City Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, February 1, 2016 ~ 7:30 P.M.

Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building
John P. Coleman Council Chamber
6550 North High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Bonnie D. Michael, President
Scott Myers, President Pro-Tem
Rachael Dorothy
Douglas C. Fost
David M. Norstrom
Douglas Smith
Michael C. Troper

Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council

If you have questions regarding this agenda please contact the Clerk of Council at 614-786-7347. This agenda and amendments that may be made to it can be found at www.worthington.org
CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

VISITOR COMMENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1) January 4, 2016 – Regular Meeting

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

2) Ordinance No. 05-2016

   Approving the Subdivision of Property at 918 High Street and Authorizing Variances (Plank Law Firm/MK&K Realty Inc.)

   Introduced January 19, 2016
   P.H. February 1, 2016

3) Ordinance No. 06-2016

   An Ordinance to Revise the Codified Ordinances by Adopting Current Replacement Pages.

   Introduced January 19, 2016
   P.H. February 1, 2016

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

4) Resolution No. 06-2016

   Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 300 East Wilson Bridge Road and Authorizing Variances (Advance Sign Group/MedVet).

5) Resolution No. 07-2016

   Authorizing Amendments to the Policy & Procedures of the City’s Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program.
6) **Ordinance No. 07-2016**

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund Unappropriated Balance.

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

**REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**OTHER**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**ADJOURNMENT**
City Manager Report to City Council for the Meeting of Monday, February 1, 2016

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1) January 4, 2016 – Regular Meeting

Recommendation: Approval of Minutes as Presented

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

2) Ordinance No. 05-2016 – Subdivision & Variances – 918 High Street

This Ordinance divides the property located at 918 High Street to allow the property occupied by CVS to be separated from the rest of the property. Two additional parcels at the east end of the site that house parking would be combined with the resultant southern parcel. The Ordinance also grants variances related to parking, lot coverage, side yard setback and acreage. Additional information is provided in the attached memorandum from the Director of Planning & Building. The application is also attached. Municipal Planning Commission reviewed this item and unanimously recommended approval on December 10, 2015. Minutes from the MPC meeting are attached.

Recommendation: Approval of Ordinance as Presented

3) Ordinance No. 06-2016 – Replacement Pages – Codified Ordinances

This Ordinance approves replacement pages for the Codified Ordinances of the City. This is typically done annually and incorporates all Ordinances amending provisions of Code that were enacted since the last recodification and changes necessitated by changes in state law. These pages contain changes primarily related to the Charter amendment, City Council adopted changes to the Code (e.g. regulations regarding residential one-site sewage disposal facilities, definitions in the Planning & Zoning Code, requirements for the location of service equipment in side yards, bamboo regulations, and the income tax code), state law changes and the traffic code.

Recommendation: Approval of Ordinance as Presented
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

4) Resolution No. 06-2016 – Amendment to Development Plan - MedVet

Advance Sign Group and MedVet have applied to amend the Final Development Plan for 300 East Wilson Bridge Road to change the wall and freestanding signs to reflect the business’ new image. Variances for the number of letter styles and sizes for the freestanding sign are included with this Resolution. Staff believes the proposed amendment maintains the character and integrity of the development and it does not exceed the sign area previously approved for the site. The proposal fits within the proposed Wilson Bridge Corridor Code. Additional information is provided in the attached memorandum from the Director of Planning & Building. The Municipal Planning Commission reviewed this application and unanimously recommended approval. Minutes from the MPC meeting are attached.

Recommendation: Approval of Resolution as Presented

5) Resolution No. 07-2016 – ReCAP Program - Adoption of Amended Policy & Procedures

The Re-Emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) provides grants and loans to encourage exterior enhancement to commercial properties on Huntley Road and Proprietors Road and the connecting portions of Worthington Galena Road and Schrock Road. The program was originally instituted in 2014 and after two years of operation, the materials for the program were reviewed. This Resolution approves modification of the Policy and Procedures for ReCAP. The modifications were reviewed by the Community Improvement Corporation Board, which recommends approval. Additional detail regarding the proposed changes is provided in the attached memorandum from the Assistant City Manager. Also attached are redline copies of the proposed Policy & Procedures, a summary sheet of the projects funded by the program in 2014 and 2015, presentation slides that highlight the program investments to date, and a copy of the draft minutes from the CIC Board meeting. A clean copy of the proposed Policy and Procedures is attached to the Resolution.

Recommendation: Approval of Resolution as Presented

6) Ordinance No. 07-2016 – Supplemental Appropriation

This Ordinance appropriates additional funds for payment to the Convention & Visitors Bureau (CVB) and to pay for repairs that are necessary for the elevator in the Municipal Building. The additional funding for the CVB provides for the final allocation of 2015 funds. Ordinance 37-2014 specified the CVB would receive 66% of the hotel/motel tax revenue received by the City. Total collections for 2015 equaled $223,528.28. Sixty six percent of that amount is $147,528.66. The 2015 Operating Budget included an appropriation of $130,000 so an additional $17,528.66 needs to be appropriated to meet the allocation specified in Ordinance 37-2014.

The elevator in the Municipal Building is not operating reliably and needs to be repaired. Funds are provided to pay for this unexpected repair.
An appropriation of $150,000 is needed to cover the legal fees incurred on the Community Center Roof settlement.

**Recommendation:** Introduction for Public Hearing on February 16, 2016

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

I respectfully request an executive session for the purpose of discussing appointments to Boards and Commissions.
Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 4, 2016 ~ 7:30 P.M.

Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building
John P. Coleman Council Chamber
6550 North High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

City Council

Bonnie D. Michael, President
Scott Myers, President Pro-Tempore
Rachael Dorothy
Douglas C. Foust
David M. Norstrom
Douglas Smith
Michael C. Troper

D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council
CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, January 4, 2016, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 8:10 p.m.

Members Present: Rachael R. Dorothy, Douglas C. Foust, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, Service and Engineering Director William Watterson, Director of Building and Planning Lee Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, and Chief of Police James Mosic

There were twenty two visitors present.

President Michael suspended the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance as it was previously recited.

VISITOR COMMENTS

Michael Bates, 6560 Evening St.
Mr. Bates shared that he is attending on behalf of WARD (Worthington Alliance for Responsible Development). He knows that council will be making some decisions on the Charter Review Commission, probably within the next few sessions. He sent Council an e-mail about a month and a half ago on behalf of WARD to let them know that WARD is very interested in having a representative serve on the Charter Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

• November 16, 2015 – Regular Meeting
• December 7, 2015 – Regular Meeting
• December 14, 2015 – Committee of the Whole Meeting

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

There being no additional comments, the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote to approve the minutes as amended.
PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION
President Michael declared public hearings and voting on legislation previously introduced to be in order.

Ordinance No. 55-2015
Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of Design and Related Services for Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons at the High Street Intersections of Stafford Avenue, Village Green South and Short Street and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 626-16)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson commented that an Old Worthington Mobility Study was launched last year. The first two phases study the crossings at Stafford and High, Village Green South and Short St. to ascertain whether there could be methodologies for improving pedestrian crossings at those intersections. DLZ was hired to help with the mobility study. They are represented tonight by Steve Jewell who will present the recommendation for pedestrian hybrid beacons. He asked Mr. Watterson to comment prior to turning the meeting over to Mr. Jewell.

Mr. Watterson shared that DLZ conducted a study at each of the intersections to identify what improvements could be implemented that could improve pedestrian safety at the three crossings. The initial results of Phase I were presented to the Bike and Pedestrian Committee and they asked that Phase II also be considered. DLZ completed Phase II and returned to the Bike and Ped Committee and made their presentation which recommended the installation of the pedestrian hybrid beacons, which is a new control device for pedestrian crosswalks. The recommendation comes to council with the approval of the Bike and Ped Committee and Mr. Jewell will go through their analysis, advise as to how the pedestrian hybrid beacon operates and with Council’s concurrence the next step would be to fund preparations of plans and specifications in preparation of the public bid process for the project.

Mr. Norstrom asked if anyone from the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committee was present. Mr. Hurley acknowledged the four Advisory Board members who were present: Emma Lindholm, John Rist, Kelly Whalen, and Michael Bates.

Steve Jewell, DLZ

Mr. Jewell shared that he manages the Traffic and Planning Department for DLZ, Ohio. He presented the following PowerPoint presentation:
OLD WORTHINGTON MOBILITY STUDY
City of Worthington
January 4, 2016
DLZ

PRESENTER
• Steven G. Jewell, P.E., PTOE
  Traffic and Planning Department Manager
  DLZ Ohio, Inc.

STUDY PHASES
• Phase 1 – High Street at Stafford Avenue Pedestrian Crossing
• Phase 2 – High Street at Village Green Drive South and at Short Street Pedestrian Crossings
• Phase 3 – Sidewalk Review for Pedestrian Accessibility
• Phase 4 – Bicycle Mobility

Mr. Jewell commented that tonight’s focus will be on Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phases 3 and 4 will come at a later date.

PHASE 1 – HIGH ST AT STAFFORD AVE.

Mr. Jewell shared that there are several major pedestrian generators at this intersection: 1) Worthington Public Library, 2) Griswold Center
PHASE 1 – HIGH ST AT STAFFORD AVE.

Mr. Jewell commented that High St. at this point is five lanes wide with a two way left turn lane in the middle of High St. There are marked crosswalks along the north/south crossing of Stafford on either side of High St. There are legal crosswalks at every intersection, including this one across High St. However they are unmarked at this particular point in time. For the most part, studies have indicated that pedestrians take greater chances when crossing at unmarked crosswalks like this one.

PHASE 1 – HIGH ST AT STAFFORD AVE.

- Traffic count (7-10 am, 11 am–2 pm, 3-6 pm)
  - 48 pedestrians (17 from 3:00 to 4:00 pm)
- Observation (3:00 to 3:30 pm)
  - 13 of 16 were children going to library (middle and high school age groups)

Mr. Jewell shared that if there was some particular device to assist with crossing, library staffers feels that the number of students coming to the library would increase because of the numerous high school activities they offer.

- Crash data (6+ years: 2009-2015) – 13 crashes
  - 6 angle; 4 parked vehicles; 0 pedestrians/bicycles; 3 others
  - No distinct crash pattern
Mr. Norstrom asked for clarification on “angle” crashes. Mr. Jewell explained that an “angle” crash is when a vehicle pulls out from a side street and hits or gets hit by a vehicle on High St.

- EVALUATED FOR A TRAFFIC SIGNAL
  - Ohio Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD) provides direction per Ohio Revised Code
  - Nine Warrants including Pedestrian Warrant and School Crossing Warrant
  - Not all Warrants are applicable in all situations
  - Evaluation of Warrants showed none were met (no justification for a traffic signal)

Mr. Myers asked if he is correct in assuming that according to the Uniform Manual, it would not dictate or suggest that there be a signalized crossing at this intersection. Mr. Jewell agreed that neither a pedestrian traffic signal or a vehicular traffic signal is warranted based on the data.

- TRAFFIC CONTROL ALTERNATIVES
  1. Pedestrian Warning Signs
  2. Crosswalk with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB)
  3. Overhead Pedestrian Crossing Signs
  4. Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB)

- Alt 1 - Pedestrian Warning Signs
  - Advance “YIELD TO PEDESTRIANS AHEAD” Signs
  - For entering heavily travelled Pedestrian Zone
    - Southbound on High Street north of Stafford Avenue
    - Northbound on High Street north of SR-161
• Alt 2 – Crosswalk with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) [overhead for multi-lane application]
  • Advantages
    • Improves visibility of crossing
    • Provides positive guidance
    • Solar powered/wireless
    • Lower install and operate than signal of PHB
    • Over 80% driver compliance yielding to pedestrians
  • Disadvantages
    • Not coordinated with signals
    • Doesn’t provide stop condition for drivers or control for pedestrians
    • Under FHWA Interim Approval; not in the OMUTCD

• Alt 3 - Overhead Pedestrian Crossing Signs
  • Advantages
    • Improves visibility of crossing
    • Provides positive guidance
      • Signs with beacons – driver compliance 31% to 74%
  • Disadvantages
    • Not coordinated with signals; increased potential for rear-end crashes
    • Doesn’t provide stop condition for drivers or full control for pedestrian

• Alt 3 - Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB)
  • Initially known as HAWK (High Intensity Activated Crosswalk)

  • Advantages
    • High visibility crossing
    • Traffic control device in OMUTCD
• Provides stop control for drivers; pedestrian control [WALK/CT-DN/DW]
• Lower install and operating costs than signal
• Works in a coordinated signal system
• 97% driver compliance

Disadvantages
• Higher costs than RRFB
• New type device to area; PR campaign needed

Traffic Analysis Performed
• Capacity Analysis – Level of Service (LOS) = A (Both AM & PM Peak Hours)

Mr. Myers asked for further clarification on the definition of “A”. Mr. Jewell explained that essentially traffic is flowing with very little interruption. “A” is very, very good.

Mr. Myers commented that in analyzing the current capacity rate it was determined to be an “A” without a signal and as it sits now. Mr. Jewell replied that traffic is flowing on High St. and the beacon will not stop traffic every time the button is pushed. It will wait a little bit so it will maintain a good traffic flow. Mr. Myers concluded that the analysis is with the signal in place we can still maintain an “A” traffic flow at this location. Mr. Jewell agreed. He added that there will be much more congestion at the High St. and StRt 161 intersection with the left turn phase. They are probably operating at a service level “D” and sometimes level service “E” because it is over capacity.

Ms. Dorothy commented that the level of service is in regards to service for only motorized vehicles. Mr. Jewell agreed. Ms. Dorothy further stated that we have no optimized guidelines for other modes of transportation in the level of service analysis. Mr. Jewell agreed that there were but added that they have not been evaluated at this point because everything was level service “A” for the vehicles on this one. Right now the delay for pedestrians is high so that level of service for them will improve. Ms. Dorothy hopes that this can be optimized.

Recommendation
• Install advance pedestrian warning signs
• Install Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon with decorative poles
- PHB Public Information Video (ODOT)

Mr. Jewell showed a video that demonstrated the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon in use. He added that the video can be found on the City’s website.

**PHASE 2 – HIGH ST AT VILLAGE GREEN SOUTH DRIVE AND AT SHORT STREET**
• Traffic counts (9 hour TMC)
  • 13 pedestrians at Short St; 66 pedestrians at Village Green Drive South
• Observation – Farmers Market (July 20, 2015)
  • 60 pedestrians crossing at Short St in 30 minutes
  • 400 pedestrians crossing at Village Green Drive South in 30 minutes
• Crash data (6+ years: 2009-2015)
  • Short St - 29 total: 11 sideswipe; 8 parked vehicles; 7 rear-end; 0 pedestrians/bicycles; 3 others
  • Village Green Drive South – 14 total: 9 rear-end; 3 parked vehicles; 1 bicycle

Mr. Norstrom asked if there was any information regarding the bicycle accident. Mr. Jewell recalls it being a young person but he doesn’t recall the extent of the injuries.

• EVALUATED BOTH FOR A TRAFFIC SIGNAL
  • Ohio Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD) provides direction per ORC
  • Nine Warrants including Pedestrian Warrant and School Crossing Warrant
  • Not all Warrants are applicable in all situations
  • Evaluation of Warrants showed none were met

Ms. Dorothy commented that this is a location where there is already some signalization and there are no warrants that show a need for any. Mr. Jewell replied that warrants aren’t really required for the signage that is present at this location. It is usually done through an engineering evaluation and an engineering judgement. Those signs have been there for a long time. He doesn’t know the specifics as to why that particular sign was chosen versus some other things but it was pretty state of the art when it was installed.

• TRAFFIC CONTROL ALTERNATIVES
  1. Install Advance Pedestrian Warning Signs
  2. Upgrade Existing Pedestrian Crossing Warning Signs
  3. Install Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHB)
• Alt 2 - Upgrade Existing Pedestrian Crossing Warning Signs
  • Advantages
    • Provides improved visibility of crossing
    • Provides positive guidance
      • Signs with beacons – driver compliance 31% to 74%
  • Disadvantages
    • Not coordinated with signals; increased potential for rear-end crashes
    • Observed drivers not yielding numerous times with existing signs
    • Doesn’t provide stop condition for drivers or full control for pedestrians

Mr. Norstrom asked if any of the data showed the effects of having flags at the intersections. Mr. Jewell replied no. He asked staff if they were used on a regular basis and they indicated that they weren’t. Mr. Norstrom disagreed because he has observed the flags being used on a regular basis.

• Alt 3 - Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB)
  • Initially known as HAWK (High Intensity Activated Crosswalk)
  • Advantages
    • Higher visibility crossing
    • Traffic control device in OMUTCD
    • Provides stop control for drivers; pedestrian control [WALK/CT-DN/DW]
    • Reuse most of existing mast arms structures; repaint poles/arms
    • Works in a coordinated signal system
    • 97% driver compliance
    • Uniform traffic control with PHB at Stafford Ave & High St
  • Disadvantages
    • New type device to area; PR campaign needed
• Traffic Analysis Performed  
  • Capacity Analysis – Level of Service (LOS) = A  
    (Both AM & PM Peak Hours)
• Recommendation  
  • Install advance pedestrian warning signs
  • Install Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons with decorative poles  
    (reuse and repaint poles/arms where possible)

Mr. Jewell noted that the current signs are pretty heavy and the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons are probably lighter. Therefore the plan is to utilize most of the existing poles.

Ms. Michael asked how many pedestrian warning signs are going to be needed at each intersection. Mr. Jewell replied that it is kind of a zone issue. Maybe one north of Stafford and one north and southbound as you come off of StRt 161 and one northbound on High St. just south of Short St. So it is only four signs.

**PHASE 1 AND 2 ESTIMATED COSTS**

• Estimated Costs  
  • Install advance pedestrian warning signs (City crews)  
    • Four signs at $150 each = $600
  • Install Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon with decorative poles  
    • Design (all three) = $30,388.00
    • Construction = $138,365.00 (Planning Level)  
      – High at Stafford =$60,200.00
      – High at Short and Village Green Drive South=$78,165.00

**OLD WORTHINGTON MOBILITY STUDY PHASES 1 AND 2**

• QUESTIONS?

Mr. Troper commented that at the crosswalk, the time is coordinated with the other signals. Mr. Jewell agreed that the times would be coordinated.

Mr. Foust asked for additional information on the public relations campaign. Mr. Jewell replied that most of the cities publish information in the local newspaper. There would also be handouts available. It could be included on the city’s website. Information could be included/distributed by whatever mechanisms are available in the city. He commented that maybe the Bike and Pedestrian Committee could assist with the effort.
Mr. Greeson added that staff could work with the schools, the library, and the Old Worthington Partnership that runs the Farmer’s Market to reach those audiences since they are the primary users at those crossing. Mr. Hurley indicated that part of the recommendation of the Bike and Ped Committee was for a very strong public information campaign that would go along with the approval.

Mr. Smith commented that next to the Fire Station the fire department can activate a typical traffic light from yellow to red or dark to yellow to red. He asked if there was any traffic signal that would be a pedestrian crossing signal as well that would activate similarly to that specific device in a manner of consistency and less confusion with the blinking reds. Mr. Jewell replied that when he indicated the fact that there is criteria or warrants that the Ohio Manual has in it, one of them is for a pedestrian type activated signal exactly like that. There is still a minimum number of pedestrians and we counted seventeen in the heaviest half hour period. There is just not enough vehicular and pedestrian side street traffic for full signalization.

Mr. Norstrom asked about the cost of doing a similar light to the ones at Short St. and Village Green at the library. Would it be $78,000 or less. Mr. Jewell replied that he doesn’t have a direct answer to that question. He doesn’t know what the signs cost to put them in or upgrade them. Mr. Watterson replied that it would be in the same range as the hybrid beacon because of the need for a controller and signs, etc. Mr. Jewell thinks the controller would be considerably less because it wouldn’t need to communicate with the traffic system.

Mr. Norstrom wonders if we are attacking this problem with a hammer. From a perspective of process, when ARB or MPC projects come before Council, members have copies of those minutes so we can understand the discussion. He would like to at least have a memo from the Bike and Ped Committee that addresses why the recommendations of the consultants were supported. That information would help members understand the thinking of the Bike and Ped Committee. As Mr. Myers asked and as we have heard these intersections do not meet the warrants. He wonders if it would be sufficient to install a similar sign to the ones at Short St. and the Village Green that would save us upwards of $80,000. Given the accidents statistics, we would enhance the safety and that it would not include a PR campaign. The citizens are very familiar with the current process. The flags are being used. In fact he had a mother tell him that even if council decided on the Hawk equipment she hoped the flags would still be available because the kids love to run across the street with the flags. He is hesitant to approve this because he thinks the problem that exists can be solved in a less expensive manner.

Mr. Foust shared that he is please this is being looked at and he stands in favor of anything that improves pedestrian and bicycle safety. He finds the sequencing of the lights a little bit confusing. He doesn’t think that any members are used to that in traffic. The PR campaign is fine and addresses the local residents and he thinks everyone will get comfortable with it over time but he is concerned about those who don’t travel the corridor very often. He asked if there has been any alternative programming through the system itself, something other than the alternating red. He asked if anyone is
Mr. Jewell reiterated the history of the device. They were put in at a few locations and were successful with no crashes. That not to say there haven’t been some over the years but they are going in all over the country. DLZ has designed three in other areas of Ohio and ODOT is also installing them. It is a new device that will take some time to get used to. It is something that they have seen that works. He has seen it installed at the national level. When looking at the statistics of what drivers have to react to, yield to, and stop for, the percentage of those devices, especially with the flashing aspect of it and that a full stop was a stronger compliance than the current ones. The current ones work. There is indication that they work with only one bicycle crash found and that is good statistics. But we were looking for something that was a little bit more authority than what is currently at the two locations. In fact, we observed people not yielding in situations.

Mr. Norstrom asked if the hawk devices are used on busy thoroughfares where the speed limit is higher than 25 mph. Mr. Jewell reported that he is aware of them being used in locations where the speed limit is upwards of 35 mph.

Mr. Norstrom remembers when these came into the industry they pretty much stayed in Tuscan. They were not immediately accepted across the country right away but Mr. Jewell indicated that has changed. Mr. Jewell agreed. He shared that he serves on the National Committee of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. They meet twice a year and provide advice with respect to federal highways and they required extensive research before this device was included in the manual. It came out very, very positive.

Ms. Michael commented that there were several residents who wished to comment on this topic. She invited Kevin Stotts to address Council.

Kevin Stotts, 39 W. Stafford Ave.
Mr. Stotts thanked City Council for addressing the issue. He is only going to address the Stafford and High St. intersection with his comments. He has lived at 39 W. Stafford for twenty nine years and is aware of that intersection since he crosses it frequently to visit the library and his children has crossed it to attend middle school.

Mr. Stotts said the first issue that he would like to address is kind of an aside. If members look at the Appendix A for the Phase I study, it includes the amount of traffic that turns down West Stafford. Between 7:00 am – 8:00 am for the traffic traveling south on High, 136 vehicles turn down West Stafford with an additional 12 that were driving north. That equates to 2 ½ cars per minute for that one hour timeframe. There is only an additional 251 vehicles between 8:00 am – 4:30 pm but obviously the first morning hour is very busy. He doesn’t have a solution on how to do anything about that but he just wanted City Council to be aware of how busy that street is during that time.

Mr. Stotts shared that the second issue deals with why he thinks there needs to be something noticeable at the intersection. The National Association of City Transportation Officials publication has a nice diagram of what it looks like for a person’s peripheral vision according to how fast they are going. The faster the vehicle is
going the more narrow the peripheral vision. The posted speed limit in Old Worthington is 25 mph. If anyone is very familiar, particularly between North St. and StRt 161 on High, that is an exception rather than a rule as most people drive much faster than that. That means that without anything at all the peripheral vision would be so narrow that most people would not be looking at any people on the edges who are starting to cross the street. That does indicate that there needs to be some kind of warning at that intersection. He commented that he attended the Bike and Ped meetings because he really wanted another stop light there as it is the only intersection in Old Worthington without any kind of signal at all. But what it also addresses, not only with the peripheral vision issue that we need some kind of additional warning there but it also indicates to him that we also need some kind of increased presence of enforcement of the speed limit, particularly in that section.

In addition, from that same group, the National Association of City Transportation Officials, when traveling 20 to 25 mph the stopping distance is 40 feet. When the speed increases to 30 to 35 mph the stopping distance is 70 to 75 feet. If doing 40 mph then 118 feet, which obviously goes to the next issue which is crash risk. At 20 – 25 mph the crash risk is only 15%. It goes up to 55% (pedestrian crash risk) for 35 mph and 90% for 40 mph. Fatality risk at 25 mph is 5% and goes up to 45% at 30-35 mph and 85% for those traveling 45 mph. Again, he thinks that addresses both issues of why something needs to be at that intersection to not only slow down traffic for pedestrians but also for increased patrol for speeding along that intersection.

Ms. Michael commented that the reason Council is studying this entire intersection is because they all feel that there is a need for something to be done for pedestrian safety. She asked him if he were to look at the hybrid beacon that was suggested tonight versus what is currently in downtown Worthington, what his thoughts would be. Mr. Stotts replied that while the ones in the downtown may have been state of the art at the time, for the most part they are ineffective now. He uses the signal and the flag and still crosses with a prayer that somebody is actually going to stop and let him cross. He doesn’t think that they are very effective right now. He thinks part of it is that people have gotten so use to them. Members were concerned about the red and yellow but the current ones are just light yellow lights and even though they flash he doesn’t think that people comprehend that there is a pedestrian and they should stop. The PHB allows for the police to ticket people if they do not stop. They really don’t have the power to do that with the current signals.

Mr. Norstrom doesn’t think that sounds correct. He commented that if he understands correctly, if a pedestrian steps into one of those crosswalks and a car does not stop then the police could ticket them. Chief Mosic replied that once the pedestrian establishes control of the crosswalk and approaches the half of the roadway then it is a failure to yield to a pedestrian offense.

Mr. Stotts commented that his understanding just came from the Bike and Ped Committee meeting and he was just reiterating what he had heard. Mr. Hurley thinks the discussion
was that the yellow light itself does not allow them to ticket which is true at any pedestrian crossing. Mr. Norstrom disagreed.

Chief Mosic clarified that the yellow light is an advisory to motorist that something is occurring but it doesn’t require the motorist to stop until the pedestrian establishes control of that crosswalk so that is where much of confusion comes.

Paul Dorothy, 179 Kenbrook Drive

Mr. Dorothy shared his credentials with City Council and stated that he speaks in favor of Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons. It was questioned tonight of whether we could just install another sign like the signs that we already have in our downtown. He shared that in the United States most pedestrian fatalities occur mid-block or at multi-lane roadway crossings at non-signalized locations. He thinks we have been lucky and it is only a matter of time before someone is badly injured or killed at one of these crossings. For a pedestrian to walk a half a block out of their way to make a crossing could take them over three minutes. Drivers are incensed by something that makes them wait three minutes. He asked why we would put our pedestrians in that position if we are claiming to be building Complete Streets and a walkable community. Pedestrian hybrid beacons support Complete Streets concepts which call for roadways to be consistently designed to be operated with all users in mind and not just cars and trucks. Our existing pedestrian activated beacons have serious flaws, one of which hasn’t been discussed yet tonight is what we call a multiple threat crash. This occurs when the pedestrian steps into the street and the person in the outside lane stops and yields for them. The pedestrian has the sense that that vehicles are stopping and continues to cross but the vehicle in the next lane over doesn’t stop. The pedestrian can’t see that because the vehicle that has stopped and yielded for him blocks their line of sight. NCHRP, one of our national research foundations has done this study on improving pedestrian safety at un-signalized intersections. That study found that driver compliance on average at those types of crossings is just 50%. Mr. Jewell presented the range, anywhere between 31 and 74%. It was questioned as to what flags would do to that as well. The same study looked at that and the flags do a little better at 65% but there is a caveat to that in that the flags are primarily used at non-multi-lane crossings and the range drops as low as 45% of compliance of drivers. He asked members to think about that. An average compliance of 50%. He asked if they would want their children crossing at a location where they get to flip a coin to see if a driver will stop for them. He doesn’t.

Enforcement: the flashing yellow lights don’t carry the weight of the law. In order for a driver to be sighted the pedestrian must step into the crosswalk. That is a suicide mission if 50% of the people are going to blow through it. So we repeatedly see drivers not yielding to the pedestrian and the pedestrian ends up back on the curb because they can’t step into the crosswalk.

Mr. Dorothy stated that we must address key mobility issues. We have several populations that use the Griswold Center on one side and elderly housing on the other so we have an older population using this location. It is not a friendly place to cross. He
crosses there all the time. There are school children. The studies showed the majority of folks cross between 3:00 and 3:30 pm. Those are high school kids who may not have the best judgment. We have patrons of businesses in the downtown area, 400 people in ½ hour during the Farmers Market. That is a lot of our fellow citizens flipping a coin. They deserve better, safer mobility options. The pedestrian hybrid beacon was first installed in Tuscan, AZ in the 1990s. They have over 100 of them now. Since then it has been installed all over the country and in all climate zones. The first in Ohio was Delta, we saw the video. Columbus is installing three but they are not new. Something like the pedestrian hybrid beacon has been used in Europe for over 60 years. They call it the Pelican. They have newer deployments called Puffin and Toucan.

There has been some question about driver confusion but the studies back up the fact that driver confusion on these is minimal. There is no change in the right-of-way rules of the road. A red light is a red light and one must stop. That red light carries the weight of law while a flashing yellow beacon does not. Compliance by motorists for the pedestrian hybrid beacon exceeds 97%. That is nearly equal to the compliance at a normal traffic light. That is critical. There is new language in the National Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices that further encourages the use of these at intersections. It says that if a pedestrian hybrid beacon is installed at or immediately adjacent to an intersection with a side road, vehicular traffic on the side road shall be controlled by a stop sign. That replaces the original language that was more restrictive. This language has already been proposed and accepted for the 2016 National manual. The Ohio manual must come within substantial conformity of the National manual. So we will see the same change occur in Ohio. The Federal Highway Administration also studied the impact of pedestrian hybrid beacons. They found a 29% reduction in total crashes where they were installed and a 69% reduction in pedestrian crashes.

Mr. Norstrom asked if that was compared to no lights or yellow blinking lights. Mr. Dorothy replied that is compared to the previous mid-block crossing without control. He continued by stating that the Village of Delta administrator after a few months of operation of their beacons was quoted as saying that he has seen much higher usage of the PHB than he anticipated. It is being used and he has seen excellent compliance by motorists. The motorists that he has seen understand the process and he is very happy with the project and how it turned out. He hopes that Worthington will take the lead and also upgrade our pedestrian crossings and protect our citizens so that we don’t expect our children to flip a coin when they have to cross the street.

Ms. Michael asked Mr. Watterson to clarify the costs. Mr. Watterson commented that a significant portion of the cost at Stafford Ave. will be the decorative mast arms that will support the signals. He doesn’t know the prices of individual pieces of equipment but he thinks it would be of the same magnitude. He added that the downtown equipment needs replaced as it is more than twenty five years old and is showing its age.

Ms. Michael asked for comments from council members.
Mr. Myers asked if Council received a recommendation from the Bike and Pedestrian Committee. Mr. Hurley replied in the affirmative. He shared that DLZ made presentations at two meetings. At the September meeting DLZ originally gave a presentation on the Stafford and High St. crossing. The discussion at that meeting included several residents and their testimonies. At that meeting the Advisory Board felt that it was important to also consider the Phase II intersections that included the two additional crossings that were discussed tonight. DLZ was asked to come back with a recommendation on the additional crossings. DLZ returns to the October meeting with that presentation at which time the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board made a motion in favor of the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons. Along with that recommendation was an exhaustive educational program that would reach the community and an evaluation prior to and after the effectiveness of those.

Ms. Michael asked for clarification in that the recommendation is for the Hybrid Beacons at all three of the intersections that we discussed. Mr. Hurley agreed. They thought it was important for the sake of consistency that all three of the intersections be treated the same. They did recommend the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons.

Mr. Hurley added that Jennie Martin the chair of that Board called this afternoon and shared that she was sick and would be unable to attend. There are four members of the Advisory Board here this evening and they could certainly add to the comments.

Michael Bates commented that a question came up about the thought process of the Board when they were listening to testimony. He will speak for himself. He thinks the two items that caused him to vote in the positive for the Hybrid Beacons was 1) the enforceability of the walkway. As we heard, a red light is a red light and that is enforceable where there is a lot of discretion with a yellow light. He understands that the pedestrian has the right of way but you have to risk stepping into the roadway before you can get that right of way. 2) The coordination of the three crosswalks and the signal at StRt 161 and High St. He thinks the idea of being able to coordinate all of those signals to make sure that we maintain consistent traffic flow both for vehicles and pedestrians was significant as opposed to having these different signals at different points as you travel the city.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 55-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes  7  Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers and Michael

No  0

Ordinance No. 55-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 01-2016

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Cleaning Contract for the Community Center.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 01-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Mr. Hurley reported that bids were opened on December 11, 2015 for Custodial Services at the Community Center. The winning bidder was ABM Onsite Services – Midwest Inc. They have a representative who has been very patiently sitting here tonight, Beth Wills, their branch manager. Their bid was for $8,319.68 per month. Tonight staff is bringing it before Council in hopes that you would authorize the City Manager through this resolution to award the bid and enter into a contractual agreement which would run from February 1, 2016 through January 31, 2017. There are sufficient funds allocated in the operating budget to fund the 2016 portion of the contract. They had three bidders and this was the low bid.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 01-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 02-2016

Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 7020 Huntley Road and Authorizing Variances (Zaftig Brewing Co.).

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 02-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

Mr. Brown commented that the request is for an Amendment to Development Plan that includes variances. As members know, when a property has a Development Plan and there are variances associated with that Plan it is required to come before City Council for approval. This property is located on the east side of Huntley Road and north of Schrock Blvd. It encompasses two buildings that has multi-tenant. The building was built in the late 1960s. Zaftig Brewing Company, which is currently housed on Schrock Rd. is in the process of moving into 7020 Huntley Rd., Suite A.

Members may recall that late last year the applicant went through the process for a Conditional Use to have a brewery in the I-1 zoning district, which was approved. They also requested an Amendment to Development Plan and when the Board reviewed their Conditional Use application recommendation for their signage was also made. The brewing company will be located in an 1800 tap room and they will be constructing a
4700 sq. ft. production and distribution space in the building. The application before Council tonight is for three variances related to their signage:

1) Exceeds the allowable sign area – 100 sq. ft./business allowed; 198 sq. ft. proposed
2) Exceeds the limit of one (1) wall sign per business – two (2) proposed
3) Exceeds more than two (2) styles of text – three (3) proposed

Mr. Brown showed a rendering of the proposed sign. It is approximately 8 x 24 (approximately 192 sq. ft.) in size. Our City code allows 100 sq. ft. There is also a small sign located above the main entrance that matches the other tenant signs throughout the complex. That sign is approximately six feet in size.

Mr. Brown commented that the application went before the Municipal Planning Commission at the December 10th meeting and was recommended for approval. The applicant is also in the audience tonight.

Mr. Myers shared that the Planning Commission had a rather extensive discussion concerning the design of the sign. He thinks they found that the brick detailing fit very well with this sign. They actually looked at several different proposals of smaller designs and they felt this one was the most appropriate given the brick detail and size and massing of the building.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 02-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 03-2016

Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 350 West Wilson Bridge Road and Authorizing Variances (Trivium Worthington LLC).

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 03-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Mr. Greeson shared that staff is pleased to talk with Council this evening about 350 West Wilson Bridge Rd., which as members know has long been vacant and something that staff has worked to fill as part of our overall redevelopment efforts in the Wilson Bridge Road corridor. Before he turns it over to Mr. Brown to overview the Amendment to Development Plan that is being requested, he would like to introduce Tim Spencer, who is renovating the building with Trivium Development. With him tonight is Tino Valentino, who is the Chief Operating Officer of the Central Ohio Urology Group, who is going to be a new business to Worthington and will occupy the first floor of this building. He welcomed Tino and Tim and thanked them for their patience.
Mr. Brown shared that the request is for an Amendment to Development Plan that includes variances. The property is located at 350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. In the two years that he has been here it has been one of those properties that has popped up several times. He thinks when Jeff Harris (previous Economic Development Director) and he met with Mr. Spencer last year and viewed the site, they determined that the building needed some major work. He is glad that it will receive an update.

Mr. Brown showed a diagram of the location, which is part of the Officescape development. The property is a little over 4 ½ acres and located on the north side of West Wilson Bridge Rd. It also has a joint access drive with 400, 450 and 500 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. that were all developed in the early to mid-1970s. The building is a little over 53,000 sq. ft.

The request is to re-use the existing building and includes several modifications, updates, and sustainable measures. It will have a new entry facility that will house a new elevator, an entryway, lobby and stairs to access all three levels of the building. The tower will need a variance as it is 1½ feet above the allowable height for the district. Part of the redevelopment is to bring the site up to accessibility and ADA compliance. There will be a drop off area for patients. The entrance is off of Wilson Bridge Rd. at Rieber St. The site will need to be regraded to bring it in to compliance and allow for handicap parking and a canopied drop-off. There will be all new windows and doors and new sound reducing windows installed along the north side of the building. The parking lot will be redeveloped and islands added. The reconfiguration will allow for four parking spaces per thousand for medical/office use. One of the additional variances will be to bring the parking space requirements down. Our code currently requires 171 sq. ft. per space. The request is for 162 sq. ft. per space, which is actually in compliance with many of our neighboring jurisdictions.

There will be some pedestrian connections in a walkway on the east side of the site that will connect to the sidewalk and bike path. There will also be a patio for the tenants and new mechanical equipment (generators and air handling units). A water line and storm sewer will need to be relocated. There will be accompanying legislation to address those issues. There will need to be a new waterline easement as well. There is currently no gas located along the northern properties of West Wilson Bridge Road. As part of the renovations, Mr. Spencer will be working towards getting gas extended to the property. There will be many sustainable improvements to the site such as new LED lighting. There will be three new light poles in the parking lot. Bike racks, landscaping and retaining walls will also be added.

Ms. Dorothy asked if the commercial development would have to include a landscape design. Mr. Brown replied yes. With the addition of the bike trail last year some landscaping has already been done. They will add to what is already there with planting strips, trees and shrubs.

Mr. Brown stated that part of the variances include signage. The Central Ohio Urology Group will have a wall sign on the West Wilson Bridge Road side and on the I-270 side.
The sign on the north side of the building is 100 sq. ft. in size. The one of the W. Wilson Bridge Rd. side will be 40 sq. ft. in size. Since this will be a multi-tenant building in the future, staff looked at a future tenant spot that will also include a size of approximately 40 sq. ft. As part of the freestanding sign along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. is a sign that identifies the address and the three tenants on the site. This request includes variances for square footage, multiple tenants on a sign and signs exceeding 100 sq. ft. in size.

This application went before the Municipal Planning Commission on December 10th and they unanimously recommended approval.

Mr. Norstrom commented that at the request of the Urology sign is only for the north side elevation that faces I-270 and future tenants would only have signs on the south side of the building. Mr. Brown replied yes, at least at this time.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 03-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Norstrom shared with the applicant that City Council is excited about them being in the community. Mr. Spencer thanked Council and said that they look forward to beginning construction. Ms. Michael added her excitement for the project.

**Ordinance No. 01-2016**
Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of Engineering and Related Services for Preliminary Design and Related Services for the Intersection Improvements at Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena Roads and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 602-14)

*Introduced by Mr. Smith.*

**Ordinance No. 02-2016**
Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the City Share of Costs for the SR-161 Pavement Surface Improvements, (ODOT Project FRA-161-8.67, PID 96305) and all Related Expenses. (Project No. 617-15)

*Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.*
Ordinance No. 03-2016  Authorizing the City Manager to Execute A Contract Between the City of Columbus Board of Health and the City of Worthington for Health Services.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

Ordinance No. 04-2016  Accepting a New Water Line Easement from Trivium Worthington LLC; Approving an Agreement to Install Utilities; and Vacating a Portion of the Original Water Line Easement upon the Completion of the New Water Line at 350 West Wilson Bridge Road.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

The Clerk was instructed to give notice of a public hearing on said ordinance(s) in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter unless otherwise directed.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Mr. Greeson shared that the ordinance that Council introduced tonight related to the Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena intersection, staff had originally planned to discuss the project at next week’s committee of the whole meeting. The consultants are evaluating some of the comments they received from the public and in order to properly do that they will need additional time. So the consultant presentation will be at the third meeting in January. Council will have the discussion at the meeting and decide whether to select a design and move forward or table until the following meeting.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION  Mr. Myers made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:33 P.M.

APPROVED by the City Council, this 2nd day of February, 2016.

Clerk of Council

Council President
ORDINANCE NO. 05-2016

Approving the Subdivision of Property at 918 High Street and Authorizing Variances (Plank Law Firm/MK&K Realty Inc.)

WHEREAS, a request has been made by Plank Law Firm/MK&K Realty Inc. to subdivide the property located at 918 High Street; and,

WHEREAS, the request has received a complete and thorough review by the Municipal Planning Commission on December 10, 2015 and approval has been recommended by the Commission; and,

WHEREAS, Section 1107.01 of the Codified Ordinances provides that on recommendation of the Municipal Planning Commission, or on its own initiative Council may permit variations from the standards established in the Planning and Zoning Code; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin and State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the Subdivision to divide the property located at 918 High Street, as per Case No. SUB 03-15, Drawings No. SUB 03-15, dated November 19, 2015 attached hereto as Exhibit “A” be approved.

SECTION 2. That there be and hereby is granted variances from Section 1149.02 of the Codified Ordinances to create a parcel that does not meet the minimum lot area and for a building that does not meet the side yard requirement; and Section 1175.01(c)(3) and 1175.01(c)(4) of the Codified Ordinances for a building that exceeds the maximum lot coverage and for a reduction in the required number of parking spaces on a parcel subject to a Development Plan.

SECTION 3. That notice of passage of the Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center, and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed: ____________________

_________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_________________________
Clerk of Council

_________________________
Introduced January 19, 2016
P.H. February 1, 2016
Resubdivision of Lots 4, 13 and Part of Lots 14 and 20 of The Town of Worthington

Approved this ______ day of ________, 2016.

Clerk, Municipal Planning Commission
City of Worthington, Ohio

Approved this ______ day of ________, 2016.

Director of Engineering
City of Worthington, Ohio

Approved this ______ day of ________, 2016.

City Manager
City of Worthington, Ohio

APPROVED AND ACCEPTED THIS ______ DAY OF ________, 2016, BY ORDINANCE No. ________, WHEREIN THE PLAT OF THE RESUBDIVISION OF LOTS 4, 13 AND PART OF LOTS 14 AND 20 OF THE TOWN OF WORTHINGTON IS ACCEPTED AS SUCH BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WORTHINGTON, OHIO.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I HAVE HERETOunto SET MY HAND AND AFFIX MY SEAL THIS ______ DAY OF ________, 2015.

Clerk of Council
City of Worthington, Ohio

TRANSFERRED THIS ______ DAY OF ________, 2015.

Auditor
Franklin County, Ohio

RECORD OF REVERSE

Reversed by ______ day of ________, 2015.

Recorder
Franklin County, Ohio

RECORD OF SUBDIVISION

Revised this ______ day of ________, 2016.

Deputy Recorder
Franklin County, Ohio

We do hereby certify that we have surveyed the above premises, prepared the attached plan, and that said plat is correct. All dimensions are in feet and decimal parts thereof.

By: M. K. K. Realty, Inc.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for Said State, personally appeared Christopher R. Kessler, Vice President of M. K. K. Realty, Inc., an Ohio Corporation who acknowledges the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his act, and voluntarily act and deed and the free and voluntary transfer and assignment of said premises in said Ohio Corporation for the uses and purposes expressed therein.

In Witness Whereof, I Have Hereunto Set My Hand and Affixed My Official Seal This ______ Day of ________, 2016.

Notary Public, State of Ohio

M. K. K. Realty, Inc.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

FROM: R. Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building

DATE: January 13, 2016

SUBJECT: Ordinance for a Subdivision and Variances – 918 High Street – (Plank Law Firm/MK&K Realty Inc.) (SUB 03-15)

______________________________________________________________________________

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:
The applicant has requested Final Plat approval to allow the part of the property that is occupied by CVS to be separated from the rest of the property. Also, two additional parcels at the east end of the site that house parking would be combined with the resultant southern parcel. The total area of the 3 parcels is 2.135-acres; the resultant lots would be 0.844-acres and 1.291-acres in size. The split would allow the property owner to potentially sell or develop the vacant lot, and separate the property taxes.

The parcels are zoned C-2 (Community Shopping Center) and were subject to Development Plan approval for any development on the site. After the proposed split the site would continue to be subject to the previous Development Plan approval until a new approval is granted. The entire site would remain in the Architectural Review District.

The existing stormwater infrastructure on the site will continue to be maintained by the property owner. In the future, each property owner would be responsible for the maintenance of their portion of the stormwater infrastructure on the site.

At the Preliminary Plat hearing, the Commission requested the applicant contact CVS to inform of the change. A copy of the contact letter is in the packet, as is a copy of the sub-sublease agreed to by CVS which includes language giving the property owner the right to obtain one or more lot splits for purposes of obtaining separate tax parcel designations.
Zoning Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C-2 Zoning</th>
<th>North Lot</th>
<th>South Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>252’ &amp; 145.54’</td>
<td>176.69’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>0.844 acres</td>
<td>1.291 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>13’2” and 22’4”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If constructed per ADP 07-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>&gt;40’</td>
<td>40’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Width Each Side Yard</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>10’8” If constructed per ADP 07-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum % of Lot Coverage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variances:

1. Parking: After the subdivision, Lot 1 would have 39 regular parking spaces and 4 handicap spaces for a total of 43 parking spaces; 57 spaces would be required. Perpetual easements are in place for ingress and egress on the adjacent parcels. Joint parking agreements were approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals on November 5, 2015 to accommodate the split.
2. Lot Coverage: The CVS building on Lot 1 is 13,013 square feet and the overall square footage for Lot 1 is approximately 36,764.64 square feet for total coverage of 35.4%.
3. Side Yard Set Back: 0’ for the CVS building being directly against the proposed property line. The southern wall would be required to be fire rated to meet the Building Code, which is reportedly the case. A 5’ pedestrian, access, utility and encroachment easement is proposed in that location.
4. Acreage: Lot 1 is 0.844 acres; 1 acre is the required minimum.

Land Use Plan:
Worthington Comprehensive Plan
At this intersection, the preferred traditional urban design principals — moving the buildings forward to the sidewalk, placing the parking to the rear (screened by the building), and creating an inviting streetscape with an attractive two-story building façade would apply.

Recommendations:
Staff is recommending approval of the application. Because the north portion of the site is fully developed the variances mostly reflect existing conditions. The rest of the site being on a separate parcel does not change the conditions of previous approvals.

Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and unanimously recommended approval to City Council at its meeting on December 10, 2015.
City of Worthington
SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

A. General Information

1. Property Location 918 North High Street

2. Zoning and Use C-2, Commercial

3. Applicant Plank Law Firm, LPA c/o Donald Plank
   Address 145 E. Rich Street, FL 3, Columbus, OH 43215-5240
   Home Phone ___________________ Work Phone (614) 947-8600

4. Property Owner MK&K Realty, Inc.
   Address 7215 Busey Rd., Canal Winchester, OH 43110
   Home Phone ___________________ Work Phone (614) 833-0028

5. Surveyor or Engineer Myers Surveying, Joseph P. Myers
   Address 2740 E. Main Street, Columbus, OH 43209
   Phone (614) 235-8677

B. Existing

1. Number of lots 3
   2. Area 1.865

C. Proposed

1. Number of lots 2
   2. Area 0.844
   3. Dimensions see plat

4. Frontage Yes

5. Utilities available? Yes

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME:

The information contained in this application and in all attachments is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I further acknowledge that I have familiarized myself with all applicable sections of the Worthington Codified Ordinances and will comply with all applicable regulations.

Applicant (Signature)  

Property Owner (Signature) 

Date  

Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DQ Properties</td>
<td>1505 S. James Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus, OH 43227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVS 3407 OH LLC</td>
<td>1 CVS Dr.</td>
<td>Woonsocket, RI 02895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; Melissa Hutson</td>
<td>43 E. North St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation Church Residences</td>
<td>2335 N. Bank Dr.</td>
<td>Columbus, OH 43220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Hummer</td>
<td>6 Hartford Ct.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk &amp; Linda Smith</td>
<td>8 Hartford Ct.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Vaughan</td>
<td>888 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVS</td>
<td>918 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providential Properties LLC</td>
<td>1601 W. 5th Ave. #193</td>
<td>Columbus, OH 43212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hash</td>
<td>67 Spring Creek Dr.</td>
<td>Westerville, OH 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Center LLC</td>
<td>893 High St., Suite F</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Pizza</td>
<td>895 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Cleaners</td>
<td>899 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Goodman's Baking Co.</td>
<td>901 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salon De Mir</td>
<td>903 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>905 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon</td>
<td>911 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprint Lube</td>
<td>923 High St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBDIVISION APPLICATION SUPPORTING STATEMENT

M.K.&K. Realty, Inc. ("MK&K") owns property situated at the southeast corner of North High Street and North Street. The property currently consists of three lots that are each zoned C-2 with a total area of 1.865 acres. The requested subdivision will result in two lots, Lot 1 consisting of 0.844 acres and Lot 2 consisting of 1.021 acres, both of which will remain zoned C-2. Proposed Lot 1 is developed with an existing retail/pharmacy store. Proposed Lot 2 currently possesses vacant building pads and some parking spaces. The proposed lot split line, as referenced on the attached plat, was arrived at based on current conditions and to optimize future possibilities for both lots. The subdivision will cleanly divide the property into two lots. This will enable the possibility of future sale and/or development of Lot 2 and provide a clear separation of property taxes pursuant to a lease between MK&K and Ohio CVS Stores, LLC.

MK&K acknowledges the need for variances due to the requested subdivision and will work with Worthington to acquire all necessary variances.
CVS (Store No. 3407-2)  
1 CVS Drive  
Woonsocket, Rhode Island 02895

Re: Parcel Subdivision

To whom it may concern:

I write on behalf of M.K. & K. Realty, Inc. ("MK&K") and DMPRK, LLC ("DMPRK"), a wholly owned subsidiary of MK&K. This letter is in regards to Store Number 3407 located at 918 N. High Street, Worthington, OH 43085. This letter is intended to notify Ohio CVS Stores, L.L.C. ("CVS") of MK&K’s intent to submit a Subdivision Application to the City of Worthington.

Pursuant to Section 21 of the Sub-Sublease dated June 15th, 2012, between CVS and DMPRK (the “Sub-Sublease”), “DMPRK shall have the right to obtain one or more lot splits with respect to the Premises for purposes of separating the Premises from the Remaining Premises and obtaining separate tax parcel designations. CVS agrees to cooperate with and assist DMPRK in connection with same…”

MK&K, as the property owner, will submit the application to the City of Worthington. The proposed parcel subdivision is consistent with the Ground Lease dated June 15th, 2012, between MK&K Realty, Inc. and Ohio CVS Stores, LLC, which was executed concurrently with the Sub-Sublease. The subdivision will create new property lines that are consistent with the lease area as illustrated in Exhibit A and A-1 of the Ground Lease. Enclosed are copies of the referenced exhibits.

Please contact me at (614)679-9488 or chriskessler11@gmail so we can discuss any questions you may have, as well as, take the necessary steps to get an REA in place.
Sincerely,

M.K. & K. Realty, Inc. and DMPRK, LLC.

Christopher R. Kessler  
Vice President  
Phone: (614)679-9488  
Email: chriskessler11@gmail.com
AGREEMENT OF SUB-SUBLEASE (this "Lease") made this 15th day of June, 2012, by and between Ohio CVS Stores, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company, having its principal office at One CVS Drive, Woonsocket, Rhode Island 02895 (hereinafter referred to as "CVS") CVS Store No. 3407-2, and DMPRK, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company, having its principal office at 479 East Oakland Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43202 (hereinafter referred to as "DMPRK").

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, MK&K Realty, Inc., an Ohio corporation ("Overlandlord"), ground leased located at 900 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085 (the "Site" or "Shopping Center"), as more fully described in the Ground Lease; and
2. PREMISES

CVS does hereby let to DMPRK and DMPRK does hereby hire from CVS, for the term and on the conditions hereinafter provided, the demised premises consisting of two development pads (sometimes hereinafter referred to as “Pad A” and “Pad B”) and the parking areas and drive aisles located directly east thereof and hereinafter sometimes referred to collectively as the “Premises” and as more particularly described on Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, together with a non-exclusive easement to DMPRK, its tenants, their customers, employees and invitees to use the drives necessary to access North Street. DMPRK hereby acknowledges that Pad A is sufficient to construct a building containing approximately 4,936 square feet of ground floor space and Pad B is sufficient to construct a building containing approximately 7,367 square feet of ground floor space (the “Respective Pad Areas”). Notwithstanding the foregoing, neither DMPRK nor its tenants, contractors or invitees shall be permitted to park in the “CVS Exclusive Parking” area depicted on Exhibit A and neither CVS nor its tenants, contractors, or invitees shall be permitted to park in the “Tenant’s Exclusive Parking” area depicted on Exhibit A. No reserved parking or overnight parking shall be permitted in the “Shared Parking” area depicted on Exhibit A. Pad A, Pad B, the Common Areas (defined below), the exclusive parking areas and CVS’s building are depicted on Exhibit A attached hereto. CVS reserves the right to access and use the CVS Dumpster and Compactor identified as such on the Site Plan, but DMPRK may use the other dumpster pad area. The buildings constructed on Pad A and Pad B, if any, are sometimes referred to as “Buildings”. In no event shall DMPRK have any obligation to construct the Buildings or construct them in the full size of the Respective Pad Areas, however in no event shall they be larger than the Respective Pad Areas without the prior written consent of CVS, which may be withheld in CVS’ sole discretion.
Notwithstanding the foregoing, DMPRK shall have the right to obtain one or more lot splits with respect to the Premises for purposes of separating the Premises from the Remaining Premises and obtaining separate tax parcel designations. CVS agrees to cooperate with and assist DMPRK in connection with same at no additional cost or expense to CVS.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, CVS and DMPRK have duly executed this Lease on the day and year first above written.

WITNESS:

DMPRK, LLC:

DMPRK, LLC
an Ohio limited liability company
BY: M.L. M. REALTY, INC., SOLE MEMBER
BY: 
NAME: Richard P. Kosler
TITLE: President
DATE: 5/18/12

WITNESS:

CVS:

Ohio CVS Stores, LLC,
an Ohio limited liability company

CVS LEGAL APPROVAL:  

CITY OF WORTHINGTON
SUB 03-15
DRAWING NO.
DATE 11-19-15
0.839 ACRE PLAT FOR LEASE PURPOSES

SITUATED IN THE STATE OF OHIO, COUNTY OF FRANKLIN, CITY OF WORTHINGTON, QUARTER TOWNSHIP 2, TOWNSHIP 2 NORTH, RANGE 3B WEST, UNITED STATES MILITARY DISTRICT; AND BEING IN ALL OF LOT NUMBER 4, AND A PORTION OF LOT NUMBER 13, AS THE SAME ARE NUMERATED AND PLACED ON THE WORTHINGTON TOWN

PLAT, OF RECORD IN PLAT BOOK 1, PAGE 350, AND BEING A 0.839 ACRE LEASE AREA WITHIN A PORTION OF A

1.073 ACRE PARCEL DEFINED AS TRACT 1 (1.0847 ACRES), IN A WARRANTY DEED OF RECORD, CONVEYED TO

M.K. & E. REALTY, INC. IN OFFICIAL RECORD VOLUME 1856, PAGE 113. ALL RECORD REFERENCES CITING BEING OF THE FRANKLIN COUNTY RECORDED'S OFFICE, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

BASIS OF BEARINGS:

THE BEARINGS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON AN EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BEARING TO HIGH STREET, DEFINED AS N 07°27'0" E ON A RECORD PLAT ENTITLED "870 HIGH STREET SUBDIVISION", OF RECORD IN PLAT BOOK 81, PAGE 80, FRANKLIN COUNTY RECORDED'S OFFICE, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

LEGEND

- PROPERTY LINE
- RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE
- LINE
- CENTER LINE OF ROAD
- RT R." PIN
- R.R. BRK.

EXISTING CVS PHARMACY
STORE NO. 3407
948 N. HIGH STREET

0.839 ACRE LEASE AREA

M.K. & E. REALTY,
INC.
O.R.V. 8656, PG. 113
TRACT 1
1.073 AC.

M.K. & E. REALTY, INC.
O.R.V. 8656, PG. 113
TRACT 1
1.073 AC.

CITY OF WORTHINGTON
DRAWING NO.

DATE 11-19-15
DECLARATION OF EASEMENT

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that MK&K Realty, Inc., an Ohio corporation ("Declarant"), owner of the real property described on Exhibit A (the "Retail Site") and the real property described on Exhibit B (the "Office Site") does hereby grant, declare and establish a perpetual easement for pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress between public rights of way and the parking areas on the Office Site as depicted on Exhibit C in, over, across and through the paved areas as they may exist from time to time on the Retail Site for the benefit of the Office Site.

Prior Instrument Reference: Volume Page 6656513 Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio

Declarant hereby agrees that all terms and conditions contained herein shall run with the land and inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the owners of the Retail Site and the Office Site and their respective successors and assigns. The easement granted hereby may only be modified to be consistent with Exhibit C.

The perpetual easement rights granted herein are "exclusive" as to all except the Declarant, and the Declarant's employees, customers, tenants, contractors and its and their invitees. Declarant retains the right to use the Retail Site for all purposes not inconsistent with this grant, including the rights of ingress and egress. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained herein, in no event shall redevelopment of the Retail Site as depicted on Exhibit C be deemed to be inconsistent with this grant.

Use of the easement granted hereby shall be at the risk of the user; the owner of the Retail Site assumes no obligations, duties or other responsibilities to the owner of the Office Site, or its tenants, employees or invitees except as specifically set forth herein. In the event any party exercising the rights granted hereby disturbs or damages the landscaping, buildings or other improvements on the Retail Site, or any portion thereof, such party shall, in a prompt and workmanlike manner, repair and restore such damage or disturbance as nearly as practicable to the condition that existed prior to such damage or disturbance.

Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be deemed to be a gift or dedication of any portion of the Retail Site or Office Site to the general public or for any public use or purpose whatsoever, it being the intention of the parties hereto that this agreement be for the exclusive benefit of the Declarant and its invitees and tenants and that nothing herein, express or implied, shall confer upon any person, other than the owners of the Retail Site and Office Site and their tenants, heirs, administrators, legal representatives, successors and assigns, any rights or remedies under or by reason of this Agreement. No easements, except those expressly set forth herein shall be implied by this Agreement including, without limitation, no parking rights are granted hereby.
The Declarant, MK&K Realty, Inc., an Ohio corporation, has caused this instrument to be executed and subscribed this 4\( \text{th} \) day of April, 2007.

MK&K Realty, Inc., an Ohio corporation

By: 
Print Name: Richard J. Kessler
Title: President

STATE OF OHIO
COUNTY OF FRANKLIN, SS:

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on this 4\( \text{th} \) day of June, 2007 the foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me by Richard Kessler, President of MK&K Realty, Inc., an Ohio corporation as his free and voluntary act on behalf of the corporation.

MICHAEL J. HORNBERGER
Notary Public

Notary Public

Joanne I. Goldhand, Esq.
Skilken Properties
4270 Morse Road
Columbus, Ohio 43230
To: M.K. & K. Realty, Inc.

This is to certify that the map or plot and the survey on which it is based were made in accordance with the 2011 Uniform Standards for Title Surveys, jointly established and adopted by ALTA and NSPS, and includes Items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7(a), 8, 9, 11(a) to 14 of Table A thereof. The field work was completed on January 5, 2015.

We hereby certify that the foregoing Boundary Survey was prepared from actual field measurements in accordance with Chapter 4723-37 Ohio Administrative Code. Iron pipes are 30" x 1½" O.D. with a plastic plug labeled "P.S. 43815", unless otherwise noted. Bearings of bearings to the south line of N. High Street are as North as per Table A on Page 15.

Joseph P. Raynor, Professional Surveyor No. 12361

NORTH STREET 49.5'

N. HIGH STREET 99'

Legend

A.L.T.A./A.C.S.M. LAND TITLE SURVEY

Scale: 1" = 20'

Date: January 5, 2015

2710 S. Rich St., Butler, Ohio 45307-0777
(937) 293-3027 - Fax: (937) 293-4959
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DATE 11-19-15
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PRELIMINARY DRAFT
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DATE 11-19-15
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C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

5. Subdivision

a. Final Plat – **918 High St.** (Plank Law Firm/MK&K Realty Inc.) SUB 03-15

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**
The applicant has requested Final Plat approval to allow the part of the property that is occupied by CVS to be separated from the rest of the property. Also, two additional parcels at the east end of the site that house parking would be combined with the resultant southern parcel. The total area of the 3 parcels is 2.135 acres; the resultant lots would be 0.844 acres and 1.021 acres. The split would allow the property owner to potentially sell or develop the vacant lot, and separate the property taxes.

The parcels are zoned C-2 (Community Shopping Center) and were subject to Development Plan approval for any development on the site. After the proposed split the site would continue to be subject to the previous Development Plan approval until new approval is granted. The entire site would remain in the Architectural Review District.

At the Preliminary Plat hearing, the Commission requested the applicant contact CVS to inform of the change. A copy of the contact letter is in the packet, as is a copy of the sub-sublease agreed to by CVS which includes language giving the property owner the right to obtain one or more lot splits for purposes of obtaining separate tax parcel designations.

**Zoning Requirements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C-2 Zoning</th>
<th>North Lot</th>
<th>South Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>252’ &amp; 145.54’</td>
<td>176.69’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>0.844 acres</td>
<td>1.291 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>13’2” and 22’4”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If constructed per ADP 07-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>&gt;40’</td>
<td>40’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Width Each Side Yard</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>10’8”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If constructed per ADP 07-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum % of Lot Coverage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variances:
1. Parking: After the subdivision, Lot 1 would have 39 regular parking spaces and 4 handicap spaces for a total of 43 parking spaces; 57 spaces would be required. Perpetual easements are in place for ingress and egress on the adjacent parcels. Joint parking agreements were approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals on November 5, 2015 to accommodate the split.
2. Lot Coverage: The CVS building on Lot 1 is 13,013 square feet and the overall square footage for Lot 1 is approximately 36,764.64 square feet for total coverage of 35.4%.
3. Side Yard Set Back: 0’ for the CVS building being directly against the proposed property line. The southern wall would be required to be fire rated to meet the Building Code, which is reportedly the case. A 5’ pedestrian, access, utility and encroachment easement is proposed in that location.
4. Acreage: Lot 1 is 0.844 acres; 1 acre is the required minimum.

Land Use Plan:
Worthington Comprehensive Plan
At this intersection, the preferred traditional urban design principals — moving the buildings forward to the sidewalk, placing the parking to the rear (screened by the building), and creating an inviting streetscape with an attractive two-story building façade would apply.

Recommendations:
Staff is recommending approval of the application. Because the north portion of the site is fully developed the variances mostly reflect existing conditions. The rest of the site being on a separate parcel does not change the conditions of previous approvals.

Discussion:
Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Donald Plank stated he is an attorney representing his client and his address is 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Plank said the property currently has three tax parcels. They are combining the parcels together and splitting them in half to create two tax parcels instead of having three. Nothing else changes on this site except the tax parcels are getting shifted around. Mr. Coulter asked if the parking agreement with the urgent care will remain and Chris Kessler with the Plank Law firm at 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio, said the parking agreement is a declaration of record and will remain in place. Mr. Plank said the Memorandum of Lease discusses the cross access and easements. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:
Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PLANK LAW FIRM FOR APPROVAL OF A FINAL PLAT TO RE-SUBDIVIDE THE PARCELS AT 918 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. SUB 03-15, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 03-15, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2015, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.
Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll.  Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.
ORDINANCE NO. 06-2016

An Ordinance to Revise the Codified Ordinances by Adopting Current Replacement Pages.

WHEREAS, certain provisions within the Codified Ordinances should be amended to conform with current State law as required by the Ohio Constitution; and,

WHEREAS, various ordinances of a general and permanent nature have been passed by Council which should be included in the Codified Ordinances; and,

WHEREAS, the Walter H. Drane Company has prepared a supplement to the Codified Ordinances containing such new material;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, Franklin County, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the ordinances of the City of Worthington, Ohio, of a general and permanent nature, as revised, recodified, rearranged and consolidated into component codes, titles, chapters and sections within the 2015 Replacement Pages to the Codified Ordinances are hereby approved and adopted.

SECTION 2. That the following sections and chapters are hereby added, amended or repealed as respectively indicated in order to comply with current State law:

Traffic Code

301.19 Motorcycle. (Amended)
303.081 Impounding Vehicles on Private Residential Property. (Amended)
303.082 Tow Away Zones. (Amended)
331.46 Vehicular Operation on Street Closed Due to Rise in Water Level. (Added)
335.031 Driving With Probationary License; Curfew. (Amended)
335.072 Driving Under Financial Responsibility Law Suspension or Cancellation. (Amended)
335.074 Driving Under License Forfeiture or Child Support Suspension. (Amended)
335.09 Display of License Plates. (Amended)
335.10 Expired or Unlawful License Plates. (Amended)
341.01 Definitions. (Amended)
341.03 Prerequisites to Operation of a Commercial Vehicle. (Amended)
341.05 Criminal Offenses. (Amended)
341.06 Employment of Drivers of Commercial Vehicles. (Amended)
351.04 Parking Near Curb; Handicapped Parking. (Amended)

General Offenses Code

501.07 Requirements For Criminal Liability. (Amended)
501.08 Culpable Mental States. (Amended)
529.07 Open Container Prohibited. (Amended)
549.01 Weapons Definitions. (Amended)
553.03 Duties of Locomotive Engineer. (Amended)
ORDINANCE NO. 06-2016

SECTION 3. That the complete text of the sections listed above are set forth in full in the current replacement pages to the Codified Ordinances. A summary of the amendments to such sections is hereby attached to this ordinance as Appendix A.

SECTION 4. That this ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio

Passed ________________

President of Council

Attest:

Introduced January 19, 2016
P.H. February 1, 2016

Clerk of Council
APPENDIX A

Traffic Code

301.19 Motorcycle. (Adds “cab-enclosed motorcycle” to definition of a motorcycle.)

303.081 Impounding Vehicles on Private Residential Property. (Adds additional documentation which may be used to provide proof of ownership in subsection (d).)

303.082 Tow-Away Zones. (Adds additional documentation which may be used to provide proof of ownership in subsection (g).)

331.46 Vehicular Operation on Street Closed Due to Rise in Water Level. (Adds new section prohibiting the operation of a vehicle on a street or highway closed due to a rise in water level.)

335.031 Driving With Probationary License; Curfew. (Redefines requirements for operation of a motor vehicle with a probationary license.)

335.072 Driving Under Financial Responsibility Law Suspension or Cancellation. (Adds subsection (d)(3) pertaining to providing the court with proof of financial responsibility; amends subsection (e) to add presentation of electronic wireless communication devices.)

335.074 Driving Under License Forfeiture or Child Support Suspension. (Adds last sentence to subsection (c)(2) pertaining to providing the court with proof of financial responsibility.)

335.09 Display of License Plates. (Adds “cab-enclosed motorcycle” to vehicles required to have a license plate on the rear of the vehicle.)

335.10 Expired or Unlawful Plates. (Changes penalty in subsection (f)(1) from a misdemeanor of the fourth degree to a minor misdemeanor.)

341.01 Definitions. (Adds “gross vehicle weight” to subsections (c)(1) and (c)(4).)

341.03 Prerequisites to Operation of a Commercial Motor Vehicle. (Redefines criteria for who may operate a commercial motor vehicle.)

341.05 Criminal Offenses. (Adds “commercial driver’s license temporary instruction permit” to first line and subsection (a)(9).)

341.06 Employment of Drivers of Commercial Vehicles. (Adds subsection (d) imposing additional restrictions on allowing nonqualified persons to operate a commercial vehicle.)

351.04 Parking Near Curb; Handicapped Parking. (Adds subsections (f)(2) and (i)(3) which prohibit parking in an access aisle and provides a penalty for such violation.)
General Offenses Code

501.07 Requirements for Criminal Liability. (Clarifies when strict criminal liability is imposed and modifies the concept of acting recklessly.)

501.08 Culpable Mental States. (Modifies the concept of acting recklessly and makes stylistic changes.)

529.07 Open Container Prohibited. (Adds subsections (c)(7) and (f) to permit the possession of an open container in an “outdoor refreshment area” and to exempt persons who are passengers on a commercial quadricycle.)

549.01 Weapons Definitions. (Deletes second sentence in subsection (e); changes “silencer” to “suppressor” in subsection (k)(5); adds subsections (p) and (q).)

553.03 Duties of Locomotive Engineer. (Deletes former subsection (a)(2).)
RESOLUTION NO. 06-2016

Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 300 East Wilson Bridge Road and Authorizing Variances (Advance Sign Group/MedVet).

WHEREAS, Advance Sign Group/MedVet has submitted a request for an amendment to the Final Development Plan for 300 East Wilson Bridge Road; and,

WHEREAS, Sections 1175.02 (f) and 1107.01 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington provide that when an applicant wishes to change, adjust or rearrange buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights or yards, following approval of a Final Development Plan, and variances are included, the modification must be approved by the City Council; and,

WHEREAS, the proposal has received a complete and thorough review by the Municipal Planning Commission on January 14, 2016 and approval has been recommended by the Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the amendment to the approved Final Development Plan to renovate the site at 300 East Wilson Bridge Road as per Case No. ADP 02-16, Drawings No. ADP 02-16 dated December 13, 2015 attached hereto as Exhibit “A” be approved.

SECTION 2. That there be and hereby are granted variance from Code Section 1170.03(c), to allow a sign to exceed the permitted number of letter styles and sizes on the freestanding sign.

SECTION 3. That the Clerk of Council be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted ____________________________

President of Council

Attest

Clerk of Council
CITY OF WORTHINGTON
ADP 02-16
DATE 12-13-15
DRAWING NO.

ADP 02-16
REPLACEMENT FRAMES: SCALE: 1/2" = 1'

(2) TWO REQUIRED

3/16" Toluene PolyCardinal L
3430-23 Red PMS Applied First Surface
9630-157 Sultan Blue PMS Applied First Surface
PAINT EXISTING CABINET PMS 281

ADP 02-16
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
FROM: R. Lee Brown, Director
DATE: January 26, 2016
SUBJECT: Resolution for Amendment to Development Plan and Variances – 300 East Wilson Bridge Road (Advance Sign Group/MedVet) (ADP 02-16)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:
The building at 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. was constructed in 1979 along with the neighboring building at 250 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. Medvet purchased and renovated the 300 property in 2002, and has periodically made changes to the building and signs. Variances were granted as part of the last sign change for the total area and number of signs currently on the site. This is a request to change the wall and freestanding signs to reflect the business’ new image, and within the previously approved variances for size and number of signs, however a variance is needed for the number of letter styles and sizes for the freestanding sign.

Project Details:
1. Face changes are proposed for the existing freestanding sign. The new faces would be installed in the 4’-2 ¼” x 7’ 6 ¼” sign cabinet. The cabinet would be painted PMS 281 to match the proposed face background, which is a darker blue than the current signs. The background must be opaque. MedVet in white would be at the top of the sign; “24 HR EMERGENCY” in red on white would be in the middle; and IDEXX Laboratories is proposed in white at the bottom. A variance would be needed for the requested number of letter styles and sizes. Although the proposed is similar to the existing, a variance was not previously granted.
2. The wall-mounted signs are proposed with a 2’ 4 ½” high x 12’ wide (28.8 sf) non-illuminated background panel in the same blue (PMS 281). Five inch thick white internally illuminated channel letters, 1’ 7 ½” in height, are proposed to be mounted on the background panels. Both wall-mounted signs would be in the top portion of the building wall, one facing south and the other north, and moved further away from the building corners than the existing.
Land Use Plans:

2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan
This area is designated as the commercial office center of Worthington. The advantage of this area is the freeway visibility and access. Reinvestment in the existing buildings is encouraged to make the buildings more competitive in the market place.

2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study
The study recognizes the corridor can provide vital support for the future of the City’s economy and quality of life. The site is recommended as Office to accommodate large-scale office development/renovation with freeway visibility and smaller offices to support the streetscape along Wilson Bridge Road.

Proposed Chapter 1181 – Wilson Bridge Corridor
Signs – Generally exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination. Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10’. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape. Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building abutting the I-270 Right-of-Way may have a wall-mounted sign facing each Right-of-Way. Such signs may have a non-illuminated background up to 200 square feet in area. The graphic portion of such signs shall not exceed 100 square feet in area. Wall-mounted signs shall be designed appropriately for the building, and shall not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

Worthington Sign Code
Current zoning regulations for the site allow each businesses to have 1 wall-mounted sign, and each development to have 2 freestanding signs. Maximum sign area cannot exceed 100 square feet per business. No more than two styles of lettering plus one logo, and three sizes of lettering and logo are permitted.

Recommendations:
Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed amendment maintains the character and integrity of the development and does not exceed the sign area previously approved for the site. Also, the proposal fits within the proposed Wilson Bridge Corridor Code language.

On January 14, 2016 the Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and unanimously recommended approval to City Council on an Amendment to Development Plan with Variances.
Amendment to
Development Plan
Application

1. Property Location 300 E. WILSON BRIDGE ROAD, WORTHINGTON, OHIO 43085
2. Present Use & Proposed Use VETERINARY MEDICAL CLINIC & HOSPITAL
3. Present & Proposed Zoning C3n
4. Applicant STANLEY W. YOUNG, III, ADVANCE SIGN GROUP
   Address 5150 WALCUTT COURT, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43228
   Phone 1-614-564-9432
5. Property Owner VETERINARY DIAGNOSTICS Specialty Services LTD.
   Address 300 E. WILSON BRIDGE ROAD, WORTHINGTON, OHIO 43085
   Phone 1-614-846-5800
6. Project Description REPLACE EXISTING WALL & GROUND SIGNAGE WITH NEW IMAGE SIGNAGE
7. Variances Requested NONE, ALL SIGN SIZES ARE STAYING THE same.

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME:

The information contained in this application and in all attachments is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I further acknowledge that I have familiarized myself with all applicable sections of the Worthington Codified Ordinances and will comply with all applicable regulations.

[Signature]
Applicant

Date 12-23-2015

[Signature]
Property Owner

Date 12-24-15

MPC Approval Date:

City Council Approval Date:
ABUTTING PROPERTY OWNERS
FOR
300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.

ls-Can Ohio L P
330 EWB LLC
Association for the Developmentally Disabled
Jeffrey Klima
Durk & Lenora Reese

2600 Corporate Exchange D
330 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.
350 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.
261 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.
1019 Spring Grove Ln.

Columbus, OH 43231
Worthington, OH 43085
Worthington, OH 43085
Worthington, OH 43085
Columbus, OH 43235
December 22, 2015

City of Worthington, Planning Commission
Ms. Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator
6550 N. High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Re: Supporting Statement for: Medvet Medical Center for Pets, 300 E. Wilson Bridge Road, Worthington, Ohio 43085, Amendment to Development Plan for Building and ground signage.

Dear Ms. Bitar,

Please find enclosed an application to Amend the Development Plan, a check for $50.00 for the filing fee, with drawings and photo documents to support our request for signage changes at the above subject site. The subject site known as 300 E. Wilson Bridge Road, Worthington, Ohio 43085 is a (2) two story medical office building built in 1979. There is 56,925.9 square feet of office / medical facility area used to treat pets with medical issues. This facility is zoned C3n, which means it is not in an Architectural Review District. Our proposal includes changing the sign faces in the existing monument sign with new faces to reflect current image standards. The signs size, over-all-height and set-back are not changing. The existing wall signs on the north and south building elevations are also going to be changed out like for like same area in favor of new image standards as well. Please place us on the January 14, 2016 calender to be heard by the Planning Commission. Thanking you in advance for your professional review and support in our request.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
Stanley W. Young, III

cc: Ms. Amanda Sales
300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.
REPLACEMENT FACES SCALE: 1/2" = 1' (2) TWO REQUIRED

3/16" WHITE POLY CARDBOARD
3630-22 RED PIX APPLIED FIRST SURFACE
3630-159 SULPHAN BLUE PIG APPLIED FIRST SURFACE
PAINT EXISTING CABINET PMS 281
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UPDATING SIZE PER SURVEY
THIS DRAWING SUPERSEDES ALL OTHER DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY OTHERS CONCERNING THE FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION OF THIS PROJECT, A SIGNATURE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS DRAWING WILL BE TAKEN AS CONSENT TO PROCEED WITH MANUFACTURE.
ILLUMINATED CHANNEL LETTERS  SCALE: 1/2" = 1'
(1) ONE SIGN FOR WILSON BRIDGE
26.9 SQ FT

要求：

1. 颜色：
   - 侧面和顶部的铝漆
   - 内部白色
   - 门面：PMS 281
   - 侧面：PMS 281

2. 架子：1/4" 硬木
3. 电源：远程

4. 灯光和固定：安装硬件
5. 框架：铝制框架
6. 裁切：铝制框架
7. 附属材料：
   - 门面：PMS 281
   - 侧面和顶部的铝漆

8. 材料：
   - 铝
   - 硬木
   - 漆

9. 其他：
   - 安装和绘制
   - 软木
   - 硬木

项目管理：

- 设计
- 绘制
- 安装
- 给定日期

批准日期：12/13/15

项目编号：020975
ILLUMINATED CHANNEL LETTERS  SCALE: 1/2" = 1'
(1) ONE REQUIRED FOR 270
38.27 SQ FT
4' X 5' DECK ALUMINUM
PAINT OUTSIDE MS 281 C
PAINT INSIDE WHITE
FACES: 1/8" WHITE ACRYLIC
ILLUMINATION: WHITE LED AS REQUIRED
POWER SUPPLY: SELF CONTAINED IN BACKER, PRIMARY ELECTRIC BY GRAPHICS
WIRING AND CONNECTORS: UL LISTED APPROVED HARDWARE
BACKER: 4' X 3' ALUMINUM 3003 H4 W/ DEEP ALUMINUM FACES AND RETURNS PAINTING 281 C
FACE TO BE HINGED FOR ACCESS
TRIM: 17" BRUSHED 304 C
FACADE: 4" BIRDS EYE PLYWOOD BACKER
MOUNTING HARDWARE: TOGGLE BOLT W/ 4" PVC SPACERS
270 ELEVATION  SCALE: 1/2" = 1'
C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. Signs – 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Advance Sign Group/MedVet) ADP 02-16

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:
The building at 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. was constructed in 1979 along with the neighboring building at 250 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. Medvet purchased and renovated the 300 property in 2002, and has periodically made changes to the building and signs. Variances were granted as part of the last sign change for the total area and number of signs currently on the site. This is a request to change the wall and freestanding signs to reflect the business’ new image, and within the previously approved variances for size and number of signs.

Project Details:
1. Face changes are proposed for the existing freestanding sign. The new faces would be installed in the 4’-2 ¼” x 7’ 6 ¼” sign cabinet. The cabinet would be painted PMS 281 to match the proposed face background, which is a darker blue than the current signs. The background must be opaque. MedVet in white would be at the top of the sign; “24 HR EMERGENCY” in red on white would be in the middle; and IDEXX Laboratories is proposed in white at the bottom. A variance would be needed for the requested number of letter styles and sizes. Although the proposed is similar to the existing, a variance was not previously granted.
2. The wall-mounted signs are proposed with a 2’ 4 ½” high x 12’ wide (28.8 sf) non-illuminated background panel in the same blue (PMS 281). Five inch thick white internally illuminated channel letters, 1’ 7 ½” in height, are proposed to be mounted on the background panels. Both wall-mounted signs would be in the top portion of the building wall, one facing south and the other north, and moved further away from the building corners than the existing.

Land Use Plans:
2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan
This area is designated as the commercial office center of Worthington. The advantage of this area is the freeway visibility and access. Reinvestment in the existing buildings is encouraged to make the buildings more competitive in the market place.

2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study
The study recognizes the corridor can provide vital support for the future of the City’s economy and quality of life. The site is recommended as Office to accommodate large-scale office
development/redevelopment with freeway visibility and smaller offices to support the streetscape along Wilson Bridge Road.

Proposed Chapter 1181 – Wilson Bridge Corridor
Signs – Generally exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination. Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10’. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape. Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building abutting the I-270 Right-of-Way may have a wall-mounted sign facing each Right-of-Way. Such signs may have a non-illuminated background up to 200 square feet in area. The graphic portion of such signs shall not exceed 100 square feet in area. Wall-mounted signs shall be designed appropriately for the building, and shall not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

Worthington Sign Code
Current zoning regulations for the site allow each businesses to have 1 wall-mounted sign, and each development to have 2 freestanding signs. Maximum sign area cannot exceed 100 square feet per business. No more than two styles of lettering plus one logo, and three sizes of lettering and logo are permitted.

Recommendation:
Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed amendment maintains the character and integrity of the development and does not exceed the sign area previously approved for the site. Also, the proposal fits within the proposed Wilson Bridge Corridor Code language.

Discussion:
Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Stanley W. Young, III, stated he is representing Advance Sign Group, and his address is 2379 Hardesty Drive North, Columbus, Ohio 43204. Mr. Michael Robin (Facility Manager for Medvet) was also with Mr. Young, and stated his address is 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Young asked the Board if they could grant relief so a variance was not needed, and Mr. Coulter said they were not able but would be supportive of the approval. He then asked if there could be approval of the wall signs so they could get started making it, while waiting for the variance for the freestanding sign and Mrs. Bitar said that would be fine.

Motion:
Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STANLEY W. YOUNG, III OF ADVANCE SIGN GROUP TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY CHANGING THE SIGNAGE AT 300 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 02-16, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 02-16, DATED DECEMBER 13, 2015, BE APPROVED AND THAT ONLY THE FACES FOR THE FREESTANDING SIGN BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.
Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Other
Mrs. Bitar mentioned the use of City e-mail addresses. Mr. Brown explained the City’s Engineer will be retiring tomorrow. The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor zoning went to City Council this past Monday for briefing. There was a two hour discussion about setbacks, heights and appearance and will be further discussed at the next meeting in February. Mr. Brown also mentioned a development proposal City staff had seen for the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Rd.

E. Adjournment
Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:27 p.m. and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye.” The meeting was adjourned.
RESOLUTION NO. 07-2016

Authorizing Amendments to the Policy & Procedures of the City’s Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program.

WHEREAS, since 2014 the City has implemented the Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (“ReCAP”) to encourage voluntary investment in the commercial corridor generally comprised of Huntley Road and Proprietors Road, by providing funding for exterior facade and streetscape enhancement projects; and

WHEREAS, as projects have been approved and completed over the past couple of years, City staff evaluated the ReCAP Policy & Procedures authorized by City Council on March 17, 2014, and the related application materials, and presented some updates to the Board of Directors of the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation, who recommended approval at its January 22, 2106 meeting.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the Council of the City of Worthington does hereby authorize the recommended amendments to the ReCAP Policy & Procedures as further outlined in the attached EXHIBIT A.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk of Council be instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
The Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) provides financial assistance to encourage exterior investment and enhancement to commercial properties within certain areas of the City of Worthington. The program provides a mixture of grant funds and no-cost financing to building owners or commercial tenants to improve their building facades and surrounding streetscapes.

ReCAP is part of the City’s efforts to drive new job growth along the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road corridor, including the connecting portions of Worthington Galena Road and Schrock Road. This corridor’s commercial real estate is comprised primarily of industrial and warehousing space and was defined largely from the 1950s until 1980. As properties along this corridor are improved, the City desires continued attraction and retention of commercial renters and owners that provide employment in Worthington.

Worthington is known for appealing architecture and historic aesthetics, much of which derive from Worthington’s design review and approval of development along the High Street and Granville Road corridors. Other areas of the City, notably the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road corridor, are not subject to Worthington’s design standards. This program is intended to spur investment in the older properties in this corridor to enhance the attraction of employers to this important commercial area of Worthington.

The ReCAP program began in 2014 and nine projects have received funding during the first two years of the program. The projects that have been funded are spread across the eligible area with four of them located on Huntley Road, two located on Proprietors Road, two on Worthington Galena Road and one on Schrock Road. Award amounts have ranged from $5,000 up to the maximum allowed of $25,000. The City’s contribution has been matched at least one to one with private funding in each project.
Section 1: Assistance Available

Grants and no-cost financing are available under ReCAP to fund commercial building exterior enhancements. ReCAP assistance is provided as one-time, up-front cash payments to awardees, each in the form a half-grant and half-loan. This assistance is intended to partially fund exterior enhancements to the properties and improve the aesthetics of the corridor to prevent devaluation and disinvestment along the corridor.

The maximum ReCAP award is fifty percent (50%) of the lowest contractor’s bid for work under the project or $25,000, whichever is less. In all cases, the cash assistance award will be comprised of 50% grant and 50% loan. Each project has a maximum one time grant payment of $12,500 and a maximum $12,500 loan at zero percent (0%) interest for a term of up to three (3) years. The actual award amount is determined by the cost of the work to be done under the project.

As part of the ReCAP Program, the City provides design assistance to applicants through a contract with the Neighborhood Design Center. When potential applicants contact the City regarding interest in the program, City staff will connect them with the Neighborhood Design Center who will provide design advice and assistance related to meaningful ways to utilize funds to enhance the aesthetics of the property. This design assistance is provided at no cost to the applicant.

If qualified to do so, the applicant may perform the improvement work. ReCAP funds cannot be used to compensate the applicant for the purchase or rental of tools and equipment or for applicant’s labor or the labor of family, friends, employees, or others with a financial interest in the business or property. In such instances, ReCAP can be used only to pay for materials.

An application seeking ReCAP funds must be filed with the City to be considered for funding. The City may solicit certain property owners or tenants to participate. Applications will be reviewed by City staff and then forwarded to the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation for recommendation to City Council.

Awards are subject to the availability of funds. Applications will be received throughout the year as long as funds are available. Review deadlines have been established to trigger the review of the applications received. These review deadlines for 2016 are:

February 26, 2016
April 29, 2016
August 26, 2016

If all of the funding allocated for 2016 is awarded to projects before the end of the year, the review deadlines for the remainder of the year will be cancelled. The review deadlines may be modified
by the Community Improvement Corporation Board as it deems appropriate. Applicants can verify deadlines with the City’s Economic Development Manager.

To be eligible to participate, commercial properties must be located within the ReCAP Program Area (see Attachment A).

The grant-loan award must be for exterior front façade enhancements (and/or side building elevation if located on a corner lot) and/or the streetscape adjacent to the subject building.

Section 2: Eligibility

Building owners and tenants, with the property owner’s approval, can apply for cash assistance if (1) the building to be improved is in the ReCAP Program Area (see Attachment A); (2) the improvements are to a commercial building (industrial, office and/or retail); and (3) the applicant and building owners are in full compliance with City ordinances and regulations, including income and real estate tax obligations and building and zoning code regulations.

After an award is made, all build-out work must be completed according to the construction schedule submitted as part of the application. In all cases, ReCAP-assisted construction must be completed within 24 months of making application. All build-out work must be performed by licensed contractors which are bonded and insured for the project. All project work must be in compliance with applicable City building permit processes and planning commission approvals.

Applications must demonstrate, via a bank’s letter of credit, loan commitment or personal financial statement, the ability of the applicant to complete the entire project as proposed and repay the loan portion of the cash assistance award.

To receive funding or otherwise participate in the program, recipients cannot be in violation of any City rules, regulations or ordinances. A project close-out occurs upon an awardee’s submittal of any Certificates of Occupancy issued regarding the project, paid invoices to the licensed contractors and/or suppliers, and the full repayment of the loan component.

Table 1: Eligible Improvement Costs

| • Exterior painting that incorporates a major visual change |
| • Significant masonry cleaning and restoration modification (if part of an overall design restoration) |
| • Addition of awnings or replacement of awnings with a updated design style that results in a major visual enhancement |
• Enhanced exterior building lighting that creates a noticeably enhanced appearance
• Storefront entry systems and individual windows and door replacement or modification (if part of an overall design restoration)
• New or restored façade elements such as: cornices, soffits, canopies, and other detail elements
• Streetscape plantings, street furniture, new curbs and sidewalks, streetlights and related streetscape amenities
• Demolition (if part of an overall design)
• Signage, if new sign is in line with City overlay standards and/or old sign is significantly upgraded from existing old, out-of-date, substandard, or non-conforming signage
• Stormwater improvements to parking lots

Table 2: Ineligible Costs

• Paying down on existing loans
• Routine maintenance (including painting, general masonry upkeep, general window and door upkeep, and repair or replacement of current lighting or removing inoperable lighting fixtures)
• Building Permit & Inspection Fees
• Working capital
• Security fencing or gates
• Inventory
• Roof repair or replacement
• Awning repair or replacement if utilizing the same style of awning
• Interior improvements of any kind

Section 3: Application & Grant Payment Process

ReCAP assistance is appropriated by Worthington City Council as part of its annual budget process; in 2016, the program has been appropriated $75,000.

Building owners or tenants with the building owner’s approval, are to complete and submit the ReCAP Application Form, which must include digital photographs of the subject property as well
as renderings or illustrations of the proposed improvements. The cost to prepare an application, if any, is solely the responsibility of the applicant.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to contact the City’s Economic Development Manager to discuss the project before submitting application materials. When contact is made, the Economic Development Manager will provide information regarding the program and will connect the potential applicant with the Neighborhood Design Center. The Neighborhood Design Center will provide design advice and assistance at no cost to the applicant. The Neighborhood Design Center is available to prepare renderings or illustrations of the proposed project and assist with other parts of the application.

City staff will review submitted ReCAP applications after the review deadlines listed in Section 1 and prepare them for the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation. The Worthington Community Improvement Corporation will prepare formal recommendations of funding for projects to City Council. Awardees should receive the approval of City Council prior to any construction commencing under their respective projects.

A one-time, up-front cash payment will be remitted upon City Council approval of the project and execution of an agreement between the City and the awardee detailing the terms and conditions of assistance.

**Section 4: Selection Criteria**

City staff will process each ReCAP application that has been submitted by the review deadline and prepare it for full review by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation. Applications for assistance will be measured according to the following:

- **Current physical condition / exterior appearance**
  - Prominence and visibility of site
  - Perceived age of facilities and lack of exterior upkeep
  - Extent to which current conditions are impacting surrounding properties

- **Project scope of work**
  - Project describes exterior improvements fully and in sufficient detail
  - Improvements will positively impact the site’s appearance along the corridor
  - Improvements are in line with design expectations and build quality typical for similar properties in Worthington
  - Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements
  - Extent of pre-planning via the scope of work
  - Estimated completion time of the project
• Project viability and demonstrated ability to repay
  o Estimated total exterior project costs are reasonable and appropriate for the scope
  o Bids are in line with trade customs and comparable projects in the area
  o Applicant’s capabilities and capacity to successfully manage and complete the project
  o Site not marked by obvious significant obstacles to renovation
  o Applicant’s ability to repay the loan within three years

• Commitment to Worthington community
  o Applicant’s involvement in Worthington area business associations or charitable groups
  o Applicant’s length of operation in Worthington
  o Applicant’s commitment to the Worthington community
Staff has reviewed the program materials for ReCAP (Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program) and recommends updates. The proposed changes were discussed by the Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) Board, which recommends approval of the revised Policy and Procedures for the program. The ReCAP Policy and Procedures document was adopted by resolution of City Council, thus the changes need to be approved by resolution. Both clean and redline versions of this document are attached as well as a summary sheet and presentation slides that highlight the program investments to date.

The Policy & Procedures are proposed to be modified in several ways:

a) Establishment of review deadlines for the applications – Applications will be accepted throughout the year as long as funding is available. These deadlines will establish the timing for the review of the applications that have been submitted. In the past, applications were reviewed as they were received and they were funded on a first come, first served basis provided the application met the minimum score of 52 points. Staff anticipates more demand for the program than there is funding available, so the Policy & Procedures are proposed to be modified to move away from the first come, first served approach and conduct a review of applications three times per year. Within each review group, the Board will determine which applications to recommend for funding by the City Council. This provides for funding of the best applications within each group, as determined by the Board, rather than funding based on the first applications submitted. The process will still
be influenced by the timing of the applications as not all applications will be submitted at once. Once the funding runs out, the review will cease for the remainder of the year.
b) Inclusion of summary information about projects that were funded in 2014 and 2015.
c) Addition of information about the Neighborhood Design Center services provided through the program
d) Inclusion of a statement regarding situations in which the applicant performs the work for the project. This information was on the application and has been moved to the Policy & Procedures.
e) Addition of a requirement to submit copies of paid invoices once the work has been completed.
f) Addition of awning replacements as an eligible expense as long as the new awnings have an updated design style that results in a major visual enhancement.
g) Modification to the Selection Criteria section to utilize the wording on the scoring sheets.
h) Refinement of the narrative for the program.

In addition to the changes to the Policy & Procedures, the CIC Board discussed and approved changes to the application and the scoring sheet. These documents are adopted by the CIC and do not require City Council approval. The changes are described below.

The application is proposed to be modified to obtain a mailing address for the applicant and bring attention to the requirement for the applicant to be in compliance with income and property taxes as well as the City’s planning and zoning code. The statement regarding situations in which the applicant performs the work for the project is deleted from the application and moved to the Policy and Procedures document.

The scoring sheet has two changes. The first is an increase in the minimum score required for funding. This number is increased from 52 points to 65 points. This change is recommended due to the experience with two years of project scoring. Most of the projects exceeded 65 points and this higher threshold should result in the more impactful projects being funded. Another minor change is the deletion of an item related to compliance with building standards that hasn’t been used but was still listed on the sheet.
The Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) addresses provides financial assistance to encourage exterior investment and enhancement to commercial buildings’ issues of age, obsolescence, and disinvestment properties within certain areas of the City of Worthington. The program provides a mixture of grant funds and no-cost financing to building owners or commercial tenants to improve their building façades and surrounding streetscapes.

ReCAP is part of the City’s efforts to drive new job growth along the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road Corridor. The corridor, including the connecting portions of Worthington Galena Road and Schrock Road, This corridor’s commercial real estate profile, which is comprised primarily of industrial and warehousing space, and was defined largely from the 1950s until 1980. As properties along this corridor are improved, the City desires that they will continue to attract continued attraction and retain retention of commercial renters and owners that employ persons in Worthington.

The City of Worthington is known for appealing architecture and historic aesthetics, much of which derive from Worthington’s design review and approval of development along the High Street and State Route 161 - Granville Road corridors. But other areas of the City, notably the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road Corridor, are not subject to Worthington’s design standards. It is neither necessary nor prudent that all commercial land uses This program is intended to spur investment in Worthington follow the City’s architectural and design guidance. But it remains that this corridor is comprised of older properties which lag behind comparable properties elsewhere in this corridor to enhance the Central Ohio region, and many of which are marked by declining investment and depressed leasing rates.
To stave off decline, ReCAP is intended to help drive re-investment and improve aesthetics in attracting employers to this critical important commercial area of Worthington.

The ReCAP program began in 2014 and nine projects have received funding during the first two years of the program. The projects that have been funded are spread across the eligible area with four of them located on Huntley Road, two located on Proprietors Road, two on Worthington Galena Road and one on Schrock Road. Award amounts have ranged from $5,000 up to the maximum allowed of $25,000. The City’s contribution has been matched at least one to one with private funding in each project.

Section 1: Assistance Available

Grants and no-cost financing are available under ReCAP to fund prospective commercial building exterior enhancements. ReCAP assistance is provided as one-time, up-front cash payments to awardees, each in the form of a half-grant, and half-loan amount. This assistance is intended to partially fund well designed exteriors that enhance exterior enhancements to the design integrity properties and improve the aesthetics of the corridor and secure participating buildings against further devaluation and disinvestment along the corridor.

The maximum ReCAP award is the lesser of fifty percent (50%) of the lowest contractor’s bid for work under the project or $25,000, whichever is less. In all cases, the cash assistance award will be comprised 50%-50% of a half-grant and half-loan amount. Each project, up to $12,500 provided as a maximum one-time grant payment of $12,500 and up to a maximum $12,500 loaned at zero percent (0%) interest for a term of up to three (3) years. The actual award amount is determined by the cost of the work to be done under the project.

As part of the ReCAP Program, the City provides design assistance to applicants through a contract with the Neighborhood Design Center. When potential applicants contact the City regarding interest in the program, City staff will connect them with the Neighborhood Design Center who will provide design advice and assistance related to meaningful ways to utilize funds to enhance the aesthetics of the property. This design assistance is provided at no cost to the applicant.

If qualified to do so, the applicant may perform the improvement work. ReCAP funds cannot be used to compensate the applicant for the purchase or rental of tools and equipment or for applicant’s labor or the labor of family, friends, employees, or others with a financial interest in the business or property. In such instances, ReCAP can be used only to pay for materials.
An application seeking ReCAP funds must be filed with the City; to be considered for funding. The City may solicit certain property owners or tenants to participate. Applications will be reviewed by City staff on a first-come, first-served basis, with all such applications forwarded to the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation for recommendation to City Council. Awards are subject to the availability of funds.

Applications will be reviewed throughout the year as long as funds are available. Review deadlines have been established to trigger the review of the applications received. These review deadlines for 2016 are:

- February 26, 2016
- April 29, 2016
- August 26, 2016

If all of the funding allocated for 2016 is awarded to projects before the end of the year, the review deadlines for the remainder of the year will be cancelled. The review deadlines may be modified by the Community Improvement Corporation Board as it deems appropriate. Applicants can verify deadlines with the City’s Economic Development Manager.

To be eligible to participate, commercial properties must be located within the ReCAP Program Area (see Attachment A).

The grant-loan award must be for exterior front façade enhancements (and/or side building elevation if located on a corner lot) and/or the streetscape adjacent to the subject building.

Sample exterior, before:
Section 2: Eligibility

Building owners and tenants, with the property owner’s approval, can apply for cash assistance if (1) the building to be improved is in the ReCAP Program Area (see Attachment A); (2) the improvements are to a commercial building (industrial, office and/or retail); and (3) the applicant and building owners are in full compliance with City ordinances and regulations, including income tax and real estate tax obligations, and the building and zoning code regulations.

After an award is made, all build-out work must be completed according to the construction schedule submitted as part of the application; in all cases, ReCAP-assisted construction must be completed within 24 months of making application. All build-out work must be performed by licensed contractors which are bonded and insured for the project. All project work must be in compliance with applicable City building permit processes and planning commission approvals.

Applications must demonstrate, via a bank’s letter of credit, loan commitment or personal financial statement, the ability of the applicant to complete the entire project as proposed and repay the loan portion of the cash assistance award.

To receive funding or otherwise participate in the program, recipients cannot be in violation of any City rules, regulations or ordinances. A project close-out occurs upon an awardee’s submittal of any Certificates of Occupancy issued regarding the project, paid invoices to the licensed contractors and/or suppliers, and the full repayment of the loan component.

Table 41: Eligible Improvement Costs
- Exterior painting that incorporates a major visual change
- Significant masonry cleaning and restoration modification (if part of an overall design restoration)
- Addition of awnings or replacement of awnings with a updated design style that results in a major visual enhancement
- Enhanced exterior building lighting that creates a noticeably enhanced appearance
- Storefront entry systems and individual windows and door replacement or modification (if part of an overall design restoration)
- New or restored façade elements such as: cornices, soffits, canopies, and other detail elements
- Streetscape plantings, street furniture, new curbs and sidewalks, streetlights and related streetscape amenities
- Demolition (if part of an overall design)
- Signage, if new sign is in line with City overlay standards and/or old sign is significantly upgraded from existing old, out-of-date, substandard, or non-conforming signage
- Stormwater improvements to parking lots
Table 52: Ineligible Costs

- Paying down on existing loans
- Routine maintenance (including painting, general masonry upkeep, general window and door upkeep, and repair or replacement of current lighting or removing inoperable lighting fixtures)
- Building Permit & Inspection Fees
- Working capital
- Security fencing or gates
- Inventory
- Roof and awning repair or replacement
- Awning repair or replacement if utilizing the same style of awning
- Interior improvements of any kind

Section 3: Application & Grant Payment Process

ReCAP assistance is appropriated by Worthington City Council as part of its annual budget process; in 20152016, the program has been appropriated $10075,000.

Building owners or tenants with the building owner’s approval, are to complete and submit the ReCAP Application Form, which must include digital photographs of the subject property as well as schematic designs, renderings or illustrations of the proposed improvements. The cost to prepare an application, if any, is solely the responsibility of the applicant.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to contact the City’s Economic Development Manager to discuss the project before submitting application materials. When contact is made, the Economic Development Manager will provide information regarding the program and will connect the potential applicant with the Neighborhood Design Center. The Neighborhood Design Center will provide design advice and assistance at no cost to the applicant. The Neighborhood Design Center is available to prepare renderings or illustrations of the proposed project and assist with other parts of the application.

City staff will review submitted ReCAP applications on a first-come, first-served basis after the review deadlines listed in Section 1 and prepare them for the Worthington Community
Improvement Corporation. That entity, in turn, The Worthington Community Improvement Corporation will prepare formal recommendations of funding for projects to City Council on a rolling basis. Awardees should receive the approval of City Council prior to any construction commencing under their respective projects.

A one-time, up-front cash payment will be remitted upon City Council approving approval of the project and execution of an agreement between the City and the awardee detailing the terms and conditions of assistance.

Section 4: Selection Criteria

City staff will process each ReCAP application as it is that has been submitted by the review deadline and prepare it for full review by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation. Applications for assistance to improve subject properties will be measured according to the following:

- What is the subject property’s current physical condition and/ exterior appearance?
- Will the project result in upgrading the subject property to applicable current commercial building standards?
- Has the applicant provided a well constructed, thought out written scope of work for the exterior enhancement project?
  - How extensive is the proposed Prominence and visibility of site
  - Perceived age of facilities and lack of exterior upkeep
  - Extent to which current conditions are impacting surrounding properties
- Project scope of work
  - Project describes exterior enhancement project?
    - Will the ReCAP award assist in making substantial improvements to the outside appearance and exterior condition of the subject property? fully and in sufficient detail
    - Will the project result in making the subject property compliant Improvements will positively impact the site’s appearance along the corridor
    - Improvements are in line with the Americans with Disabilities Act?
    - What is the measure of commitment of the commercial tenant or building owner to the design expectations and build quality typical for similar properties in Worthington business community?
    - What is the applicant’s Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements
    - Extent of pre-planning via the scope of work
    - Estimated completion time of the project
• **Project viability and demonstrated ability to repay**
  o Estimated total exterior project costs are reasonable and appropriate for the scope
  o Bids are in line with trade customs and comparable projects in the area
  o Applicant’s capabilities and capacity to successfully manage and complete the project as proposed and
  o Site not marked by obvious significant obstacles to renovation
  o Applicant’s ability to repay the ReCAP loan component within three years

• **Commitment to Worthington community**
  o Applicant’s involvement in Worthington area business associations or charitable groups
  o Applicant’s length of operation in Worthington
  o Applicant’s commitment to the Worthington community
## ReCAP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Description of Improvements</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Agreement Date</th>
<th>Total Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>966 Proprietors Road</td>
<td>ERJV Properties (KJ Tool Kits)</td>
<td>New roof with extended overhangs at the entrance, loading dock and southern overhead door; brick accents added to the pillars; ornamental and structural components incorporated into the new overhang; complete repainting; repair loading dock driveway and new landscaping.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8/1/2014</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6520 Huntley Road</td>
<td>Dave Kolbe (Kolbe Construction)</td>
<td>Re-work entire front and part of south elevations with new full height storefront windows and door, steel awning, concrete entry and landscaping. South side painted and overhead door installed, Wood or metal siding will be added to the east gable above the brick.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8/14/2014</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Schrock Road</td>
<td>Franklin Imaging</td>
<td>Exterior paint, replacement of broken windows, new metal roofing on awning, and new electrical sign.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10/15/2014</td>
<td>$16,954.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7099 Huntley Road</td>
<td>Geldreich Family LP</td>
<td>New windows, removal of dead trees and pruning of trees, exterior paint, replacement of old shingles</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12/9/2014</td>
<td>$7,547.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6955 Worthington Galena Road</td>
<td>DK&amp;M Real Estate</td>
<td>Window replacement, new awnings, stucco repair and painting, and pedestrian door replacement</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1/29/2015</td>
<td>$6,784.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6300 Huntley Road</td>
<td>Marilyn Swisher (Loeb Electric)</td>
<td>Updates to the front façade and sides of building with new awnings, new entry canopy, new entry feature and new signage.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4/21/2015</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Workdays</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028 Proprietors Road</td>
<td>MAC Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>Installation of suspended awnings, exterior paint, new architectural finishes and masonry, new aluminum storefront door and sidelight, new landscaping beds and plantings, and new signage and street numbers.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6/8/2015</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6601 Huntley Road</td>
<td>Huntley Partners LLC</td>
<td>Remove existing exterior paint and awning, new paint including new color scheme, new landscaping and shrubbery to hide HVAC &amp; mechanicals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6/24/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7046 Worthington Galena Road</td>
<td>Chad Roberts (Under PSI Properties)</td>
<td>Widen windows and install new door, exterior paint, and outdoor break area with awning and landscaping.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1/6/2016</td>
<td>$21,037.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Loan Amount</td>
<td>Payment Schedule</td>
<td>Payment Amount</td>
<td>Work to Begin</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>Q4 2014 to Q3 2017</td>
<td>$1,041.67</td>
<td>8/1/2015</td>
<td>8/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>Q4 2014 to Q3 2017</td>
<td>$625.00</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>9/1/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,477.00</td>
<td>$8,477.00</td>
<td>Q1 2015 to Q4 2017</td>
<td>$706.72</td>
<td>10/1/2014</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,773.57</td>
<td>$3,773.57</td>
<td>Q2 2015 thru Q1 2018</td>
<td>$314.12</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,392.00</td>
<td>$3,392.00</td>
<td>Q2 2015 to Q4 2018</td>
<td>$282.67</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>Q3 2015 to Q2 2018</td>
<td>$1,041.67</td>
<td>3/1/2015</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>Q4 2015 to Q3 2018</td>
<td>$1,041.67</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>9/1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Q4 2015 to Q3 2018</td>
<td>$208.33</td>
<td>7/10/2015</td>
<td>8/10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,518.50</td>
<td>$10,518.50</td>
<td>Q2 2016 to Q1 2019</td>
<td>$876.54</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ReCAP Program
2014-2015 Projects
Program Summary: 2014-2015

• 9 projects
  – 4 on Huntley Road
  – 2 on Proprietors Road
  – 2 on Worthington Galena Road
  – 1 on Schrock Road

• Total Amount Awarded: $147,322
966 Proprietors Road

Before:

Current:

Scoring:

- Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance 20
- Project Scope of Work 15
- Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay 15
- Commitment to Worthington Community 5
- Overall Quality of Application 20
- TOTAL 75

Project Description:

New roof with extended overhangs at the entrance, loading dock and southern overhead door; brick accents added to the pillars; ornamental and structural components incorporated into the new overhang; complete repainting; repair loading dock driveway and new landscaping.
Before:

Current:

Scoring:
Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance  15
Project Scope of Work  15
Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay  15
Commitment to Worthington Community  7
Overall Quality of Application  20
TOTAL  72

Project Description:
New full height storefront windows and door, steel awning, concrete entry and landscaping. South side painted an overhead door installed, wood siding added to east gable.
500 Schrock Road

Before:

Current:

Scoring:
Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance 15
Project Scope of Work 15
Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay 15
Commitment to Worthington Community 10
Overall Quality of Application 20
TOTAL 75

Project Description:
Exterior paint, replacement of broken windows, new metal roofing on awning and new electrical sign.
**Before:**

![Old Building Image]

**Current:**

![New Building Image]

**Scoring:**
- Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance: 15
- Project Scope of Work: 5
- Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay: 15
- Commitment to Worthington Community: 5
- Overall Quality of Application: 20
- **TOTAL**: 60

**Project Description:**
New windows, removal of dead trees and pruning of trees, exterior paint, replacement of old shingles
6955 Worthington Galena Road

Before:

Current:

Scoring:
- Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance: 15
- Project Scope of Work: 15
- Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay: 15
- Commitment to Worthington Community: 7
- Overall Quality of Application: 20
- TOTAL: 72

Project Description:
Window replacement, new awnings, stucco repair and painting, and pedestrian door replacement
Before:

Current:

6300 Huntley Road

Scoring:

Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance 15
Project Scope of Work 20
Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay 15
Commitment to Worthington Community 5
Overall Quality of Application 20
TOTAL 75

Project Description:

Updates to the front façade and sides of building with new awnings, new entry canopy, new entry feature and new signage.
1028 Proprietors Road

Scoring:
- Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance: 15
- Project Scope of Work: 20
- Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay: 15
- Commitment to Worthington Community: 10
- Overall Quality of Application: 30
- TOTAL: 90

Project Description:
Installation of suspended awnings, exterior paint, new architectural finishes and masonry, new aluminum storefront door and sidelight, new landscaping beds and plantings, and new signage and street numbers.
6601 Huntley Road

Before:

Current:

Scoring:
- Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance: 20
- Project Scope of Work: 20
- Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay: 15
- Commitment to Worthington Community: 5
- Overall Quality of Application: 20
- TOTAL: 80

Project Description:
Remove existing exterior paint and awning, new paint including new color scheme, new landscaping and shrubbery to hide HVAC & mechanicals.
Before:

Current:

Proposed:

Scoring:
Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance  20
Project Scope of Work  15
Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay  15
Commitment to Worthington Community  5
Overall Quality of Application  20
TOTAL  75

Project Description:
Widen windows and install new door, exterior paint, and outdoor break area with awning and landscaping.
EXERPT RELATED TO RECAP PROGRAM

Ms. Princehorn introduced the next agenda item related to the ReCAP Program. Ms. Stewart stated that after two years of the program, it seemed an appropriate time to review the program materials in preparation for 2016 projects. Staff distributed two documents that highlight the projects to date. One was a spreadsheet with summary information about each project. The second was a PowerPoint slide deck with photographs of each property prior to application along with a current photograph. Some of the projects are still underway. There is one project that does not appear to have started and staff will follow up on it. It is still within the 24 month completion window required by the program, but it is past the proposed construction schedule in the application. The Finance Director indicates that all of the ReCAP applicants are current on loan payments.

Mr. Struewing asked where the funding came from and Ms. Stewart provided a brief summary of the City’s annual grant funding and the direction from City Council that the CIC review the ReCAP applications and provide a recommendation to the Council.

There are three documents that were reviewed by staff, the Policy and Procedures, the application and the scoring sheet. Ms. Stewart highlighted the proposed changes to the Policy and Procedures Document:

- The narrative in the first section was modified to include information about the projects funded to date and to refine some of the language.
- Information was added in Section 1 regarding the design services offered by the Neighborhood Design Center (NDC). The City has entered into an arrangement with NDC to provide free design assistance to applicants. This was done in an effort to encourage more impactful projects than simply a new coat of paint. NDC also prepares renderings for inclusion with the application.
• Section 1 was modified to include a statement regarding execution of the work by applicants. This statement was moved from the application to this document.

• Section 1 was also modified to establish three review deadlines in 2016. In the past, projects were awarded on a first come, first served basis as long as they met the minimum score. Since interest in the program is increasing and staff anticipates more potential projects than can be funded, the proposed changes provide for a review of all applications submitted prior to the review deadline. The applications would be considered as a group and evaluated for impact. If all of the funding is allocated before the end of the year, any remaining review deadlines would be cancelled.

• Section 2 is modified to require submittal of paid invoices before the project can be closed out.

• The replacement of awnings with an updated design style that results in a major visual enhancement is added as an eligible expense. Replacement of awnings was previously ineligible. With the proposed change, the repair or replacement with the same style of awning would remain ineligible.

• Section 4 is modified to reflect the selection criteria on the scoring sheet. The criteria stay the same, but the language is changed to match the scoring sheet.

Mr. Evans asked about the length of time to complete the review after the review deadline. Ms. Stewart responded that there are several factors including an initial review by staff, then review by the CIC Board and the forwarding of the funding recommendations to the City Council. It could conceivably be completed in about a month. Mr. Evans suggested the creation of a timeline so applicants know how long it will be before a funding decision is made. Mr. Greeson explained the original intent was to get the money out as fast as possible, which was accomplished. The question is whether a more competitive process is possible as we may not get to an August review with the funds that have been allocated.

Ms. Princehorn asked if City Council would be willing to allocate additional funds if there are worthy projects and funds are not sufficient to fund all of them. Mr. Smith replied it was doubtful. City Council has been concerned about cutting back. Ms. Stewart commented the funding for 2016 is reduced from prior years because of other pressures on the City’s Economic Development Fund. There are increasing obligations regarding other economic development incentives the City has provided and this has placed constraints on the Economic Development Fund, which is the account that funds the ReCAP program.

Ms. Stewart mentioned the application has a few minor recommended changes. The one change to note is the addition of a new “Compliance with City Laws & Regulations” section. These requirements have already been in place with the program, but this addition to the application form calls the applicant’s attention to it.

Ms. Stewart highlighted a proposed change to the scoring sheet. Staff recommends increasing the minimum score from 52 points to 65 points. Only one of the nine projects previously funded was below this new threshold and it was primarily focused on new paint, shingle repair and the removal of dead landscaping. By increasing the number of points, it may eliminate projects that are more maintenance in focus.
Mr. Smith asked about the expansion of the program to other areas such as High Street, either in Old Worthington or along the entire corridor. Mr. Greeson commented there are enough interest entities and enough target properties in the current corridor that it will probably take a few more years to run its course. It may be good to expand it, but we may want to delay it a bit. Another consideration with expansion to High Street, and particularly Old Worthington, is consideration of how the program will address the City’s Design Guidelines. These create a different environment and it may not be a good fit for the Neighborhood Design Center. The scoring criteria would probably need to change. Mr. Carter stated he thinks Old Worthington will be tricky because of the Architectural Review District and the different cost structure there.

Mr. Greeson said that the idea of the current ReCAP boundary was to implement the program in one area long enough to create some critical mass that would build on itself. Then the City could look to other areas that may need some aesthetic renovation to be competitive (i.e., on the south end around Selby Avenue and High Street and on the north from Route 161 to North Street).

Mr. Struewing asked about the allocation of the funds and how much of the money goes to owner-user properties. Mr. Greeson reviewed the list and noted more than half of the projects funded thus far are occupied by the owners. Mr. Struewing stated that was good because they are more likely to stay for a while and be involved in the community. Investors are likely to periodically invest in the buildings if they have difficulty with leasing so improvements might occur anyway to investor owned properties.

Mr. Carter stated the biggest issues for the corridor are low density and functional obsolescence.

Mr. Struewing observed that the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road corridors are primarily residential contractor businesses. Thus if the residential construction and renovation market is strong, the corridor will be more likely to be strong.

Mr. Smith suggested the CIC begin a conversation with the Old Worthington Partnership regarding ways they can partner to provide support for the downtown. The Board expressed support for this idea.

Mr. Smith moved to approve the proposed changes to the Policy and Procedures, the application, and the scoring sheet. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
ORDINANCE NO. 07-2016

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund Unappropriated Balance.

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the General Fund unappropriated balance to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101.1060.540522</td>
<td>Legal Services – Law</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.1170.540548</td>
<td>CVB - Lodging Tax</td>
<td>17,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.3040.540560</td>
<td>Building Maintenance – Building Maint.</td>
<td>11,515.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Fund Totals**  $179,045.00

SECTION 2. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ________________

_____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

___________________________________
Clerk of Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Month</th>
<th>Payment Month</th>
<th>LODGE</th>
<th>INN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>CVB 66%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1,001.43</td>
<td>9,435.55</td>
<td>10,436.98</td>
<td>6,888.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1,106.28</td>
<td>8,660.61</td>
<td>9,766.89</td>
<td>6,446.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>879.92</td>
<td>12,761.47</td>
<td>13,641.39</td>
<td>9,003.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>1,839.80</td>
<td>19,534.82</td>
<td>21,374.62</td>
<td>14,107.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1,548.39</td>
<td>17,308.15</td>
<td>18,856.54</td>
<td>12,445.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>1,927.11</td>
<td>19,662.86</td>
<td>21,589.97</td>
<td>14,249.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>2,184.59</td>
<td>25,405.27</td>
<td>27,589.86</td>
<td>18,209.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1,947.56</td>
<td>26,080.14</td>
<td>28,027.70</td>
<td>18,498.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>1,466.42</td>
<td>20,143.69</td>
<td>21,610.11</td>
<td>14,262.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>1,837.07</td>
<td>19,917.94</td>
<td>21,755.01</td>
<td>14,358.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1,954.25</td>
<td>22,582.24</td>
<td>24,536.49</td>
<td>16,194.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>994.30</td>
<td>13,785.40</td>
<td>14,779.70</td>
<td>9,754.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

|             |      | 17,685.69 | 205,842.59 | 223,528.28 | 147,528.66 |

Total payments made to CVB as of 12/31/2015 = $130,000.00
Payment for Balance due to CVB for 2015 collection year - $17,528.66  CK #202978 1/22/16