullocks’ – who deserves to get interviewed) – How thorough was their - - Interview Shortlist – Five Teams – most thorough.

Chair O’Leary – encourage people to refresh themselves with RFQ – those development objectives were a guiding light – for citizen panel and Planning & Development. In first round cut-off to get to five interviewed. Those teams – to some extent – missed - A couple of teams came – so heavy on residential – only other features of project were coffee shop – lunch – basically that’s it. Like a residential only focus. Wanted mixed use instead of specific use.

Evaluation Criteria- Project team 25%, Relevant Experience 30%, Approach 25%, Financials 30%.

Quantitative square and qualitative - example – did they ask good questions of City’s team.

Wanted to summarize – Transformative mixed-use – 1-13 (not in order) – Strong knowledge of Lakewood’s past (who knew about development, 100 year housing stock – Madison ave – solstice steps – clear teams that did their homework) –

Of five developers – all had strong financials.

Common weaknesses – one – proposing primarily residential project – (not priorities)  
History of low risk projects

Tension amongst team – members during interview. Indication of public debt requirement for the project (Important – make sure – they’re going to be in front of public, Council – on a porch )

Chair O’Leary – Evidence of that – there was a one person show – also some teams – opposite – side long glances – as to who might have the answer to that – that issue cut both ways.

Public Debt – (weren’t necessarily considering) – but were a number of developers – talking a good amount of public debt IF they were to develop the project.

Lead to Unanimous Decision for Round 2

CASTCO NorthPoint Realty and  
Carnegie Development Corporation

Mr. Sylvester concluded that he wanted to make sure the public input was meaningful. He said there would be stages of this project where it makes sense for them to weight in.

He indicated that not necessarily come to indicate where bike racks should go or landscaping should be, At this particular stage. There will be room for that and it’s coming.

Next Monday would be a re-cap of Round two. Start in April – work up to today.

Committee Member Dan O’Malley – Indications – public debt – what investment on City’s behalf would be proposed. When will there be an opportunity to see that.

Sylvester – as early as next Monday. Like to see – even in advance of that.  
A couple of articles online and in print and haven't seen details – would like to see details of that.

O'Leary – heart Mr. O'Malley make that request – understand trade secret – but would anticipate that those documents to be made available – for myself – re: financials - would require some help.

Committee member Bullock – How does member of public – contribute – input. Three ways - Website, Visit, Phone call or email.

Get something out from Council Office (waterbill? From Council Office? Get word out) – said before – never heard before. Mr. Bullock – think high interest – people excited to be engaged. Trying to represent public and also to get good advice from professionals who have success and experience – at that interface – got a good process up to now.

Chair O'Leary – brainstorming - develop process to get most feedback - how to scale the process – encourage feedback – would like to have a meeting to include some of the broader stakeholders – such as Lakewood Alive, Downtown Business Alliance, Chamber as well as individual business owners

Sylvester – Design of building, what materials, public space, what are setbacks off of Marlowe and Belle – All of that will be a robust review.

Meeting adjourned 7:28 PM.