

GROVE CITY COMMUNITY CENTER SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 29, 2025
7:00pm – 9:00pm

(No Agenda)

Members in Attendance: Melissa Anderson, Jodi Burroughs, Sam Clark, Patrick Katzenmeyer, Chris Roach, Tricia Zelenek

Others in Attendance: Carlo Burns (Pizzuti), Jack Castle, Cindi Fitzpatrick, Patrick Katzenmeyer (Pizzuti), Christine Manns, Don Wheat (Pizzuti)

Don from Pizutti opened the meeting with a reminder and explanation that the goal of this meeting is to start the creation of the “Site Evaluation Matrix”. To adhere to the timeline set out on April 23, the final “Site Evaluation Matrix” needs to be ready before the next scheduled meeting on May 12, 2025. Don also encouraged the committee to begin brainstorming for a list of potential sites. The “Site Evaluation Matrix” will be applied to the final list of potential sites in Phase 2, which is slotted to take place then second half of May. *(Refer to the 042925 Pizzuti Criteria List Example.)*

The Site Evaluation Matrix is an established list of weighted site criteria. The “weight” is a number system in which each site criteria is given a number value determined by its level of importance to the city, the weight of one (1) being one of the least important factors and three (3) points (or any chosen maximum) being one of the most important factors. Applying the Site Evaluation Matrix to a site means giving each criteria a score (ie. 0 points, 3 points, etc.) for that site and then multiplying the that score by the previously determined “weight”. The final document of scored criteria is called a score sheet.

The purpose of the score sheet is to take subjectivity and emotional aspects out of the selection, resulting in an objective, science-based, and publicly defensible site selection decision.

Options for the Site Selection Committee to collaborate on the site criteria and corresponding “weight” include discussing/deciding during this and other in-person meetings, working individually on an editable version of the Site Evaluation Matrix in between meetings, and/or by using a shared document on the Teams site. Pizzuti will share an editable version of the matrix document through Teams. The number of criteria is up the committee. Pizutti recommends having 4-5 focus criteria and then other additional criteria that aren’t as important but should still be involved in the final decision. Don recommends only striking through the criteria that is not a consideration for Grove City in case it becomes criteria later in the process.

Carlo from Pizutti referred everyone to the blueprints and development that Pizzuti brought in from four of their nearby recent projects. He encouraged everyone to look them over as well as to plan an actual walk-through of the facilities and grounds for the facilities that are complete, as well as other community facilities that Pizzuti might not have been involved in.

- 1. New Albany Fieldhouse & Community Center – New Albany** (expected to open in the fall of 2026) will have the following features:
 - 186,000 sq ft site
 - 2 Fieldhouses (indoor track and indoor turf) with a 30,000 sq ft community center in the middle

- Mutli-Purpose Program Rooms, two fitness studios, outdoor gathering spaces, basketball and volleyball courts
 - No aquatic
 - New Albany’s population is 11,335
2. **Linden Community Center – Columbus** (opened in 2021, Columbus Parks and Recreation) has the following features:
 - 55,000 sq ft facility
 - Focus is on basketball programming
 - Fitness room, elevated walking track, game room, state-of-the-art teaching kitchen, performance stage, music studio, senior lounge, dance studio, green areas
 3. **Bob Crane Community Center – Upper Arlington** (opened in Apr 2025)
 - 165,000 sq ft (1.3 acres)
 - 5 story building
 - Indoor pool, event center, cafe, fitness spaces, gymnasiums, indoor playground, art gallery
 - 350 parking spaces with elevated parking deck on the retail side
 4. **Fran Ryan Center – Columbus** (opened in Jan 2025, Columbus Parks and Recreation)
 - 44,000 sq ft facility, 4 acres
 - The focus is on arts, wellness, and senior engagement
 - Creative studios, fitness center, gift shop featuring local senior art, large lawn for concerts and community events
 5. **Other facilities to look at (not Pizzuti): Westerville**

Don and Carlo led the committee back to a discussion about determining the criteria for the Site Evaluation Matrix with the following key points:

Land Size

The decision on the size of the land is dependent on the desired programming and amenities that the city wants the facility to include. The “map” for the programming, features and amenities is in the results of the Community Survey. Before proceeding, the committee confirmed that their focus was to pick ONE site to align with City Council’s decision to build one large facility instead of multiple facilities spread across multiple sites.

General Building Features

General building features suggested by Don and Carlo based on prior experiences include the following:

- Include a lot of storage space
 - Items requiring storage space include sporting and other programming equipment, a gator for moving things around, a lift to change lightbulbs and maintain ceiling fixtures, etc.
- Include rentable meeting space
- Include a party room that is near the aquatics area
 - Important if pool parties are an option for guests
- Avoid basements
- Start with a minimum of 200 – 300 parking spots and consider more depending on programming
 - The site can include enough acreage for the parking spaces or the committee could consider building next to a facility that already has parking options

- Include land and/or paths for service vehicles to get in and out
- Ensure doorways are large enough to move items in and out
- Create flexibility within the facility to change with changing trends and sports
 - For example, pickleball is popular now but will it be popular in 10 – 15 years
- Including water, electricity and storage in studio rooms allow for change of the space over time
- Have a list of “add alternates” that might only be included if the bids come in low enough to add features
- Have space for a partnership if having a partner within the facility is desired
 - Partnerships are the best way to get money back on the facility

Site Selection Criteria Considerations

The committee began their site selection brainstorming and discussion. The following site selection criteria considerations and questions were brought up by various committee members:

1. The committee agreed that the ultimate goal they are working toward is the build of a city-operated multigenerational central hub recreation center with tournament space and field space.
2. Initial thoughts on site acreage is 18-30 acres which would include the main facility and 2 soccer fields and enough parking for 350-500 cars which would take up 4.5 acres alone
3. Initial thoughts on building size is greater than 120,000 sq ft, ranging from 120-160
4. Zoning requirements?
5. Benefit to the surrounding area?
6. Avoiding current traffic corridors (suggested weight of 3)
7. Close to the population and geographic center of the community?
8. Convenient (suggested weight of 2)
9. Room to grow and expand (suggested weight of 2)
10. Should it be near walking and bike paths?
11. Does the location of the YMCA play a role?
12. Visible by the community
13. Visible by people driving by Grove City (suggested weight of 2)
14. Maintaining healthy forestry space
15. Fulfilling community programming (suggested weight of 3)
16. Ease of access to utilities and water, the idea of wind or solar as a source of energy was mentioned as possibly less constraining to a project
17. Strike through #35 on the matrix template

Sites

For now, the only sites to consider as possibilities should be over 21,000 acres. Patrick from Pizutti has found 12 possible sites in Grove City that meet this initial size threshold to put on the list for scoring. Everyone on the committee is encouraged to come up with their own list of sites for the next meeting.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, May 6, 2025 @ 7pm.



Christine Manns, Project Coordinator
Grove City Parks & Recreation Dept.
Acting Secretary



Jack Castle, Director
Grove City Parks & Recreation Dept.
Meeting Chair

Grove City Community Center

Site Evaluation Considerations/Criteria		Note: total score is based on the following parameters: Weighting indicates the multiplier used to weight the individual criteria score on a scale, 1 being the lowest (unweighted) and 10 the highest (most weighted). Undesirable impacts or qualities reflected by a negative score.	
		1: Site 1 ()	
Item	Criterion	Criterion Weighting	Comments
SITE SPECIFICS			
1	Location is convenient to community	1	
2	Adequate area for intended use	1	
3	Configuration/ proportions/ usability of the site area supports planned use	1	
4	Greenfield - site is previously undeveloped	1	
5	Brownfield	1	
6	No recognized wetlands/ contamination/ environmental issues/ HREC's/ HAZMAT	1	
7	Geotechnical conditions allow typical construction without significant soil modifications	1	
8	No storage tanks, questionable structures, or extensive demolition required	1	
9	Impediments - drainage, culvert, bridges, railroad, wells, overhead, easements, etc.	1	
10	Designated as a floodplain? (if yes, remaining site area adequate for intended use with minimal cost impact)	1	
11	Frontage or visibility from roadways- provides a Civic Presence	1	
12	Potential site is complementary to future planning endeavors - connectivity, civic spaces, etc.	1	
13	Meets program criteria	1	
14	Site is currently vacant or occupants can be readily relocated	1	
15	Vacant land or building available for renovation	1	
16	Existing structures require demolition?	1	
17	Reuse/ preservation of Historical Asset required?	1	
18	Existing curb cuts work with proposed development	1	
19	Land has no problematic legal restrictions	1	
SUB TOTAL			
ZONING APPROVAL PROCESS		Zoning Approval Process Scoring Will Be Deferred Until The Second Round	
20	Current Zoning allows or is a benefit for intended use	1	
21	Any overlay districts that impose significant restrictions on site usage for this facility?	1	
22	Intended use allowed under maximum building heights	1	
23	Planned use compatible with adjacent zoning(s)	1	
24	Required setbacks allow planned use of the site	1	
25	Zoning allows planned FAR without requiring a variance	1	
26	Proposed development can meet required green space	1	
27	Maximum building coverage permitted	1	
28	Parking requirements/ limits are met	1	
29	Landscape/ Tree/ Parks & Rec or environmental Impact fees are reasonable and within budget	1	
30	Site does NOT require any variances	1	
31	Other development plans for area or ROW	1	
32	Development Phasing required?	1	
33	Planned signage conflicts with requirements/ limits	1	
34	Difficulty/ time required for approval process - Preliminary/ Final/ Council/ BZA	1	
35	Liquor License availability (D-5/ D-6)	1	
SUB TOTAL			
SITE CONTEXT			
36	Compatibility of planned use with surrounding area and/or Master Plans	1	
37	Presence of support services/ compatible amenities nearby (hotels, restaurants, retail, other cultural/ civic institutions, etc.)	1	
38	Local Ties to Site (there is a positive or negative emotional component)	1	
39	Proposed use will not adversely impact adjacent uses	1	
40	Proximity to community partners	1	
41	Availability (realistic ability to acquire, owned by government or community partner, etc.)	1	
42	Surrounding development context would create noise issues for planned site use	1	
43	Community Support or (Opposition - reflected with negative number)	1	
SUB TOTAL			
UTILITIES/ INFRASTRUCTURE			
44	Required utility capacities readily available to site (water, gas, electricity, fiber/ telecom) without significant upgrades	1	
45	Required utilities will require Owner to pay for upgraded distribution in the ROW (if so, negative score)	1	
46	Storm water infrastructure in place or adjacent	1	
47	Site will require significant utility relocations (if so, negative score)	1	
48	Local or state condition ratings of surrounding roadway conditions (poor condition negative score)	1	
SUB TOTAL			
ACCESS			
49	Roadway access/ capacity/ safety is adequate for ingress and egress	1	
50	Proximity to Interstate, regional roadway network	1	
51	Proximity to Mass Transit Options	1	
52	Access to bike/ hiking trails	1	
53	The site is pedestrian friendly and connected to community sidewalks	1	
54	Traffic in the surrounding area does not conflict with the proposed use	1	
SUB TOTAL			
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES/ BENEFITS			
55	Impact to Schedule	1	
56	Impact to Budget	1	
57	Proposed use would gain positive public support	1	
58	Economic Impact (will the project provide an economic benefit to the surrounding area?)	1	
59	Purchase cost of property is reasonable	1	
60	Impact to public revenue	1	
61	Marketability of Facility/ Events	1	
62	Site development would enhance positive image of neighborhood/ community	1	
63	Local Incentives available	1	
SUB TOTAL			
POINT TOTAL			
AVERAGE SCORE			