

July 2025 - CIC Meeting

Tue, Jul 22, 2025 6:00PM • 13:54

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Demolition update, asbestos change order, transformer removal, grant funds, site clearing, wall shoring, development status, property value appeal, sale of property, community notification, meeting minutes, action items, due diligence, retail space, mixed-use development.

SPEAKERS

Meredith Hughes, Taylor Vogt, Johnathan Stuchell, Christopher Schildmeyer

Johnathan Stuchell 00:03

Okay, we'll go ahead and call to order the Tuesday, July 22 meeting of the St. Bernard Community Improvement Corporation. Can we have a roll call by the secretary please.

Christopher Schildmeyer 00:32

Jonathan, present. Tom is absent. Bob Culbertson is absent, Joe Bricker here, Peggy Brickweg, here, Ray Culbertson, here, Jeff Edwards, here, Ali Palmer, here, Chris Sauer, here, Amy Yosmali, here, Meredith Hughes, here, Taylor Vogt, here,

Johnathan Stuchell 01:01

normally, the Secretary does the minutes, but I did prepare the minutes since I did them last time. So I did email them out in a chance to review them.

Christopher Schildmeyer 01:10

You can fire me as well

Johnathan Stuchell 01:14

There was an error that I actually had pointed out. So again, I made sure this time we made we had so with your voice to text program, it likes to give him an EN. He was kind of repulsed by the spelling. And we did have such an egregious error that some reason, somehow we came out of out without the minutes even being approved. Anyhow, just want to let you know. But anyhow, you've had a chance to review the men. Minutes of their earning. Are there any corrections, if not can I have a motion to accept?

Christopher Schildmeyer 02:01

Motion Joe Brickler, seconded by Peggy ... accepted.

Johnathan Stuchell 02:05

Does anyone have a Treasurer's Report? So as far as action items, update on the demolition and shopping center, I wanted to come over with you, Chris, and there is a second change order that I need to get to you, and that was again, for the asbestos coated pipe they discovered. Okay, so, and I believe it was right around 5800 I don't know if that sounds right. It was, I'll verify that. But I did approve that, because they still need to move on, and they thought it would take them a couple days. But again, basically, right now, I mean, they're removing the foundation. They're making, you know, substantial progress. One thing that I wanted to touch on as well, and maybe this is something that Tim Williams had been following up on. Got confirmation from Duke that within the next week or two, that that transformer on the corner is going to be removed. So with that being said, since we do have additional funds from the other grant, whether or not we want to go ahead and have that, if they do remove the transformer, we had them go ahead and even though they backfilled, do we have them go ahead and dig out that corner, remove that remaining portion of the basement wall while they're here?

Christopher Schildmeyer 03:28

Yeah, my opinion is we should have them do it, as long as they're still here to do it. Sure, and then I don't, I don't remember what Taylor you might know, what was the second half? What's that? How much money was involved in the second half of the grant,

Taylor Vogt 03:49

or the other grant was larger, right? Initially, talking about whether the asphalt department came out to which is now, so there's, there's enough there to meet that then definitely clearing the site completely.

Johnathan Stuchell 04:06

Yeah. And I guess the other question being, is it, as far as in your communication with O'Rourke, are they still going to move forward with shoring up that wall, as far as you're concerned?

Christopher Schildmeyer 04:19

Yes, I think they My recommendation would be to have them shore that up. It's going to be there long enough that I would be concerned about whether events taking down that block wall. Only thing really supporting it right now is the joist, which isn't really designed to keep it held up without the other joists, which are now gone..

Johnathan Stuchell 04:35

So again, they're making great progress. I mean moving right along. So I'm thrilled, and I think at least the community can see what it looks like with its scraping. It's refreshing site. So as of right now, that's where we're at. Update on progress to the developer and current status. I'm still in their due diligence period. I don't know if Taylor or Meredith, you had anything to add? I mean, it's just still in process. One of the things, though, I did want to touch on kind of while we're on this just a basic refresher, because at times, there seems to be misinformation that gets distributed about the actual development itself. Development as far as the scope of the development and the overall design. You know, the design portion is not finalized. We, you know, basically looking at, again, 190 unit mixed use development with 5000 square feet of retail space on the lower level, which was reduced from the original 10. But the, you know, the scope of the project hasn't really changed. And we have had some information that was requested where people wanted an update, people that may have moved in the community curious

about the project. There are people that have answered, say on our behalf. So again, there hasn't been anything that's changed. Anyone that wishes to from the community, that would like to see some original concepts. As far as the footprint layout, I mean, that's all available. The developer has been here several times to make those presentations and updates. So really, again, there isn't anything that has changed from our original intent. So as far as an update on the contesting of the property value of the shopping center. Lean on Meredith for that,

Meredith Hughes 06:29

we did win our appeal for the 2024 valuation. So the auditor is going to reduce the total value from \$2.1M and some change to \$757,000, which is what our appraiser appraised at. That is a huge, huge drop. The next step of the process is that board will issue a formal opinion that the auditor of the treasurer so they can adjust that number, and then either of we will either get a refund back, in the difference or will go as a credit on the 2025 not quite sure which, but I have to wait for that formal opinion to come out.

Johnathan Stuchell 07:29

Great news, this is kind of a repeat item as far as sale of property, so the 306 Bank Street, so I did. I still need to send a letter to the remaining property on the right side, the new property onto the left of the property is called again, and is still super interested in actually acquiring that property. I brought this up at the last at the last meeting, I'm trying to point at both of you, but Taylor, since you were primarily the one that was in control of helping with the side lot purchases, the program that we offered in this case, I'm trying to remember, because I can't find the initial communication that was sent, whether or not when we sent out notice to the joining property owners, whether we did list purchase price in that or whether or not just asking for potential interest. And we definitely have an interested buyer, but we don't have, you know, an exact amount, because basically what we're looking at that particular lot is valued right now, currently at \$19,920, based on their, you know, the market value per se, and without a structure, it's not a buildable lot. It has a cistern on the front end. So it's something we inherited. And I guess the plan was we had a number of, roughly, again, if I went back to the comp side of what we did when we did the Orchard Street, we were at, you know, at 2790 prior to the application.

Johnathan Stuchell 09:19

It may have been, it may have been,

Taylor Vogt 09:23

I'd like to look into this right now, just so I actually look back at the application materials. I cannot recall if we diverged the auditors value.

Johnathan Stuchell 09:38

didn't have a I cannot remember how we came up with that amount, but it was valued at greater than the lot that we sold in orchard was greater than the 2000 whatever ended up being. But again, I would like, and we brought this up at the last meeting, and basically the Board gave approval to make contact to start looking at marketing the property, because, again, it's something that's not a buildable lot. It's a continued lot that we have. It's sizable enough based upon depth that it requires a bit of annual maintenance. So you know, the adjoining property owner is definitely interested in it, and I would like to

follow up with him and also, again, provide proper notice based on the sale process to both the other adjoining our owner

Taylor Vogt 10:24

I think if the board was open to listing the property, that would be the first step in getting to the bottom of the price then. But I think it's a question of does the board think that property should be made available.

Johnathan Stuchell 10:44

So no, but based on the last meeting that we had, we talked about it being a side lot purchase and opening it up to the joining property owners first, not just making it a public sale, but to make the property available, first to a either adjoining property owner, as we did with other side lots in the past. But the point that the question I was based on coming up with an actual value. We're talking about true assessed value from the Hamilton County Auditor, whether or not we come up with a different price, again, because the property is more of a liability to us than an asset. So, you know, whatever the recommendation would be.

Taylor Vogt 11:40

I think typically, that's how we do it. This typically, of course, is the boards recommendation on how we approach things like price. I just want to make sure we're being consistent setting the standard that everyone's comfortable with moving forward.

Johnathan Stuchell 12:21

So if we can try to schedule essentially, a quick review committee meeting, at least before the next scheduled meeting, and then I will let the interested party that we have know, but in the meantime, we would still need to discuss whether or not some we'd already proved notification so whether or not we can come up before the next meeting with appropriate, you know, letter to the other owner as well. So if, if we can try to whether we schedule it tonight, whether we sent out a few dates based on our calendars, as long as we can have that, I would say before the next meeting, that would be great.

Johnathan Stuchell 13:05

As far as anything under open discussion, additional agenda items? Does anyone in the audience have anything?

Johnathan Stuchell 13:15

Anybody on the board have anything items or additional. Anybody want to fill in for Tom, okay, so at this point, I show our next meeting on August, 26 at 6 p.m. is there a motion to adjourn all

Christopher Schildmeyer 13:42

Motion made by Amy Yosmali. All those in favor? All responded with Aye.