City Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, April 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

Bonnie D. Michael, President
Scott Myers, President Pro-Tem
   Rachael Dorothy
   Douglas C. Foust
   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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

1) Resolution No. 16-2016 – Good Neighbor Award

To Congratulate Joanna Saul on Her Recognition as a Recipient of the 2015 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

2) Resolution No. 17-2016 – Expressing Appreciation

Expressing the Appreciation and Best Wishes of the Worthington City Council to Mikel Coulter For His Outstanding Service to the Community.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3) March 7, 2016 – Regular Meeting
4) March 14, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

5) Ordinance No. 10-2016

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 the Heischman Park Playground Replacement Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 627-16)

6) Ordinance No. 11-2016

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the Worthington Station TIF Fund and Worthington Place TIF Fund Unappropriated Balances.
7) **Ordinance No. 12-2016**

Amending Section 1107.01, Section 1141.01 and Section 1141.06 and Enacting Chapter 1181 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Facilitate Redevelopment and Reinvestment of the Wilson Bridge Corridor.

8) **Ordinance No. 13-2016**

Authorizing the City of Worthington to Participate with Other Central Ohio Jurisdictions in the Funding for a Study of the State Route 161 Corridor and 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 Thereof.

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

Information Item(s)

9) Update of Parks Master Plan

**REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**OTHER**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**ADJOURNMENT**
City Manager Report to City Council for the
Meeting of Monday, April 4, 2016

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

1) Resolution No. 16-2016 – Good Neighbor Award

The Community Relations Commission (CRC) established the Good Neighbor Award to recognize members of the community who promote cooperation and goodwill throughout their neighborhoods and the City of Worthington. The CRC voted to present the 2015 award to Joanna Saul.

This Resolution congratulates the recipient of the 2015 Good Neighbor Award. Jack Miner, Chair of the Community Relations Commission, will be present for this presentation.

2) Resolution No. 17-2016 – Honoring Mikel Coulter – Community Relations Commission

Mikel Coulter recently completed nine years of service on the Community Relations Commission, including over five years as Chair of the CRC. A presentation will be made recognizing his years of service.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3) March 7, 2016 – Regular Meeting
4) March 14, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting

**Recommendation:** Approval of Minutes as Presented
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

5) Ordinance No. 10-2016 – Appropriation – Heischman Park Playground

This Ordinance appropriates funds for the replacement of the playground at Heischman Park. This replacement was included in the 2016 capital plan and staff is ready to move forward with design and installation of the new playground. A memorandum from the Director of Parks & Recreation is attached which outlines the process proposed by staff for developing and finalizing a design for the new playground.

Recommendation: Introduction for Public Hearing on April 18, 2016

6) Ordinance No. 11-2016 – Appropriation – TIF Fund

This Ordinance appropriates funds related in the Worthington Station and Worthington Place Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds. The Worthington Place TIF is related to the Heights at Worthington Place development and was established as a “non-school” TIF which means the property tax payments derived from the improvements were to be paid directly to Worthington Schools by Franklin County. However, the County incorrectly disbursed the entire amount to the City. An appropriation is needed to pay the Schools their amount.

This appropriation also included funds for costs assessed by Franklin County for the collection and distribution of the funds for both the Worthington Place TIF and the Worthington Station TIF. (Note: The Worthington Station TIF is associated with the property on the northeast corner of Proprietors Road and Granville Road.) Attached is a memorandum from the Director of Finance that provides additional information.

Recommendation: Introduction for Public Hearing on April 18, 2016

7) Ordinance No. 12-2016 – Wilson Bridge Road Zoning

In 2011, the City adopted the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study that makes recommendations for the corridor from the Olentangy River on the western end to the railroad crossing on the eastern end. Staff has drafted zoning text that creates new zoning categories for the corridor consistent with the recommendations from the Corridor Study. The text has been reviewed by the Wilson Bridge Road Steering Committee and the Municipal Planning Commission with both groups recommending approval. The text was also discussed with City Council on November 9, 2015, January 11, 2016, February 8, 2016 and March 14, 2016. This Ordinance reflects those discussions and modifies the City’s zoning code to incorporate new zoning categories and requirements along the Wilson Bridge Road corridor. The attached memorandum from the Director of Planning & Building provides a description of the proposed zoning language. The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study is available for review on the City’s website at: http://www.worthington.org/index.aspx?nid=168.

Recommendation: Introduction for Public Hearing on April 18, 2016
8) Ordinance No. 13-2016 – SR-161 Consent Legislation

On March 18, 2016, the City Council heard a presentation from the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and discussed participation in a study of State Route 161 from Olentangy River Road to Sawmill Parkway. The purpose of the study would be to identify alternatives to improve traffic safety and congestion, as well as improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. ODOT's presentation, an initial traffic analysis conducted by the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC), and related memoranda can be found at www.worthington.org/index.aspx?NID=679. City Council is being requested to introduce legislation that would consent to participation in the study. The City budgeted $150,000 in the Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) to participate in the study. The study is estimated to cost $600,000 and will be administered by ODOT. The following entities are scheduled to participate in the project: City of Columbus ($270,000), ODOT ($120,000), MORPC ($30,000) and Perry Township ($30,000).

**Recommendation:** Introduction for Public Hearing on April 18, 2016

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

9) Update of Parks Master Plan

The Parks and Recreation Commission has been working on a Park Planning Document to provide recommendations on future park improvements and projects. A presentation will be provided regarding the work completed thus far and the proposed steps for moving forward with the rest of the process. Attached are a memorandum from the Director of Parks & Recreation and a copy of the presentation that will be given.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
RESOLUTION NO. 16-2016

To Congratulate Joanna Saul on Her Recognition as a Recipient of the 2015 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

WHEREAS, the Worthington Community Relations Commission established the Good Neighbor Award to recognize members of the community who promote cooperation and goodwill throughout their neighborhoods; and,

WHEREAS, on April 4, 2016 the Worthington Community Relations Commission will present the 2015 Good Neighbor Award to Joanna Saul; and,

WHEREAS, Joanna Saul of Pingree Drive exemplifies the term “good neighbor” through her dedication to the Worthington community; and,

WHEREAS, Joanna Saul is committed to encouraging walking and promoting Worthington as a walking community; and,

WHEREAS, Joanna Saul has worked with neighborhoods, organizations and businesses to create Walk Worthington which combines fitness with educational programs that focus on neighborhoods, health topics and the City’s rich history; and,

WHEREAS, by encouraging neighborhood walks, Joanna Saul has brought neighbors together, highlighted unique neighborhoods and created opportunities for improved wellness and community connections;

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

SECTION 1. That this Council does hereby recognize Joanna Saul for promoting cooperation and goodwill through Walk Worthington programs that enrich the lives of both current and future residents.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk of Council be instructed to forward a duly certified copy of this Resolution to Joanna Saul and to record said Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted_________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_______________________________
Clerk of Council
RESOLUTION NO. 17-2016

Expressing the Appreciation and Best Wishes of the Worthington City Council to Mikel Coulter For His Outstanding Service to the Community.

WHEREAS, Mikel Coulter diligently served the City of Worthington as a member of the Community Relations Commission from February 2007 through January 2016; and,

WHEREAS, Mikel Coulter served as Vice Chair of the Community Relations Commission from January 2009 to June 2010 and as Chair from July 2010 through January 2016; and,

WHEREAS, Mikel Coulter’s leadership of the Commission included assisting with community dialogue when difficult issues arose with the United Methodist Children’s home in 2010; and,

WHEREAS, Mikel Coulter focused the CRC on activities which strengthen Worthington neighborhoods, enhance community connections, and assist senior citizens and those less fortunate in the community; and,

WHEREAS, Worthington City Council does recognize and appreciate the service given by Mikel Coulter during his tenure on the Community Relations Commission;

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

SECTION 1. That on behalf of the residents of the community, the City Council hereby expresses to Mikel Coulter sincere appreciation for his contributions and years of dedicated service and extends him best wishes for the future.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk of Council be instructed to forward a duly certified copy of this Resolution to Mikel Coulter and to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted________________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 7, 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, March 7, 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 7:30 p.m.

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

**Member(s) Absent:** Douglas Foust, Scott Myers

**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, Director of Building and Planning Lee Brown, Director of Public Service and Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire Scott Highley and Chief of Police James Mosic

There were nine visitors present.

*President Michael invited all those in attendance to stand and join in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.*

**VISITOR COMMENTS** – There were no visitor comments

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION – Update on Zika Virus**

Theresa C. Long, MD, MPH, Health Commissioner
Keith Krinn, RS, MA, DAAS, Environmental Health Administrator

**ZIKA**

What We Are Doing

- Alerting area physicians with Health Advisories as CDC guidance is available.
- Convening all area hospital systems and public health agencies so we communicate with one voice to area physicians and the communities at risk.
- Convening all area colleges and universities so that they communicate effectively to their students and faculties.
- Facilitating testing of patient specimens to be sent to CDC.
- Ready to conduct disease investigations of Zika cases.
- Evaluating and planning our mosquito control efforts for this mosquito season.
- Will launch an educational campaign to help eliminate standing water – the major source of mosquito breeding in our backyards.
ZIKA BASICS
Mosquitoes

• Zika is spread mostly by being bitten by an infected Aedes species mosquito.
• These mosquitoes are aggressive daytime biters, but can also bite at night.

ZIKA BASICS
No Vaccine

• There is no vaccine or medicine for Zika.
• The best way to avoid Zika is to prevent mosquito bites.

ZIKA BASICS
Common Symptoms

• Common symptoms are fever, rash, joint pain, and conjunctivitis (red eyes) within 2 weeks of exposure.
• The symptoms are usually mild and only affect 1 in 5 people who are infected.

ZIKA BASICS
Birth Defects

• Infection during pregnancy may be linked to birth defects in babies.

ZIKA BASICS
Travel

• Check for updates on Zika-affected countries and for travel advisories at www.cdc.gov/zika.

ZIKA BASICS
Sexual Transmission

• Sexual transmission of Zika Virus from a male partner is possible.

INFORMATION FOR
Pregnant Women

• Pregnant women should avoid travel to any area where Zika Virus is spreading.
• If you must travel to these areas, talk to your doctor first and strictly follow steps to prevent mosquito bites during your trip.
• Use condoms every time and correctly with male partners who have traveled to these areas or abstain from sex.
INFORMATION FOR

Men

Men Who Have Traveled to Areas Where Zika is Spreading:

- If you are sexually active with a woman who is or could become pregnant:
  - Use a condom every time and correctly
  - or –
  - Abstain from sex

Testing To Date

ZIKA VIRUS TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># Total</th>
<th># Positive</th>
<th># Negative</th>
<th># Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Columbus & Franklin County as of 2/29/2016*

INFORMATION TO HELP

Prevent Mosquito Bites

- **Empty or get rid** of items that hold water around your yard or surroundings.
- **Treat rain barrels** for mosquitoes.
- Check and **repair window screens** around your home.
- Use an **EPA-registered insect repellent** and follow the label carefully.

Distribution of Zika Vectors in the Continental United States

Keith Krinn spoke about the Aedes Aegypti as not being very hardy mosquitoes. They mainly thrive in tropical areas, such as the climate around the Gulf coast and in Arizona. Its cousin however is a hardy mosquito and can survive the Ohio winters. To date there has been no transmission of the disease by this mosquito. In theory someone could come to Worthington from the Virgin Islands infected and be bitten by an albopictus which could then bit someone else and transmit the disease. The virus has been isolated in the laboratory in the albopictus mosquito but again, there has been no transmission of it to date.
What About Mosquitoes Here?

- **No local mosquito-borne cases reported in U.S. states at this time.**
- CDC is not able to predict how much Zika virus may spread in the continental U.S.
- Recent Chikungunya and Dengue Fever outbreaks suggest that Zika outbreaks may be relatively small and limited to a small area in the U.S.

Mosquito Control

**Columbus Public Health stepping up prevention efforts:**

- Increase trapping to find the mosquitoes.
- Targeted larviciding and source reduction in areas where we find and suspect these mosquitoes.
- Respond to complaints of daytime biting mosquitoes.

Mr. Krinn stated the principle goal of the mosquito program is still the West Nile Virus because it is deadlier than Zika.

**INFORMATION TO HELP**

Mosquito Control

**Columbus Public Health stepping up prevention efforts:**

- Targeted daytime adulticide/spraying.
- Respond with control measures near reported/suspected human cases.
- Extensive Public Education Campaign

**INFORMATION TO HELP**

Prevent Mosquito Bites

- **Empty or get rid** of items that hold water around your yard or surroundings.
- **Treat rain barrels** with mosquito repelling dunks (tablets).
- Check and **repair window screens** around your home.
- Use an **EPA-registered insect repellent** and follow the label carefully.
Ms. Dorothy asked how someone would contact the health department if they have a concern about a suspected case or a biting incident. Dr. Long replied that her staff will take calls from the public through the infectious disease reporting system, which is 525-8888. But anyone with symptoms will be referred to their provider for an assessment. If the provider feels that testing is needed then they would go from there.

Mr. Norstrom shared that he has been involved with rain barrels for several years. He understands that it is too early to have them treated but wondered when the number for that would be published. Mr. Krinn commented that he doesn’t know the date but will find out the information for him.

Mr. Norstrom shared that the number is not necessarily out in the public in the way that it should be. The Zika virus gives us an opportunity to talk about mosquitoes but mosquitoes are a major problem as you’ve indicated. He doesn’t want the public to be overly concerned about the Zika because there isn’t a native born Zika case yet but we should be concerned about mosquitoes in general and doing everything within the community to avoid stagnant water, and get rain barrels treated, etc. Mr. Krinn confirmed that the dusk to dawn mosquitoes are the Culex species and those are the ones that transmit the West Nile virus. They are also associated with encephalitis.

Ms. Dorothy asked if the number of mosquito prevention treatments would increase or is this just a campaign to calm the public’s fear of Zika. Dr. Long replied that they will continue to expand treatments, mostly in the early dawn hours. They will respond and be very concerned if a case is discovered locally. Obviously they would be looking at provision efforts right in that neighborhood and close to the person diagnosed. She added that it is also an opportunity to make people aware of things that they can do in the neighborhoods and backgrounds to reduce the breeding of mosquitoes.

Ms. Dorothy asked if Columbus or Franklin will be sending anything out or is this something that Worthington may want to include in with our publications. Dr. Long replied that the Health Department has no plans to send anything out but they would be happy to work with city staff if members want to send something out. She added that Ohio State sent the information out to its students, faculty, staff and parents. They would be happy to make all of the artwork available for the city to share with its residents. Mr. Greeson commented that he would have Anne Brown work with Dr. Long’s staff to get something for distribution.

Dr. Long added that she thinks it is a tad early for the information but they wanted to give council a heads up on this issue.

Council members thanked Dr. Long for the presentation this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Committee of the Whole Meeting – January 11, 2016
- Regular Meeting – January 19, 2016
• Special Meeting – February 1, 2016
• Regular Meeting – February 1, 2016

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

The motion to approve the minutes as presented carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION  
President Michael declared public hearings and voting on legislation previously introduced to be in order.

Ordinance No. 08-2016  Authorizing the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation to Execute a Lease Agreement Between the WCIC and Sew to Speak LLC for a Portion of the Kilbourne Building.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mrs. Fox shared that staff was approached last December by Anita Gastaldo, who is present this evening. Ms. Gastaldo is the owner of Sew to Speak and she expressed an interest in leasing the northern 2,035 +/- square feet of space on the first floor of the Kilbourne Building. Sew to Speak has been in business in Clintonville for approximately eight years and is known as a destination shop for customers interested in sewing, knitting, and crafting. Ms. Gastaldo was alerted to this space by the owner of Sweet Carrot, who was shopping for fabric and they began talking. So there has been a great deal of good discussion between the owner of Sweet Carrot and Ms. Gastaldo about the space. Staff met with Ms. Gastaldo and indicated that we would be interested in having her obtain some estimates to prepare the space for occupancy. She did that and came back to us with a construction estimate of $180,000. Staff continued to work with her and began putting together the term sheet for the lease, which is very similar to the lease terms done for Sweet Carrot. There was one change to the lease that members have before them that she doesn’t believe is adverse to the city. Ms. Gastaldo had asked that she have an initial ten year lease with a renewal term for seven years. Ms. Gastaldo has asked that the renewal terms be switched to three, three year terms. She believes that is a reasonable request and asked that council also agree that the request is reasonable.

Mrs. Fox reported that the lease is a triple net lease similar to Sweet Carrot. Square footage is estimated at $15.00 a square foot, and in exchange for the amount of investment that Sew to Speak is putting in to the building, we calculated a rent abatement for just shy of seven years.

Mrs. Fox shared that there was extensive discussion about this lease at the Community Investment Corporation (CIC). She noted that Mr. Smith and Mr. Norstrom were part of those discussions. Mike Simpson of NAI Ohio Equities was also consulted on the lease
structure, the lease rate and the compatibility of this use with the restaurant use and in proximity to the Village Green. She added that Mr. Simpson is also present this evening.

Mrs. Fox commented that everyone is excited about this business. We think it is a good fit for the Kilbourne Building and compatible with the Sweet Carrot restaurant next door. She would request approval of this ordinance.

Mr. Troper understands that if approved, this agreement would abate $180,000 in rent. He asked what would happen if the construction company comes in more or less than $180,000. Mrs. Fox replied that the agreement is to abate the $180,000.

Ms. Dorothy asked if there are any significant differences in this lease and the one approved for Sweet Carrot. Mrs. Fox replied that the structure of the two leases are the same. The businesses will be investing the dollars ahead of time. The rent will be abated, it is triple net, and they will be sharing the maintenance costs in the common area. The option to renew on Sweet Carrot is a seven year term but Ms. Gastaldo has asked for the three, three year terms.

Ms. Dorothy asked about the hours of operation. Ms. Gastaldo shared that currently they are open Monday – Saturday. They will try to be open in Worthington on Sundays as well. Their current hours are 10:00 am to 6:00 pm but they likely will switch to closing at 7:00 p.m. with the Sunday hours a bit shorter. Ms. Dorothy commented that she hopes more residents will be out and about and visiting her business.

Ms. Michael asked if an amendment is needed before members vote on the ordinance. Mrs. Fox replied that the ordinance is structured to allow changes to be made that are not adverse to the city but it always helps to have council agree to those changes if they wish to do that.

**MOTION**  Mr. Smith made a motion to amend the lease to allow for the change in the renewal option. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Mr. Norstrom stated that he would like to get specific. He asked if the change is to Section 3. under rent. Mrs. Fox replied that it would be under the renewal option in Section 31, page 11. The tenant would have the option to renew the lease for three, three-year terms instead of seven.

Mr. Norstrom commented that since council was criticized on this deal when we did it with Sweet Carrot, he wants to make it clear for the record that: 1) the costs that are paid by the tenants are not normal build out costs. He asked Mike Simpson to assist with an explanation.

Mr. Simpson stated that the reason the abatement makes a great deal of sense is because normally in this kind of situation the landlord would be investing money to get the premises ready to occupy, both base building type improvements and also what is known as tenant improvements. In this case, the fact that the tenant is willing to invest their
money in the improvements, every landlord would love to get a tenant like that. Because this is less risk for the city, he thinks that structure/type of deal makes a lot of good sense for the city.

The motion to amend the lease attached to Ordinance No. 08-2016 carried unanimously.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 08-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5  Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 08-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 09-2016  Amending Part Seventeen – Title Two of the Codified Ordinances of the City Regarding Municipal Income Tax.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mrs. Roberts shared that Council passed Ordinance No. 42-2015 on October 19, 2015 to incorporate the required changes that the General Assembly enacted due to House Bill 5 for significant changes to the Income Tax Code. Following passage of this ordinance, staff was provided with additional revisions, which are primarily clerical in nature but we do feel that they are significant enough to amend the ordinance passed in October. Additionally these revisions designate appointments to the Board of Tax Review. Previously we had an Income Tax Board of Tax Appeals. House Bill 5 requires that the name of the appeal board be changed to the Board of Tax Review. Staff has contacted our current members and they are willing to additional serve on this newly constituted Board of Tax Appeals as required. Again, these change are clerical in nature and not substantive however staff does request the changes be incorporated.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 09-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5  Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 09-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 10-2016  Approving an Agreement and Permit for between Level 3 Communications, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, to Operate and Maintain a Telecommunications System Within the City of Worthington Pursuant to and Subject to the Provisions of Chapter 949 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION  Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 10-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mrs. Stewart shared that this is a rather routine renewal however both Level 3 and tw telecom have held right-of-way permits with the city and both permit expired late last year. Level 3 has acquired tw telecom since they last obtained their permit and Level 3’s preference is that they be consolidated under one permit.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 10-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 11-2016  Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Agreement to Participate in the Franklin County Drug Task Force.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

MOTION  Mr. Troper made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2016. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

Mr. Greeson shared that we have recently talked about drug use in our community and members know the issue of combating drugs transcend jurisdictional boundaries. In recent years the city has participated in the Franklin County Drug Task Force. He asked Chief Mosic to overview this item.

Chief Mosic reported that the city has been involved in the Task Force since mid to late 2013 with one officer assigned full-time. The document before Council had some minor changes to it and that is why it is before Council at this time for approval. The Task Force provides the city with many benefits that a small agency could not provide. He would be happy to answer any questions.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy to share some highlights of the benefits, Chief Mosic replied that it is basically a force multiplier. Being a small agency, Worthington is limited on
manpower. The Task Force also provides technical equipment in order to conduct our investigations that we would not have access to.

Ms. Michael asked if this is anticipated to help reduce drug use and drug trafficking in our community. Chief Mosic replied that they have made significant seizures county wide and they work on stemming the flow to all the communities throughout Franklin County so it is a direct benefit to our locality.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 12-2016  
A Resolution Indicating What Services the City of Worthington Will Provide to the 0.10 ± Acres Located in Perry Township, Franklin County, Ohio, Upon Annexation to the City.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION  
Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Mr. Greeson shared that there is an eighty foot strip of roadway adjacent to the UDF parcel that is neither in Worthington or Columbus. It has been identified as being important to clean up the jurisdictional responsibilities for it. Staff recommends that it be annexed into Worthington. He asked Mrs. Fox to overview both the issue and the procedure.

Mrs. Fox reported that this is an area of Linworth Road that probably should have been annexed to either Columbus or to Worthington when the adjacent property was annexed over the last many years but it wasn’t so it remains in Perry Township. As a result of the UDF redevelopment the city was approached to see if we would be willing to take on this very small portion of the roadway. It actually is adjacent to the former First Merit Bank parcel that has been acquired by UDF. This Resolution is the first of two actions that is required by Council when property is annexed. This resolution indicates what services the city will provide to this portion. It is a little bit of a strange resolution because it is not really a property that we would consider providing the full range of our services to. Nevertheless the county requires the resolution to be considered and if passed delivered to the county within twenty days of the date of filing the petition, which occurred on February 29th.

Mrs. Fox shared that the annexation statute requires a buffer be included as part of the legislative action when the city determines the zoning for the annexed land. Since this is a little bit of an outlier, the buffer requirement has been waived. We explain in the resolution that it doesn’t make any sense to have a buffer requirement on the roadway with the adjacent property. She added that Chris Kessler, who is with the attorney firm working with UDF is here this evening should members have any additional questions.
Ms. Dorothy asked who was previously providing services to this parcel. Mr. Whited replied that this small piece of property was maintained by the County Engineer because it was located in Perry Township.

Ms. Michael asked if this annexation will in any way help with the redevelopment of the intersection. Mr. Whited sees it as an opportunity to clean up some discontinuity in the properties out there and clarify maintenance responsibilities as well as traffic accidents. Mrs. Fox added that with the UDF development, the developers are constructing a dedicated left turn lane southbound on Linworth to SR 161. She doesn’t know where that turn lane will fall within this but it was all just part of the redevelopment questions that came up.

Mr. Kessler shared that the request came from the county as part of the redevelopment. As Mr. Whited said its main purpose is to clean up the area and define the boundaries.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if they support the annexation Mr. Kessler replied yes.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- Gypsy Moth Treatment

Mrs. Stewart shared that this request is very similar to the treatment that Franklin County provided last year with regards to the gypsy moth. It involves an aerial application of a pheromone, which is a mating disruption chemical. It essentially prevents the males from finding the females and thus it helps to control the gypsy moth population. This year only a very small portion of Worthington west of SR 315 is slated for the application which is scheduled for this summer. The Ohio Department of Agriculture has requested a letter from the city indicating acknowledgement of receipt of the information and also indicating support for the aerial application. Staff is seeking a motion in support of that in order to provide the letter that is requested.

Ms. Dorothy asked if they could provide the city with a more specific timeline once they have the treatment scheduled. Mrs. Stewart shared that staff received many calls last year because of the low flying aircraft used to distribute the pheromones. She recalls that last year more specific dates were provided so staff can certainly request those. Ms. Brown can put out information to the community as well.

Ms. Dorothy thinks we need to do just about whatever we can to prevent pests from killing all of our trees. She sees the prevention effort as a substantial benefit to Worthington.
MOTION
Ms. Dorothy made a motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a letter approving the treatment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

There being no additional questions or comments, the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson shared the following information:

1) Anne Brown provided council members with a memorandum regarding the community group subcommittee’s report on funding. Staff intends to schedule that for city council discussion at the committee of the whole meeting next week. Usually no action is taken at that meeting however in this instance we may encourage members to do that given the fact that some of these groups are reliant and waiting on funding.

2) The Linworth Alternative School recently asked whether crosswalks would be included at both the UDF redevelopment and the Linworth Crossing development. He thought it important to remind everybody that yes there will be crosswalks where none currently exists. He wanted to make sure that members had this information to share with residents.

Mr. Greeson told Ms. Michael that there would be crosswalks and sidewalks.

3) Meeting Schedule:
   a. March 14th – Topics will include Community Group Funding, and Wilson Bridge Road Zoning Ordinance
   b. March 21st – Transportation Related Night (MORPC has asked for an opportunity to present their Metropolitan Transportation Plan and ODOT will talk about moving forward with the SR 161 Study)

4) Mr. Greeson complimented Mrs. Stewart, Mrs. Fox, and the members of the CIC who worked very hard on the Sweet Carrot and the Sew to Speak leases to achieve what has been quite a long goal of the community’s to get the Kilbourne Building occupied. Ms. Michael chaired the CIC and he knows that members put many hours into the effort in the last several weeks and he wanted to compliment them for their work.

Mrs. Fox shared that the 2016 Charter Review Commission will hold its first meeting on March 21st at 5:45 p.m. in Council Chambers. We look forward to beginning that process.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if those were public meetings Mrs. Fox replied yes.

Mr. Norstrom shared that ten years ago the meetings were held in a round table forum which was much better for conversation than this room allows. Mrs. Fox stated that we
are going to start in this room and we will let the Commission decide from that point how and where and for how long they would like to meet.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom raised the issue again of installing cameras in Council Chambers. He shared that he was watching HBO before tonight’s meeting and they had cameras of a special district with just two people in there, the chair and vice-chair but the entire meeting was recorded and people could see what occurred.

Mr. Smith commented that he likes the idea. He added that a couple of week ago when members met there was talk about scheduling the sidewalk proposals for an upcoming meeting. He thought that meeting was next week. If it has been postponed that is fine but residents need to be informed. Mr. Greeson thanked him for the reminder to talk about that issue. Staff wanted to try to do it on the 11th of April, if that works for this group. That allows staff some time to get it noticed. It also gets us past some other activities.

Mr. Norstrom asked if the conversation will only be for Crandall Avenue. Mr. Smith shared that it will be a city-wide concept. Mrs. Fox further explained that a few Crandall residents proposed two code changes to Council. We also have Mr. Smith’s additional concept that may result in numerous changes that will add to the code provision. Staff would like to get council’s input on whether or not you want to consider one, some or all of those provisions before the actual change to an ordinance is drafted.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she sent City Council members and the City Manager a notice about a presentation that she and Mrs. Stewart attended at the John Glenn College of Public Affairs. The presentation was by a Master’s program person who had collected local government data from 2007 to 2013 regarding the impact of reduced funding from the state. This is an ongoing conversation that everyone is invited to participate in throughout the entire state of Ohio to hopeful help talk with our legislative peers in the state house. There will be a follow up meeting in May on this specific issue. She added that she is also aware of other organizations who are looking at this type of information.

Ms. Michael shared that she received a memo from the Central Ohio Fair Housing Association who asked if council would be willing to do a proclamation proclaiming the month of April as Fair Housing Month. She asked council members to weigh in on whether to provide a proclamation or not.

Members shared that they would be interested in reading the request. Ms. Michael read the letter and asked for direction from members.

Mr. Norstrom opposed having staff spend time on the issue.

Ms. Michael understands that there is not much fair housing issues in our community.

Mr. Troper agreed that city staff didn’t need to spend much time on the topic.
Mr. Norstrom added that if we do that we should think about the precedence that we are setting. Ms. Michael agreed. She acknowledged groups like the Veterans where it makes sense to recognize an organization. She just wondered how close this really matches with what council may want to do, which is why she asked the question.

Mr. Smith suggested sending the request to the mayor.

Ms. Michael asked that Council’s salaries continue to be on a “To Do List” to be brought up for discussion sometime before the end of the year.

She commented that there was talk after the Groundhog Day breakfast of the Schools, the City and the Chamber to work together and the Schools have offered their meeting room to share the MORPC presentation again that talked about 2050 and future development and trends. She thinks as we talk about some of the other development issues that have come around the city of Worthington like the Holiday Inn development it would be nice to have the educational component to make it easier for residents to watch it on TV in their homes. The schools technology was offered and can handle the presentation effort.

Mr. Smith thinks it is a good idea if MORPC can do that. Mr. Greeson agreed to work with them to try to identify some time. They have a few different staff members who are doing that presentation but if we are interested in doing a larger community event, he thinks it would be great. Ms. Michael liked the educational component that would be good for the community. Mr. Greeson agreed to head the effort.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 8:36 p.m.
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CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, March 14, 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 7:30 P.M.

Ms. Michael appointed Tanya Maria Word as Temporary Clerk of Council for this evening’s meeting.


Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Deputy Clerk of Council Tanya M. Word, City Manager, Matt Greeson, Assistant City Manager, Robyn Stewart, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, City Engineer Daniel Whited, Parks and Recreation Director Darren Hurley, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Chief of Police James Mosic and Chief of Fire Scott Highley.

There were 40 visitors present.

President Michael invited all those in attendance to stand and join in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 13-2016

Approving Funding to Worthington Community Groups for the 2016 Community Grant Program.

Introduced by Councilmember Foust

Councilmember Foust explained there were five of us involved in this discussion; Anne Brown helped to get things organized. Mr. Troper and I were the two council representatives; it was an interesting and challenging conversation. We had in excess of $70,000 worth of requests and a little bit north of $55,000 to work with. We met as a group, we went our separate ways, we then shared our thoughts back with each other in writing and then met again to lobby, to explain and to defend our various recommendations. We did apply council’s matrix and we appreciate the effort that went into that; it was certainly very helpful.

Would like to share some thoughts for when we do this for next year; our mission really wasn’t as clearly defined as perhaps as I would have liked for it to have been, it was hard to apply some of the concepts universally (i.e. is $55,000 the right number and what was
it we were trying to accomplish), so we had some heart-to-heart discussions about that, I know that we set aside the arts component of things as a separate body going forward, but what I would like to see us try to aim for in the next go around with this is identifying more effectively the outcomes of where that money was used; and more importantly that we’ve carved out the arts and what we’re now left with is a group of requests that included a lot of human services elements and the historical society, I think we viewed that as a mismatch and what I’d like to suggest for consideration and again this is a later conversation down the road, but I would like to suggest that we think about why we are budgeting this money again and identify what the purpose and the mission is, and think in terms of the arts, which we can all agree enhances people and human services as a second group and as a third component the historical society and anything else like it that comes up over time; and I set that one aside because to me the historical society and anything else like it represents a component of Worthington and there’s an element of our value and that historical appreciation and the preservation of that is actually a part of how we market ourselves; and honestly looking at decisions between historical society and Special Olympics, it’s not a match. It’s difficult to try to draw the line and say here is where we want to place our money. I’m asking as we move forward that we think as a city about those three categories respectively.

Mr. Greeson gave the breakdown of the distribution;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Mentor Foundation</td>
<td>$1,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Worthington</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LifeCare Alliance</td>
<td>$3,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Community Counseling Center, Inc.</td>
<td>$7,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners for Community and Character</td>
<td>$2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntero, Inc.</td>
<td>$8,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Historical Society</td>
<td>$25,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington-Linworth Kiwanis</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Resource Pantry</td>
<td>$2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Special Olympics</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISBURSED</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,888</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Troper thanked the group for their hard work, time, and input to the process.

Mr. Smith asked can we look forward to Mr. Troper and Mr. Foust recommendations for how to proceed with the three (3) buckets. Mr. Foust replied I believe Mr. Troper has some thoughts on it, but I would like to see this be a broader discussion across the entire council. Ms. Michael asked Mr. Greeson can we put this on a future Committee of the Whole agenda. Mr. Greeson replied yes and we would have some thoughts on that as well and would be glad to help facilitate that conversation and resource it any way possible.

Hollie Goldberg, Syntero/Northwest Counseling Services, 1560 Fishinger Road, Columbus, OH 43221. Ms. Goldberg thanked the committee and Council for their approving the funding. We see a great deal of need in the City of Worthington clients, we
try to make them a priority and we do two (2) support groups and other educational presentations at the Griswold Center and your support makes it possible.

Jutta Pegues, Worthington Historical Society, 107 Halligan Avenue, Worthington, OH 43085. Ms. Pegues thanked the committee and Council for the funding we shall receive.

MOTION

Councilmember Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2016. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

(1) Local Government Safety Capital Grant Program Application

Mr. Greeson indicated that we were notified of an opportunity through the State of Ohio to apply for grant funding that is specifically for local government safety program. The legislated appropriated funds is being administered by the Ohio Development Services Agency and we can apply for up to $100,000 in total grant money over the two-year budget cycles, so we have an opportunity to apply this year and if we’re not successful or we only receive partial funding, we also have an opportunity to apply next year up to a total amount over the two year of $100,000.

It is supposed to be used for vehicles, equipment, facilities or systems related to public safety and as we evaluated this in a really short time frame between the announcement and the application deadline which is this week, we identified a couple of areas that we thought we had a need, one where our budgeted dollars were less than the total project costs; you’ll recall a couple of years ago that we did a comprehensive facilities security study looking at all of the city buildings ranging from the Griswold Center to City Hall to Police and Fire station, Service and Community Center in that we have been incrementally budgeting up funds to help implement those facility security recommendations from the Engineering firm that we hired to conduct that study; so really it’s modernization of facilities to include door access controls, cameras, other security enhancements, upgrades where appropriate and consistent with the way Worthington approaches things because we’re not going to become one of these places that is unwelcoming in its approach to security; so we are requesting authorization to apply for $56,541 in costs for enhancing safety and security at City Hall, the Fire Department, and the Griswold Center which are facilities that we have not yet budgeted for facilities enhancements consistent with our evaluation.

We also anticipate that next year we’ll also have applications both in terms of potentially fire department materials and we’re also talking to the other partners in the Central Ohio
Interoperable Radio System (COIRS), there are some improvements to that (our public radio system in particular), the fiber network that supports it and the radio system towers that we think might make a good joint application, but the timeline for this grant application didn’t support us moving forward with this; that would require some engineering work and some more preparation that we’ll do with the City of Dublin, Delaware County and the City of Hilliard who are our partners in that system. So we’ll be at this next year.

Mr. Myers asked this would allow us to enhance security systems that we have not yet budgeted for. Mr. Greeson replied that is correct. Mr. Myers remarked so we actually leverage what we’ve already budgeted. Mr. Greeson replied yes.

MOTION Councilmember Myers made a motion to approve the application for the City to apply for the aforementioned grant funds. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Dorothy.

There being no additional comments, the motion to approve the application for the City to apply for the aforementioned grant funds carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Discussion Item(s)

(1) Wilson Bridge Road Zoning Overlay

Mr. Greeson commented we have been discussing the Wilson Bridge road Zoning Overlay, I think the more appropriate terminology should be the Wilson Bridge Road Zoning Districts rather than overlay. The City Council adopted in 2011 the Wilson Bridge Road Study and that was conducted and adopted with the goal of encouraging over a long period of time the health and vitality of the Wilson Bridge Corridor as one of our really lynch pins in terms of the economic health of this community and this City’s budget. So we evaluated ways in which the vitality of that corridor could be fostered in redevelopment could occur. So there are a number of strategies that were in that study that your staff has been working to implement; one is pursuing things like wayfinding and we did all the wayfinding signage that will be implemented in the coming years. We’ve set aside funds in the Capital Improvement Program to start pursuing esthetics improvements recommended in that plan, on other words streetscaping and things to make the corridor more attractive for those of us who live here as well as businesses that locate here and people who may want to locate here in the future and visit here.

We also have worked on developing code language, some zoning code language that would help encourage the redevelopment over time that is contemplated in the Wilson Bridge Road plan; that was developed in partnership with a steering committee, got some input from Municipal Planning Commission which recommended it to you and it has been in your laps since I believe November when we held the first discussion regarding this; I think this is our fourth workshop on this and I think it’s important to note there’s going to be no action taken this evening, there is no vote to occur, there is no legislation
before the Council to be voted on; any legislation that is going to be voted on would need to be introduced first at a future meeting and scheduled for a formal public hearing. What we’re really seeking tonight is some more dialogue and an opportunity to discuss some of the strategies, some of the changes that we’ve made from the last discuss we had in February where we received public input and I believe you’ll receive some public input this evening. I know that we want to discuss strategies for moving forward. Mr. Brown has a fairly extensive presentation.

Mr. Brown explained what happened back in 2008 – 2011 when the corridor study was under way we really looked at 250 acres from river to rail along the Wilson Bridge Corridor. Kind of looked at existing zoning, existing development patterns and a way to move forward. As Mr. Greeson mentioned there were several objectives that were identified throughout the document, some of them we’ve already been able to check off and accomplish (i.e. the wayfinding, the streetscape improvement plan) a lot of those items to move forward. A lot of the key items in here one talked about our image and our brand, our development standards.

The recommendations in the 2011 plan really focused on a variety of recommendations for the corridor again from river to rail, it also recommended a variety of heights and uses proposed in the district; again it ranged everything from three stories up to six stories throughout the corridor; as you may recall from previous briefings when the steering committee and the working group went through the proposed density and heights. The document was drafted by the planning staff and the city’s law director, it was recommended in the 2011 corridor study that was approved by city council, the steering committee approved it in August 2015 and the ultimately on to Municipal Planning Commission for recommendation in September to go onto you. A little background on the steering committee, who are these people; it was a wide variety of commercial property owners, property managers, business owners in the corridor, residents in and adjacent to the corridor and elsewhere in the community, but also Municipal Planning Commission, Council Members, Bike and Pedestrian Committee. The original committee as I mentioned was created in 2008 and then kind of morphed into the city’s wayfinding project and the Wilson Bridge Corridor Enhancement project and then we held them a little bit hostage to at least have them review the draft zoning in place.

The process to date as Mr. Greeson outlined it, we did bring it to Council for a briefing in November, started outreach, website updates, the notify me on our city’s website for people who wanted to sign up for notifications; the Steering Committee has been updated throughout the process, getting updates to the revisions; met with residents throughout the community; again it did go before City Council on January 11th, February 8th and is here again this evening. I basically want to go through the scenarios as way to move forward tonight. To reiterate, the city is not rezoning the corridor. If property is redeveloped in the future, each individual property owner would still be required to rezone their property to one of the proposed districts as part of any redevelopment project. There is only one area that we have discussed proactively rezoning, that is the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Road. This area is receiving a lot of development pressure
and interest. Again if approved by City Council, the newly created zoning districts would become part of the Planning & Zoning section of the Codified Ordinances for the City of Worthington. Each property owner would be required to follow the rezoning procedures that are currently outlined in the Codified Ordinances. This includes public meetings at many stages in the process, including the Municipal Planning Commission and City Council, to consider any rezoning of land within the City of Worthington.

Creating the zoning districts and standards does not rezone the corridor. Any future rezoning done by individual property owners would be subject to the public process and the 60-day referendum period.

Discussion items for tonight include: Residential uses in the WBC-5 district, building height, setbacks, tract coverage, design and materials, natural features and traffic.

Mr. Brown presented Council with two options:
Approach #1 – Proposed Text – Current Draft and this includes several revisions from MPC, Residents, and City Council to date. Recommended heights for the corridor and considers traffic impacts project by project in a piecemeal approach.

Approach #2 – Revised Approach

- Prioritizes recommendations from the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning:
  - Standards and guidelines
    - South side of E. Wilson Bridge Road – WBC-1 District and WBC-2 District
      - development pressure and interest.
    - Mixed use area
    - Recommends lower heights and densities in the WBC-4 district until additional traffic analysis can inform a greater discussion.
  - Building heights – WBC-4 Office
    - 3 to 4 stories
  - Remove WBC-5 – Office/High Density Residential
    - Add this area to the WBC-4 – Office District
  - No residential

Mr. Greeson explained if discuss and pursue Approach #2 essentially what I think we would be doing is adopting the Wilson Bridge Road Zoning Districts and people could apply to rezone to those and if we chose to proactively rezone the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Road as Mr. Brown suggested to where we’re starting to get some development pressure may not be beneficial to the community; we would have the standards and guidelines in place for that; and so all of the zoning districts would get created, but those in the WBC-4 and WBC-5 I think too would go into place with a height in particular that more reflects what’s there today or what’s allowed under current zoning or close to it as opposed to the six stories so that additional analysis particularly on traffic could be done. One of the points of evaluation was not only what’s happened in terms of development, but what do we see as eminent and particularly important to address. We
particularly think it’s important to address to get standards and guidelines in place for redevelopment for when it’s going to occur in any of these zoning districts. We believe that the character of the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Road is not indicative of the character we want to see in this community and promote in this important corridor for our economy and we’re starting to get some pressures that might erode that character even further, so we think that’s important; and then in the mixed use area which is the area around the intersection of Wilson Bridge Road and High Street, so think the mall, the Holiday Inn site, the BP, where the Starbucks is, Park National around in that area. Some development has already occurred that is consistent with the text like the apartments, The Heights at Worthington Place and we have to acknowledge that the development is being proposed in the case of the Holiday Inn that is more consistent with the proposed zoning.

So while they may come in under the existing zoning it would make sense to adopt language that would recognize development pressure that’s occurring that we may find a desirable. The areas where there is not eminent pressure and where we think if you and the community desire additional analysis particularly around traffic, we don’t see eminent pressure for development around the freeway office we are seeing some redevelopment of existing office, but we have no proposals at this point to go to six stories along the freeway and we have no proposals nor are we pushing to do the high density residential and office which is WBC-5 down by the Olentangy Parklands; so the point is we have more time to evaluate those carefully and ensure that their both compatible with the community additive to our economy and work practically from a traffic standpoint.

Ms. Michael asked Council for their thoughts on going with Approach #1 or Approach #2.

Mr. Myers asked assuming we go ahead and we adopt the zoning map where we go from the current FS/AR classifications to the WBC classifications, what is the effect on us taking that action on the actual zoning of an individual parcel. Let me ask it this way, it’s my understanding that even if we adopt the zoning map as is proposed if we go forward with that, we’re not changing any of the zoning, so we’re not changing building heights, we’re not changing building densities by taking this action. Mr. Brown replied that is correct; the map that’s in your packet is referenced you’re not adopting the map itself, you’re adopting the actual text itself creating the actual districts; the map is just for reference to match up with what was adopted in the 2011 plan with some modifications, but you’re adopting the text that you then once the text would become of record, you could then apply to rezone a property. Mr. Myers asked for a little more clarification. Mr. Brown explained you have to create the district and create the text before you can actually rezone a property. Mr. Myers asked so I would be rezoning to this new....Mr. Brown replied in the future yes you would. Mr. Myers asked but as it currently stands there would be no change to the zoning of that property. Mr. Brown replied correct.

Mr. Myers commented currently in the Wilson Bridge Road corridor that’s covered by what we’re discussing here there are no guidelines whatsoever. Mr. Brown remarked that
Mr. Myers commented no criteria for materials, there are criteria for height and density and setbacks. Mr. Brown remarked correct. Mr. Myers asked but as far as look, feel and materials there is no criteria and no oversight by ARB at this time. Mr. Brown replied that is correct they do not have the ability off the corridor. Mr. Myers commented so one of the things you’re also asking us to adopt would be the actual design guidelines for that corridor. Mr. Brown remarked correct. Mr. Myers said and those design guidelines would be applicable to anyone seeking a rezoning or anyone that was doing anything. Mr. Brown replied anyone that would be seeking a rezoning or if they were redeveloping their property and it fell within that criteria they would have to meet the intent of the guidelines and the standards in place. Mr. Myers asked so if the 350 building were to come before us after we’ve taken this action while they may not need a change to the zoning, they would then have to comply with the design guidelines that we would adopt as part of your proposal. Mr. Brown replied with that one it’s a little bit different, the standards are set up for thresholds I think it’s 25% if you’re doing an expansion of 25% or more. Mr. Myers asked so they fall below that threshold where you would have to seek...Mr. Brown replied for the whole building.

Mr. Smith commented I am leaning towards Approach #2, but here is a for instance real world example, so the Holiday Inn property moving into the process; asked what would the difference be between the process if we approve this and their process if we don’t approve it. Mr. Brown replied the process the Holiday Inn is going through is they are currently a permitted use in the C4 zoning district, so with the Holiday Inn redeveloping, they will not be going through a rezoning process that would ultimately make it before City Council, what they will be doing is having to go before Architectural Review Board for the site design, the look, and the architecture and then before the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance for height from the 3 stories to 4 stories and for setbacks; so the Board of Zoning Appeals would see that part, then Architectural Review Board would see the other components of it.

Mr. Brown explained it would go through the Municipal Planning Public process route (public meeting) and then ultimately on to City Council. Mr. Myers stated let me go back to Mr. Smith’s question regarding the Holiday Inn, if we were to adopt the districts, if Holiday Inn’s sought to develop as is currently proposed, they could seek a change in zoning if we then later adopt the text for that portion which would allow them to rezone to four stories on the front portion of their property as opposed to being granted a variance. Mr. Brown replied I’m going to defer to Mrs. Fox to respond to your question. Mrs. Fox explained if this were adopted and let’s say Holiday Inn has not yet applied and they came in to request development of the site, we would want them to rezone their property consistent with what has been adopted; we could do it, we could apply to rezone the property, but we would encourage them to do it. The rezoning of the property would not require them to submit for variances because in that particular mixed use category, it’s likely that an application for a PUD rezoning would be the way to go.

Mr. Myers asked what’s the benefit of doing it this way (Approach #2). Mr. Brown explained that the ultimate goal was looking at the whole language, looking at what is really important and I think it was those development standards and guidelines for better
quality and development and almost going hand in hand, you don’t want to prioritize a 1 and 2, it’s almost like a 1a and 1b was really that pressure that we’re seeing on that southeast side of Wilson Bridge Road and then the rest of it is very important, but I think it was really trying to prioritize what we’ve heard from the community, what we’ve heard from Boards and Commissions and what we’ve heard from Council as kind of a direction to go. I think the quality and the standards were part of the key thing for us.

Mr. Myers asked outside of the WBC-1 and the Holiday Inn property, there is nothing rumored, nothing in the pipe line in what would be WBC-4 which is the vast majority of the north side of Wilson Bridge Road. Mr. Brown replied the north side of Wilson Bridge Road there are 8 of those buildings are all owned by one property owner; so I think that the likelihood of that occurring in the development pressure for that to happen right now, it gives us time to figure how the 270/23 traffic readjust once it’s all completed. How does the 270/315 traffic adjust once that’s done and look at holistically the whole corridor. Mr. Myers commented and how traffic readjust when we’re finished with the Northeast Gateway.

Mr. Myers commented this would give us time to sit back, take a breath, get a more detailed traffic study in light of the redevelopment and 270/23 and the gateway project and allow us to take another look at it. Mr. Brown replied that is correct.

Council selected to go with Approach #2. Below is Option B that Mr. Brown presented.
Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study

Background:

• The City conducted a strategic study of one of the community’s primary economic centers, the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor.
  – One of the most important corridors, this corridor contains seeds that provide a vital support for the future of the City’s economy and quality of life.
  – The appearance and vacancy rates in the corridor led the City to invest in further planning for the corridor.
  • Streetscape, signage and development standards

Existing Zoning

The existing zoning in the corridor consists of seven different zoning districts. The primary zoning districts in the corridor are commercial and office districts comprising approximately 128 acres, or 52 percent of the total land area in the corridor. The planning area also includes approximately eleven acres of floodplain. This area consists primarily of the Olentangy Parklands and is bisected by the Olentangy Trail. Residential also makes up a significant portion of the corridor; approximately 35 acres, or 14 percent of the total land area in the corridor. It is important to note that residential uses are also permitted as a conditional use in the C-2 zoning district, which would bring the total area available for residential use to approximately 65 acres.
**Promotion**

Objective 1
Exchange the image and brand of Worthington.

Actions
1.6 Develop a new signage and wayfinding package for public signage.

**Design**

Objective 2
Promote new residential development in the corridor that complements existing and planned developments.

Actions
2.1 Create an overlay district for the Corridor that will allow for a variety of housing types including medium to high-density development that matches the intent of the Plan.
3.4 Develop new residential design guidelines for the Corridor that complements the existing residential character, but is also unique and helps define the image of the Corridor.

Objective 3
Guide the redevelopment of underutilized commercial properties.

Actions
3.2 Create new design guidelines and zoning tools to ensure the development concept and intent of the Plan is implemented.

Objective 4
Create a pedestrian-friendly environment.

Actions
4.2 Allow for the redevelopment of buildings along the Corridor to have varied building heights with reduced setbacks to develop a "street wall." 4.4 Develop new standards that encourage and require new development to have pedestrian access from the street and include bicycle parking on site.

Objective 5
Promote the development of civic spaces, buildings, and events in the Corridor.

Actions
5.1 Encourage new development to provide public spaces on site or pay in-lieu fee to be used for other public space improvements in the corridor as identified in the Plan (e.g. outdoor activities and fountains.)
5.3 Enhance the entrance to McCard Park and Olentangy Parklands with new signage and landscaping to improve visibility and access.

Objective 6
Create a concentrated yet diverse commercial core along Wilson Bridge Road.

Actions
6.1 Create an overlay for the Corridor that will expand permitted and conditional uses to include residential, and allow for the vertical integration of uses where appropriate.
6.4 Revise parking requirements in the Corridor to promote new development (e.g. reduced parking requirements, shared parking, include on-street parking.)

---

**Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study Recommendations**

---
### Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Building Blocks</th>
<th>Max Height (Stories)</th>
<th>Multi Family</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Civic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Medium Density)</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>10-14 units/acre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Residential (High Density)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10-20 units/acre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Residential (Medium Density)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.00-15.00 units/acre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>15.00-25.00 units/acre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Office</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.000-25.00 units/acre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>30.000-50.00 units/acre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Office</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.000-10.00 units/acre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Hotel</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Hotel 100-200 rooms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Minimum density residential and professional office on the north side of Wilson Bridge Road between Waverly Drive and McCord Park should be limited to two stories in height.

### Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

**Process:**

- **Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning Draft**
  - Drafted by Planning Staff and the City’s Law Director
    - Recommended in the 2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study
  - Reviewed and approved by the Wilson Bridge Road Steering Committee on August 13, 2015
  - Reviewed and approved by the Municipal Planning Commission on September 24, 2015
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Wilson Bridge Steering Committee:
The committee consists of commercial property owners, property managers and business owners in the corridor; residents in and adjacent to the corridor, and from elsewhere in the City; representatives from the Council, MPC, CRC, Bike and Pedestrian Committee; hired consultants. Additional residents were included due to planning, design and real estate backgrounds.

- Original committee was created in 2008 for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study which was adopted in 2011, then morphed into a committee for the Wilson Bridge Corridor Enhancement & Wayfinding Projects adopted in 2015. This same group reviewed and provided feedback on the proposed Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning.

City Council Process:
- City Council Briefing – November 9, 2015
- Outreach
  - Website updated to include all meeting materials, presentation and meeting dates.
  - Notify Me – Mass email went out on November 19, 2015 to all those signed up on the City’s email.
  - Steering Committee was updated on the status of the proposed regulations
  - Met with residents on Hayhurst and Corren
  - Met with residents on Olenwood and Hinsdale
- City Council Briefing – January 11, 2016
  - Email correspondence and meetings with residents who have questions and concerns.
- City Council Briefing – February 8, 2016
  - Email correspondence and meetings with residents who have questions and concerns.
- City Council Briefing – March 14, 2016
- Introduce Legislation – Future meeting - TBD
- Public Hearing
  - 60-Day Referendum Period for proposed Code Amendment, then rezoning can occur with another 60-day referendum period after each rezoning.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Information:

- The City is NOT rezoning the corridor. If property is redeveloped in the future, each individual property owner would still be required to rezone their property to one of the proposed districts as part of any redevelopment project.
  - There is only one area that we have discussed proactively rezoning, that is the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Road. This area is receiving a lot of development pressure and interest.
- If approved by City Council, the newly created zoning districts would become part of the Planning & Zoning section of the Codified Ordinances for the City of Worthington.
- Each property owner would be required to follow the rezoning procedures that are currently outlined in the Codified Ordinances.
  - This includes public meetings at many stages in the process, including the Municipal Planning Commission and City Council, to consider any rezoning of land within the City of Worthington.
- Creating the zoning districts and standards does not rezone the corridor. Any future rezoning done by individual property owners would be subject to the public process and the 60-day referendum period.

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Discussion Items:

- Residential uses in the WBC-5 District
- Building Height
- Setbacks
- Tract Coverage
- Design & Materials
- Natural Features
- Traffic
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Projects since adoption in 2011:

- I-270 – US-23 Project
- I-270 – SR 315 Project
- Mall Redevelopment – The Shops at Worthington Place
- Apartments – The Heights at Worthington Place
- 350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. – Building Redevelopment
- Lower vacancy rate in the corridor
- Northeast Gateway Redesign
  – Wilson Bridge/Huntley/Worthington-Galena

Strategies to move forward:

- Approach #1 – Proposed Text – Current Draft
  - Includes several revisions from MPC, Residents and City Council to date
    - Recommended heights for the corridor and consider traffic impacts project by project in a piecemeal approach.
- Approach #2 – Revised Approach
  - Prioritizes recommendations from the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning:
    - Standards & Guidelines
    - South side of E. Wilson Bridge Rd. – WBC-1 District & WBC-2 District
      - Development pressure and interest
    - Mixed Use Area
    - Recommends lower heights and densities in the WBC-4 District until additional traffic analysis can inform a greater discussion.
Approach #2:

- Building Heights – WBC-4 – Office
  - 3-4 stories
- Remove WBC-5 – Office/High Density Residential
  - Add this area to the WBC-4 – Office District
    - No residential
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

Approach #2 – Building Heights - Updated: March 14, 2016

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

Approach #1 – Building Heights
Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study Recommendations

### Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Desired Density</th>
<th>Max. Height (Stories)</th>
<th>Parks (P - Preferred / O - Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Medium Density)</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>10-15 acres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-20 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Residential (High Density)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5-10 acres</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-20,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Residential (Medium Density)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-15,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Office</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>10,000-20,000 sf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>30,000-40,000 sf</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Office</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8,000-10,000 sf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Hotel</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10,000-20,000 sf</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Medium density residential and professional office on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to two stories in height.

City of Worthington
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Zoning:

Approach #2 – Zoning: Updated: March 14, 2016

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

Approach #2 – Building Heights - Updated: March 14, 2016
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Zoning Districts:

- WBC – 1 – Medium Density Residential
- WBC – 2 – Professional Office
- WBC – 3 – Mixed Use
- WBC – 4 – Office

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

[Map showing proposed building heights with color-coding for different zoning categories]

Approach #2 – Building Heights - Updated: March 14, 2016
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Description of Zoning Districts:

“WBC-1” Medium Density Residential: An area along the WBC that allows for medium density residential housing, offering a variety of housing styles and pricing options that complement the residential and architectural patterns and styles in the City.

- Permitted Uses: Multi-family dwellings, Home Occupations, Public uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.
  - Multi-Family does not mean just apartments, it includes condos that could be owner occupied. Example: Ville Charmante

- Maximum Building Height: Three stories except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and Mccord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 30’.

- Density: The maximum number of dwelling units allowed per acre for development within the WBD-1 shall be 14, with a desired number between 10 and 14 dwelling units.

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

[Diagram of Wilson Bridge Corridor with proposed building heights and zoning]

Approach #2 – Building Heights - Updated: March 14, 2016
**Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning**

**Description of Zoning Districts:**

"WBC-2" Professional Office: Areas to promote small to medium sized office uses. A variety of office types and styles are encouraged to promote flexibility and adaptability.

- Permitted Uses: Office uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.

- Conditional Use: Public uses and Semi-public uses.

- Maximum Building Height: 3 stories, except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 35’.

---

**Approach #2 – Building Heights - Updated: March 14, 2016**
Description of Zoning Districts:

"WBC-3" Mixed Use: An area along the WBC that allows for a mix of retail and office uses both vertically and horizontally. Retail uses are encouraged for the first floor of multi-floor developments. Pedestrian facilities and public spaces are encouraged. Some residential uses may be incorporated in this area.

- Permitted Uses: Uses listed in Chapter 1147 of the Codified Ordinances as permitted uses in the following districts: "C-1" Neighborhood Commercial, "C-2" Community Shopping Center, and "C-3" Institutions and Offices.

- Conditional Uses: Residential Uses, Hotels, Motels, Drive-in Commercial Uses, and Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries.

- Maximum Building Height: 3 stories for properties south of Wilson Bridge Rd; except for the WBC-3 Mixed-Use location south of Wilson Bridge Road and west of High Street, where the maximum building height shall be 3 stories within the westernmost 180 feet and 4 stories in the remaining area; 4 stories for properties north of Wilson Bridge Rd.
Description of Zoning Districts:

“WBC-4” Office: Areas along the WBC that allows for large-scale office development and redevelopment, with such product offering prominent freeway visibility and serving local, regional and national tenants.

- Permitted Uses: Office uses, Animal Hospitals, Essential services and Accessory uses.

- Conditional Uses: Hotel, Public uses and Semi-public uses.

- Maximum Building Height: 3-4 stories except buildings abutting the Wilson Bridge Rd. right-of-way should be limited to 3 stories.
City Council    Meeting Minutes     March 14, 2016
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Proposed Building Heights:

Approach #2 - Building Heights - Updated: March 14, 2016

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts</th>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBC-1</td>
<td>Multi-Family Dwellings&lt;br&gt;Home Occupations&lt;br&gt;Public Uses&lt;br&gt;Essential Services&lt;br&gt;Accessory Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-2</td>
<td>Office Uses&lt;br&gt;Essential Services&lt;br&gt;Accessory Uses</td>
<td>Public Uses&lt;br&gt;Semi-Public Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-3</td>
<td>Permitted Uses listed in the following districts:&lt;br&gt;C-1 District&lt;br&gt;C-2 District&lt;br&gt;C-3 District</td>
<td>Residential Uses&lt;br&gt;Homes &amp; Mobiles&lt;br&gt;Drive-in Commercial&lt;br&gt;Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-4</td>
<td>Office Uses&lt;br&gt;Animal Hospitals&lt;br&gt;Essential Services&lt;br&gt;Accessory Uses</td>
<td>Note:&lt;br&gt;Public Uses&lt;br&gt;Semi-Public Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

- Site Layout:
  - Setbacks
    - Buildings less than 50,000 sq. ft. in area shall be between 5’ and 20’ from ROW
    - Buildings 50,000 sq. ft. in area shall be located at least 20’ from ROW
    - Buildings abutting “R” districts shall be 50’ to the property line
      - Parking facilities and access drives shall be 25’ to the property line
      - Clarification: A parking deck/garage is considered a building/structure and would be required to meet the proposed 50’ setback
  - Right-of-Way Dedication
    - May be required to accommodate public improvements

- Site Layout — **City Council Comment — Language added**
  - Avoid canyon/tunneling effect along corridor.
    - Use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be required.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Wilson Bridge Road - Varying ROW Widths

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

High Street - Varying ROW Widths – Westside has a greater setback than the eastside
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Wilson Bridge Road - Varying ROW Widths – ROW dedication required for planned projects

Old Wilson Bridge Road - Varying ROW Widths
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Approach #2 - Proposed Zoning Categories:

Example Development Scenario
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Example Development Scenario

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Approach #2 - Proposed Zoning Categories:

Example Development Scenario
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

• Site Layout:
  -- Setbacks – City Council Comment – Language added
    • Avoid canyon/tunneling effect along corridor.
      -- Use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be required.
    • High Street Setback – North of Wilson Bridge Road
      -- 50' setback along High Street

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

• Site Layout:
  -- Screening
    • Development abutting “R” districts shall be permanently screened in the setback area. Solid wall or fence and landscaping of 6’ in height.
  -- Equipment
    • Exterior equipment shall be located to the rear of buildings and screened from view
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

- Site Layout:
  - Tract Coverage – Maximum Impervious Surface
    - 75% - Proposed
      - Other jurisdictions range in the 80%-90% range
  - Pedestrian Access
    - Sidewalks, recreation paths or combination with a minimum width of 5’ for sidewalks
  - Drive-in Commercial Uses
    - Shall be oriented so that the drive through is not between the street frontage and the building

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

- Buildings:
  - Design
    - Building oriented towards Wilson Bridge Road, operational front entry
    - Height of at least 18’ for flat roofs measured at the parapet or 12’ for pitched roofs measured at the eave
    - Roof-mounted equipment screened
    - No extensive blank walls
    - Avoid a canyon/tunneling effect along the corridor, the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be required.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

• Buildings:
  – Design
    • Avoid extensive blank walls
    • Details & materials shall be varied horizontally to provide scale and three-dimensional qualities
    • Entrances shall be well marked
    • Designing for different uses, an identifiable break between buildings ground floors and upper floors shall be provided.
    • Where appropriate, shade and shadow created by reveals, surface changes, overhangs and sunshades to provide sustainable benefits and visual interest.

• Materials – City Council Comment – Updated Language
  • 75% of materials consisting of brick, stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding.
  • No vinyl siding permitted.
  • Color palette shall be designed to reinforce building identity and complement changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.

• Windows & Doors
  • Ground-floor windows and doors
  • Provide an unobstructed view
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

• Buildings:
  – Lighting
    • Illumination shall not exceed 3 foot candles & the light level at the property line shall not exceed 0 foot candles
    • Parking lot lights – max height
    • Pedestrian walkways – decorative low level fixtures – 12” above grade
    • Security lighting – full cut-off type fixtures

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

• Buildings:
  – Signs
    • Exterior lighting fixtures for illumination
    • Freestanding signs
      – No more than 1 per parcel on parcels less than 2-acres in size, no more than 2 per parcel on parcels over 2-acres
      – Monument signs – max height of 10’
      – Sign area – maximum of 50 sq. ft. per side
      – Can include up to 8 tenants
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:

- Buildings:
  - Signs
    - Wall-mounted signs
      - Each business occupying 25% or more of the building may have one wall sign and one projection sign
        » 40 sq. ft. in area max and 12 sq. ft. max for projection signs
      - Businesses occupying 25% or more of the building on a parcel abutting more than one ROW may have a sign facing each ROW
      - Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building abutting I-270 ROW may have a wall sign facing each ROW.
        » Non-illuminated background up to 200 sq. ft.
        » Graphic portion of such signs shall not exceed 100 sq. ft.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:
- Buildings:
  - Landscaping
    - Natural Features
      - 6” caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced
      - $150.00 per caliper inch of tree lost and not replaced
        - Varies by jurisdiction:
          * City of Delaware - $100.00/caliper inch
          * City of Dublin - $150.00/caliper inch
          * City of Westerville - $300.00/caliper inch
          * City of Hilliard - $100.00/caliper inch
    - Drought tolerant and non-invasive
    - Deciduous trees – minimum of 2”
    - Evergreens – minimum of 6’ height
    - Shrubs – minimum of 24” in height
    - Parking lot landscaping
    - Seasonal plantings
  - Landscape plan shall be maintained for the life of the development

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Natural Features:
- The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community.
- In areas located near the Olentangy River, stormwater quality treatment requirements, downstream surface water protection, and stream corridor protection areas shall be designated, protected, and/or mitigated as required by Ohio EPA’s “Construction Site Storm Water in the Olentangy River Watershed” General Permit or the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Rainwater and Land Development Manual, whichever greater.
- Wetland areas shall be delineated and mitigated as required by the Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404. A Flood Hazard Permit is required to be filed with the City for all work within the FEMA designated floodplain.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Traffic, Stormwater and Other Impacts:

- Each project is required to do a Traffic Study and Stormwater Analysis to show impact on the surrounding roadways and the natural environment.
  - This is required when properties rezone or completely redevelop. The Traffic Study and Stormwater Analysis would look at each proposed use and the findings would be included for consideration as the project proceeds through the public rezoning/redevelopment process.
- The City has hired traffic and environmental consultants to help the City review and analyze information and related requirements for development projects.
  - This analysis would be evaluated by the City to ensure compliance by each property owner with requirements outlined in the City’s Codified Ordinances, Stormwater Manual and by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency.
- Other impacts (water and sewer capacities, schools, fire & police)

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Discussion Item:

- Redevelopment and/or change of use proposals in the WBC shall be a minimum 3-acres of land and 200’ of frontage along the Right-of-Way.
  - Possible 2-acres vs. 3-acres with 200’ frontage
Ms. Dorothy asked currently the office buildings along 270 how many stories are they. Mr. Brown replied they are all three stories.

Mr. Foust commented I guess the only place this occurs is maybe on the west side because east is pretty flat; but when we talk about xxx number of stories help me understand if we say it’s limited to four stories, you think about the apartment building,
one of the comments I heard was yes it was four stories with a roll off or whatnot, you stand back on one side it looks more like six and I guess we have the same thing as there is some roll off on the property there with the Holiday Inn; so when we talk about xxx number of stories, asked is that at the low point, is that at the high point, and whatever happens down the hill happens, help me understand that.

Mr. Brown replied I think when we’ve had that discussion internally it’s been at grade. Mr. Foust asked “at grade” meaning…. Mr. Brown replied that if it was sloped off the lowest grade is where the height would start. Your reference to the apartments is an example of that one would be as part of this should be four stories, but I think with the parking structures it went up to six. Mr. Foust commented so that probably wouldn’t happen… Mr. Brown replied under this proposal no unless approved by a variance by this board.

Mr. Myers asked we are still keeping with this proposal the rear setback on East Wilson Bridge Road south side of the street. Mr. Brown replied yes.

Mr. Norstrom asked regarding the illumination, do we want to have like we have in the architectural district some shielding of parking lights and other exterior lights so that you don’t have the bright glow. Mr. Brown replied we can look into that also.

Ms. Michael asked is this only replacement paying for cutting down trees in an approved project or would this have applied to the property on the Tucker Dr. Mr. Brown replied this is just for the commercial portion in the Wilson Bridge Corridor. Ms. Dorothy asked along Huntley Road over the last three years they had some parcel splits, how large were those parcels. Mr. Brown replied about an acre, some of the smaller ones on the east side of Huntley have gone down to about an acre; I know it’s been extremely difficult with that size of property due to the narrowness and depth.

Mr. Brown for direction from council regarding possible 2-acres vs. 3-acres with 200’ frontage; council went with 2-acres.

**Visitor Comments**

**Bill Knapp, 500 Olenwood**, and we represent the Worthington Northern Gateway Residents Group that has been formed; we formed this group to ensure the preservation and enhancement of Worthington’s distinctive character which I think we all have a very strong vested interest in; and the prosperity by working with current residents, property owners, businesses and government in effort to influence the nature and scope of the development of Worthington. I want to say that we are very pro-development, some of the things that are going on in our community are just incredibly wonderful for us. We believe these interest align with other citizens groups within Worthington and include such priorities as traffic, safety, housing density, impact on our schools, protection of the environment, optimization of greenspace and the like and recreational areas as well as design considerations which we’ve been discussing.
We would like for this to be a collaborative effort, and it’s important for us that we residents as well as city government development come together on some of these pieces. We’re not trying to be a voice to all residents, but to be a source of communications at this point. We do this in light of recent events surrounding land use and zoning that are occurring such as Stratford Village, Methodist Children’s Home, the pocket park, and such; and we believe as a result of directions that we need to be proactive where development is concerned as citizens. So our focus tonight is really to raise for your consideration the need for more information before we proceed. Tonight has been excellent, thank you Mr. Brown for your continued efforts on this.

We do understand that what is under consideration is not rezoning, but rather a change in the zoning code to establish categories aligned with these districts that we’ve been discussing, and we have a number of questions and concerns about this; is the categorization driven by interest in making the zone a more desirable area for high density development; to urbanize Worthington, is it to expedite development by reducing steps in a process. Our goal is to gain really clearer understanding of your intent for the northern corridor and to ensure that further studies be done before sweeping changes occur which have a long term impact to all of us.

Valerie Knapp, 500 Olenwood, I’m going to focus on an area that really hasn’t been talked about too much and that’s the park area and the impact this will have on the park area. We are for responsible development and for development, but it has to be thought out. On February 21, 2012, Worthington City Council approved a Resolution (I understand a Resolution is not an Ordinance), but it was in support of the Olentangy Watershed Balanced Growth Plan; the materials I’m passing out to you are the materials that were obtained from the Worthington website; it is also published by MORPC, so these are materials I thought I would bring to you.

On the website it states “the goal of the Olentangy Watershed Balanced Growth Plan is to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance the Olentangy River, its tributary system and areas that serve natural functions by encouraging conservation, development and agriculture in appropriate areas while recognizing the importance of the Watershed as an asset and respecting the uniqueness of our communities.” The next packet I have is the Balanced Growth Plan in the Olentangy Watershed and why I bring this up to you is because I want you to look at it because this is something Worthington City Council said yes they would agree to:

Recommendations:
- To locally adopt a plan
- Develop local comprehensive plan
- Update comprehensive plan every 3 to 5 years
- Incorporate Priority Areas into local community plans and zoning
- Integrate Implementation Tools where applicable and appropriate
- Continue participating in the Olentangy Watershed Planning Partnership
Implementation Toolbox:
- Comprehensive Planning
- Stormwater Management
- Low Impact Development
- Natural Areas Establishment
- Stream & Wetland Setbacks
- Woodland/Tree Canopy Protection
- Conservation Development
- Transfer of Development Rights
- Brownfield Redevelopment
- Exactions and Impact Fees
- Complete Streets
- Economic Development Programs
- Farmland Preservation
- Agricultural Conservation Programs
- 208 Planning

Looking on page 2 you have the overview of the map of the Olentangy Watershed and how Worthington has aligned itself with 26 other communities. Moving on to page 3, I have circled an area and this is the City of Worthington priority area as far as the Olentangy Watershed, so if you look at the priority conservation area is located right beside the development on West Wilson Bridge Road; it’s an area that’s located right next to the priority development area. So right now we have an opportunity to embrace this and to know that we have an obligation to do certain things keeping in align with the priority conservation area; I want you to remember about the low impact area. Now I understand that it’s not an open zoning approach and I know that you’re having a traffic study and a stormwater analysis to show the impact surrounding highways in the natural environment. In the Olentangy Parkland area there is a wetland and we brought it up to Mr. Brown about recognizing that area; in this wetland area we understand that it’s partially owned by Worthington and mostly owned by a private owner, but what we would like to do is to have a combination of coordination between Worthington and this private owner to embrace this wetland. This wetland right now has not been tested, we would like the testing to be done; during the testing you would be able to find out what category the wetland is, whether it’s a 1 2 or 3. One is the lowest category and three is the highest. In corresponding with Mr. Brown, he thought it might be a category 2.

We were talking with Franklin Soil and Water and they were saying that the setbacks are designated around the wetland area. Worthington can also set standard of wider setbacks as required by the state; state guidelines tend not be as great as what you as Worthington can make it. You probably could take and make the area around it a lot larger. In the priority conservation area that we talked about there’s also an area that I would say we need to look into as a community. The wetland area right now nobody knows about it, I bet people here this evening don’t know about it. Right behind the building there is an area and nothing has been done about it, I think this is an opportunity for Worthington to protect the area, to also grow the area, work with this development and saying that it can
be part of the parkland. I think this is a good chance for us to really see what we can do with the wetland. Our parkland where we go now and we travel down and we have people who are jogging and biking and skateboarding, now we need to add the wetlands as part of it so families can go down there, so also that the schools can go down there; I do recognize again that it is privately owned, but we can coordinate efforts to make this a better area. I think we need to use this balance growth planning as a basis since we all agree to it and the council and to ensure the conservation of the area is of utmost importance.

**Judy Anderson, 510 Olenwood**, I was going to have a lot of discussion about the need for traffic assessment and it sounds like you’re putting these things into place and looking at that WC5 park area and the issues around that in terms of traffic, so I’m really stepping back here because my understanding is that you’re not going to put a residential area in that zone which I think is terrific and going along with what Val said to really look at how that impacts the environment we felt was critical. Taking the residential off there really I think makes a difference that’s because you’re not going to have a lot of people trampling in and out of there so that was one of our major concerns and with the traffic it sounds like you’re going to do traffic assessments across the board, across the corridor because one of my issues on the west side is it is a very narrow road, it’s like a two-lane road as you go down towards the park and there’s really not a lot of give-away there, you’ve got the bridge which is a two-lane bridge and as you move on up, it’s two lanes, so that was a big concern the amount of density you’re putting in those different areas and what is the overall impact of traffic; there could possibly be five traffic lights along there and then there’s 12 different in and out areas either to the offices or to the mall or to the condos, to the Holiday Inn, so it’s very congested and people are ending up going into the neighborhood to avoid the congestion; going down Reiber, going up Caren. Reiber is a line where we have two elementary schools. So that was one of my concerns how we were going to handle the traffic, but it sounds like you’re starting to look at a more comprehensive look at traffic and I think that’s extremely important.

Mr. Norstrom commented for the record we haven’t eliminated residences at WC5 at this point and time, we are going to do some traffic analysis to determine what the impact would be on higher level buildings. Mrs. Anderson commented to clarify, I looked up there, it looked like it said no residential area and you were changing the WC5 to WC4. Mr. Norstrom replied we changed from what was originally proposed by staff to take those off for now pending an analysis of traffic. Mrs. Anderson asked I thought you were taking it completely off. Mr. Knapp commented I think we’re clear that there are two options on the table of which you are considering; we are encouraged by what has been brought forth with option #2 and we really are encouraging you to consider traffic studies that look very forward in terms of not just what present volumes are, but the capacity.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Brown did we discuss details on how and when the traffic studies are going to happen. Mr. Brown replied no. Mr. Smith asked do you have any ideas. Mr. Brown replied I would have to coordinate with Mr. Greeson and Mrs. Stewart and figure out timing and budgets; our first phase would be this approach with the idea that once
we’re able to do those detailed overview analysis of the corridor, we would then come back and make the modifications and recommendations which would go through this same type of process and public meetings before anything would be modified. Mr. Smith asked that would also include variations of how in-depth the traffic study goes based on sizes of buildings. Mr. Brown replied correct. Mr. Norstrom commented the traffic study will be done in terms if we have six story buildings in every one of those lots, what’s that going to do in general for the traffic, because we asked every individual developer to bring in an individual traffic study for their work. Mr. Brown replied that is correct.

Mr. Greeson explained Approach 2 we would come back with legislation that would have new zoning districts, those zoning districts would in essence reflect what Mr. Brown has on the screen. Ms. Michael asked so there would not be five and there would not be six stories. Mr. Greeson replied that is correct; however, we would do traffic analysis to inform further conversation about what kind of density might be able to be accommodated in those areas over time and that would inform conversation down the road about each of those areas of which we would notify the public and we would have that information available to talk about it. The benefit of that is that when development does come in, you have a better understanding of your roadway capacity, we would be in a position to better scope the required developer studies; we might be able to be ahead of the game in terms of redirecting them if we’re not comfortable with the impacts they would make or two saying these are the improvements that might be required if you’re going to come in.

Mr. Myers commented what I think I hear Mr. Greeson saying is if we give you direction tonight to proceed with this, you will come back with legislation that removes the six story residential from the zoning category. Mr. Greeson replied right and I think we need some direction about where we want to put that; in other words what are we going to lower that to. Mr. Myers said for the time being that takes it off the table. Mr. Greeson replied yes, in fact they all have an existing underline zoning, so none of those properties existing rights change a bit; we can’t change what’s there. Mr. Myers asked if we engage in the traffic study, if we engage in the stormwater study, down the road in the future it would not bar us from going back and reinserting that after public hearing and appropriate legislation. Mr. Greeson replied you might find in the future that some of these areas particularly on the interstate are desirable for greater height in order to accommodate office/residential development, but you would have more information to make that decision.

Rebecca Herman, 7035 Rieber Street, I actually don’t live on a cul-de-sac like they live on, I live on Rieber Street which is one of the main streets, I live five houses in; I am well aware of traffic, the busses go up and down on our street and I’m a half mile from an elementary school where my daughter and I walk, she is 7 and I guess what I want to also say is although I’m a stay at home mom now, I have a background in Economic Development and I appreciate everything that you guys are doing up here, we are a landlocked community, and one of the things that has always concerned us is not only our school systems and how good our school systems are, but how our taxes work. One of the things that we’re all concerned about in the MOMs group that we talk about is our small
businesses that we have in the community; a concern that we have is we want to keep our small businesses, but our income tax is 2.5% which means that we are the highest in the state of Ohio which is the same as Columbus, our outer regions are out 2.0% which means that we are lagging behind in some of the competition, so one of the things that in all the conversations that I’ve had with several people about the UMCH site is we don’t want and I understand that, but here we have the opportunity to create an overlay, to create a situation where our neighbors realize that we are willing to negotiate, we are willing and able to receive conversation of Economic Development because without any economic development our taxes are not going to help us and we’re going to fall behind on our budgets and if we fall behind on our budgets our school systems are going to fail and if our school systems fail, our property values are going to go down, we’re a landlocked community and there’s a lot to consider and I just wanted to get that at least out there as part of a conversation. I’m a mom with two small kids and I plan on living here for the rest of my life; one of our concerns again is our schools. I appreciate the changes that you’re making.

John Warton, 490 Olenwood, I look at a slide up there and it says Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Zoning doesn’t say anything about Wilson Bridge Rod Corridor Districts. Two things I learned in the Army, (1) if it walks like a duck, looks like a duck, and it quacks like a duck, it’s a duck; (2) the KISS formula, Keep it Simple Stupid. We’re not just rezoning, what’s all this stuff about we’re going to have map overlays and this and that and the other, why not simply rezone it. The permitted uses that are already there are not going to be affected by a rezoning, but what you’re asking right now for is a situation where somewhere down the road somebody is going to look at this; if you have to rezone it to one of the districts how is the district not a zone.

Mr. Brown commented we started this conversation last Thursday and I’m still not understanding the direction of Mr. Warton’s questioning. Mr. Warton replied it’s either a zone or it’s not a zone. If it’s not a zone then you can’t require me to rezone to it. Mr. Brown replied you have your current zoning rights and your current zoning stays into place. Mr. Warton commented but if you can require me to rezone to a district that’s not a zone then you can’t require me to rezone. Mr. Brown remarked we’re creating the districts, we have to create the districts before you can rezone to a district. Mr. Warton asked so there’s going to be a rezoning of all of this area to the proposed district. Mr. Brown replied no. Ms. Dorothy commented you have to meet a minimum development threshold; if you’re just going to repair an existing structure, you don’t have to rezone your property, but if you meet a minimum redevelopment threshold then the zoning districts would go into effect. Mr. Warton asked why can’t I just request a variance of the existing zoning. Mr. Brown replied because once we’ve created this language and you want to come in and deviate from what is recommended in the 2011 comprehensive plan and the prosed zoning for the corridor that would be the rationale for the boards and commissions not approve it. Mr. Warton said so based strictly upon some abstract language that says this is a conceptual district, they can deny the variance. Mrs. Fox replied we are creating the districts and as they’re created, it will be considered to be development overlay districts; we’re not rezoning the individual parcels of property, we could do that, but we’re not doing that at this point and time. Mr. Warton asked why not.
Mrs. Fox explained because it’s a very large area and to rezone property has an extensive amount of procedures and notification requirements and we just believe that for us to take on that entire corridor and rezone all of those parcels would be too much for us to be able to handle; so we were trying to prioritize those districts where it was important to us to be able to apply the change in use. The City could in the future decide to take a chunk of those properties and rezone them on their own; we’re just not proposing to do that right now. Mr. Warton commented and yet if anybody comes in with a proposal to redevelop one of those parcels, their failure to do it in accordance with this proposed district would be grounds to deny any request for a variance. Mrs. Fox replied we could just rezone it on our own at that point if we wanted to, but we would rather that they do it and we work out a collaboratively rather the city just doing it on our own, but we could do that at that point and time.

Ms. Michael commented we don’t know what some individuals coming in might want to do with the property. Somebody might want to keep their property pretty much as what it is and stay within their current zoning or there might be someone who purchases a piece of property or are thinking of purchasing a piece of property and usually when they do something like that, they’ll purchase contingent upon being able to get the approvals and so we don’t know what somebody would want to do. Mr. Warton asked are these districts subject to a vote of the city. Mrs. Fox replied the creation of the district, the legislation that the City votes on to create these districts is subject to referendum.

Mr. Norstrom explained the basic reason we’re doing this is that it’s the most cost effective way to proceed along the corridor; as Mrs. Fox just said if we were going to try and rezone all the properties it would take a lot of staff time and it’s not worth it. So this is the most cost effective way for the city to manage this process that’s why we’re doing it this way.

Mr. Warton commented traffic studies, you’re proposing these overlays, asked don’t you have an obligation rather than some snapshot overview to do an in-depth analysis based upon maximum possible occupation under the thing that you are proposing; because if you look at Wilson Bridge Road west of Kroger if you do a lot of that development that you’re talking about and people come in and actually build their six story building and if you add back in the high capacity housing, you’re going to find real quickly that you’re going to have to expand Wilson Bridge, not only are you going to have to expand Wilson Bridge, but then you’re going to have to talk to Columbus about expanding either Linworth Avenue or whichever it is that runs out to 161 immediately after the bridge. If you’re looking at long range planning, that’s the kind of long range planning you should be looking at because that is going to be an incredible cost and you’re going to have to take property in order to be able to widen that road at that point. How many of you routinely make a left hand turn from Reiber onto Wilson Bridge; okay and when the buses are running, can the buses make a turn onto Reiber, yes. Okay what do they have to do in order to make a left hand turn onto Reiber off Wilson Bridge, generally they have to wait for the traffic signal light to turn red. However if there is traffic sitting waiting to turn left from Reiber onto Wilson Bridge, that traffic would have to back up in order for that bus to be able to make that turn at all. So when you start talking about adding more
Mr. Warton commented I apologize to Mr. Brown, the amount of work you given to this project is incredible and the kinds of things that you put into Option #2 match very well with what the citizens brought to you the other night. However, you said all of that stuff and we got right back to we can add that high density family housing and we can still go back to plan one and make it six stories. Mr. Brown commented the way I took Mr. Norstrom’s comment was that in the future if we did the studies and looked at the impact in the corridor, but it could be revisited; not that it would, but there’s that possibility could the corridor handle certain types of growth. I don’t think he said Carte Blanche that in 6 months, or 6 years we’ll just do it; I think it was to look at how the corridor could handle the traffic and then follow the similar type of process we’re going through now.

Emily Lloyd, 457 Greenglade Ave., I’m more interested seeing two stories condos rather than three and four stories; don’t want to see any high density residential. I am very concerned about these six story buildings; asked is it possible to go from 3 – 4 stories down to two for new construction buildings

Steven Rosandritch, 140 Caren Ave., Just want to make sure that we’re all on the same page; with all the talk that you’ve had tonight, asked are you going to vote on the proposed plan that’s up there, action #1 or action #2 or are basically putting information out so that people can..... Ms. Michael explained what we’re looking at if Council decides tonight, we’ll be asking staff to put together an Ordinance for us to vote on; at best it would have to be introduced at the first meeting in April which would be April 3rd, it would be scheduled for hearing two weeks later and at that point and time there could be a vote.

Mr. Rosandritch commented you’re talking about 14 major parcels up there can handle a property that would handle six stories where they’re located in Worthington, it’s the one place in Worthington where they can handle that kind of building and vision wise and everything else will have least effect, but the tax base would be substantially increased; and what you’re saying about the six stories doesn’t mean it has to be on every single parcel. You do have a major problem at the corner of Wilson Bridge and High Street and it’s because of the entrances on and off the property on both sides of the street; you’ve got traffic that’s coming down where the speed limit is 45 dropping down to 35 coming through an intersection and you’ve got 10 feet through the intersection where a person is
trying to make a right hand turn to get into that BP gas station; I can guarantee you that you’ll have more than one accident there. You’re going to have to do something about that traffic there because right now it’s already bad enough, but it can only get worse with any kind of proposal that’s going up here.

Mr. Brown reiterated with this again creating the districts still any development process would follow what is outlined in our Codified Ordinances; if a traffic study is needed, if stormwater development were needed, if we have to look at utilities, police, fire, all of that we review when we have a major redevelopment and or rezoning; that would be required, whether it’s one story, two stories, three stories, etc.

Ms. Michael asked Council did they want to move forward based on what was presented this evening.

Council said let’s move forward with the Ordinance based on proposal #2.

(2) Monthly Financial Reports

Mr. Greeson asked Mrs. Roberts to provide an overview of the report and indicated that staff is requesting a motion from the City Council acknowledging the report.

Mrs. Roberts presented the following:

Fund balances for all accounts increased from $20,696,914 to $20,899,925 for the month of February with revenues exceeding expenditures by $203,011.

Year to date fund balances for all accounts decreased from $21,263,095 on January 1, 2016 to $20,899,925 as of February 29, 2016 with expenditures exceeding revenue by $363,170.

Expenditures for all funds tracked at 89.7% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Year to date revenues for all funds are below 2015 revenues by $119,528 and above year to date estimates by $24,282.

The General Fund balance decreased from $10,775,815 to $10,632,523 for the month of February with expenditures exceeding revenues by $143,292.

The year to date General Fund Balance decreased from $11,250,077 on January 1, 2016 to $10,632,523 with expenditures exceeding revenues by $617,555.

General Fund expenditures tracked at 86.6% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Total General Fund revenues area above estimates by $121,558 or 3.45%.

February 2016 income tax collections are above year to date 2015 collections by $120,166 or 3.38% and above estimates by $69,688 or 1.93%. 
Mr. Norstrom commented as always it’s a little early to tell, but these numbers appear to say that the economy in Worthington is healthy. Mrs. Roberts replied I believe so.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Troper made a motion to accept the February 2016 Monthly Financial Report as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

Dan Whited, City Engineer had one note on sidewalks at Councilmember Troper’s request. Mr. Whited indicated that if there is an issue with damage, cracks or settling that results in a trip hazard which would be an inch or so in differential of the sidewalk concrete, the responsibility for that is owner/resident responsibility; we do track those, we’ll get calls about them, we also evaluate those as we go through our paving program and we’ll make notice to residents of those issues and ask them to repair the damage within a timeframe of 30 days at their responsibility; if it’s not fixed within the timeframe, the City will fix them and offer to bill them for the service(s) for payback. We do roll some of those into our paving program, we have several now that were recently identified where the owner has asked that we make those repairs for them as part of our resurfacing program for 2016 and bill them back.

**REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION**

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

_______________________________
Temporary Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 4th day of April, 2016.

_______________________________
Council President
ORDINANCE NO. 10-2016

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 the Heischman Park Playground Replacement Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 627-16)

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 Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.4010.533356 the sum of Ninety-Five Thousand Dollars ($95,000.00) to pay the cost of the Heischman Park Playground Replacement Project and all related expenses (Project 627-16).

SECTION 2. For the purposes of Section 2.21 of the Charter of the City, this ordinance shall be considered an “Ordinance Determining to Proceed” with the Project, notwithstanding future actions of this Council, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to comply with other requirements of law.

SECTION 3. 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:

Claro of Council
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

FROM: Darren Hurley, Parks & Recreation Director

DATE: March 31, 2016

SUBJECT: Heischman Park Playground CIP Funds

The 2016 CIP Program included $300,000 dedicated to Heischman & McCord Park Playground Replacements. These funds were to cover the cost of both playgrounds. We are ready to begin the process for the Heischman Park playground and I am requesting the appropriation of $95,000 to fund that part of the project. The Parks and Recreation Commission, along with staff, are working through some ideas and recommendations for McCord Park as a part of their park planning process so I would like to hold off on the replacement of the McCord Park playground until that process is complete.

Our process for replacing the playground at Heischman Park will involve community feedback. Here are the steps we have planned:

1. Develop some design renderings with vendors to provide different options.
2. Hold a public meeting to present the ideas and gather input from residents living in the area around the park.
3. Work with the vendor to integrate the public feedback into a final design.
4. Present the final design to the Parks and Recreation Commission and City Council for approval.
5. Schedule replacement and remove the existing playground.
6. Install the new playground.

Our goal is to have the playground installed this summer. If I can provide further information, please let me know.
ORDINANCE NO. 11-2016

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the Worthington Station TIF Fund and Worthington Place TIF Fund Unappropriated Balances.

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 Worthington Station TIF Fund unappropriated balance to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>910.9020.540528</td>
<td>County Auditor Fees – Worth. Sta. TIF</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Worthington Place TIF Fund unappropriated balance to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>920.9020.540528</td>
<td>County Auditor Fees – Worth. Place TIF</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920.9020.540590</td>
<td>Fr.Co. TIF Dist/Rev Sharing Fees – Worth. Place TIF</td>
<td>28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920.9020.540910</td>
<td>TIF Fund Reimbursement – Worth. Place TIF</td>
<td>224,100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** $263,100.00

SECTION 3. 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
MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Greeson, City Manager
From: Molly Roberts, Finance Director
Date: March 25, 2016
Subject: Supplemental Appropriation Ordinance

In March, the first half property tax distribution was received from the Franklin County Auditor. This payment included the first distribution of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) property tax revenue related to The Heights at Worthington Place (Worthington Place TIF), 160 West Wilson Bridge Road, as established with the passage of City of Worthington Ordinance 45-2012.

The Worthington Place TIF was approved by Worthington City Council as a “non-school” TIF, which means that property tax payments derived from the improvements made would be paid directly to the Worthington City School District by Franklin County in the same manner as they would have received the property tax revenue without the TIF. However, when the Worthington Place TIF was initiated in the Franklin County Auditor’s system this section was overlooked. Consequently, all of the first half property tax revenue related to this TIF was paid to the City of Worthington instead of the applicable apportionment of property tax revenue. It is my understanding that the correction has been made in the Franklin County system and going forward the TIF payments will be allocated to both the Worthington City School District and the City accordingly. However, the overpayment from the first half distribution needs to be reconciled and redistributed appropriately. The Worthington Place TIF revenues received by the City in March totaled $308,073, of this amount $224,100 is due to the Worthington City School District.

The Worthington Place Municipal Public Improvement Tax Increment Equivalent Fund (Worthington Place TIF Fund – Fund #912) was established to account for the revenues and expenses associated with this defined area, as specified in Ordinance 45-2012. Council action is required to allow for the appropriation of expenses within this fund. The attached appropriation ordinance is requested for Council’s consideration in order to make the necessary expenditures related to the overpayment of TIF funds and the associated direct costs assessed by Franklin County for the collection and distribution of the funds. Please include the following legislation on the council agenda of April 4, 2016 for introduction and set the public hearing for April 18, 2016 for this purpose.
ORDINANCE NO. 12-2016

Amending Section 1107.01, Section 1141.01 and Section 1141.06 and Enacting Chapter 1181 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Facilitate Redevelopment and Reinvestment of the Wilson Bridge Corridor.

WHEREAS, it is the wish of City Council to monitor and revise the Planning and Zoning Code of the City to ensure economic viability and preserve the character of the City; and,

WHEREAS, the 2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study recommends the creation of design guidelines and standards for the corridor and promotes the reinvestment & redevelopment of properties in the corridor; and,

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan for Worthington recommends supporting the redevelopment and reinvestment in the Freeway Commercial Area (Wilson Bridge Corridor); and,

WHEREAS, the Municipal Planning Commission, on recommendation of City staff passed a motion on September 24, 2015 to recommend approval to amend Section 1107.01, Section 1141.01, Section 1141.06 and Enact Section 1181 Wilson Bridge Corridor; and,

WHEREAS, it is the desire of City Council to permit the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; encourage a mix of uses; enhance the livability of the area; encourage pedestrian and bicycle connections; promote high-quality buildings and public spaces that create and sustain long-term economic vitality of the City of Worthington.

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

SECTION 1. That Section 1107.01, Section 1141.01 and Section 1141.06 of the Codified Ordinances is hereby amended, and Chapter 1181 of the Codified Ordinances is hereby enacted, to read as set forth in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and incorporated herein.
ORDINANCE NO. 12-2016

SECTION 2. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and 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
1107.01 VARIATIONS BY COUNCIL ACTION.
On recommendation of the Municipal Planning Commission, or on its own initiative, Council may, by Ordinance, permit variations from the standards established in the Planning and Zoning Code with regard to the approval of a Subdivision, Development Plan, Planned Use District or Wilson Bridge Corridor plan in order to afford justice and address practical difficulties to interested persons. Council may by Resolution permit variations from the standards established in the Planning and Zoning Code with regard to the approval of an amendment to a Development or Wilson Bridge Corridor plan. Once Council grants a variation or exception, the approval of the same by the Board of Zoning appeals is not required.

1141.01 DIVISION INTO DISTRICTS
The City is hereby divided into districts under five general categories which shall be known as: Open Area Districts, Residential Districts, Commercial Districts, Industrial Districts and Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts.

1141.06 WILSON BRIDGE CORRIDOR DISTRICTS
Refer to Section 1181.06 of the Codified Ordinances for the Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts.

1181.01 PURPOSE
The purpose of this Chapter is to facilitate implementation of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study (Res. 18-2011), which promotes the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into a mixed use area that will generate new economic growth within the City. These requirements are intended to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; to encourage a mix of uses; to enhance the livability of the area; to augment pedestrian and bicycle connections; and to promote construction of high-quality buildings and public spaces that help create and sustain long-term economic vitality.

1181.02 DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
There is hereby created the Wilson Bridge Corridor (WBC) which shall include all parcels with access from Wilson Bridge Road and Old Wilson Bridge Road, between the Olentangy River to the west, and the railroad to the east. The WBC shall also include properties adjacent to N. High St., from I-270 to Caren and Highland Avenues, but shall exclude any parcels owned by the City that are used for parkland purposes. Properties currently in the Architectural Review District shall also be subject to the provisions in Chapter 1177. In the event of conflict between the standards of the Architectural Review District and the standards of the WBC, the more restrictive standards shall apply.

1181.03 DEFINITIONS.
The definitions in Section 1101.01 and Chapter 1123 of the Planning and Zoning Code shall apply to those terms used in this chapter, with the addition of the following terms. All defined terms are capitalized.

(a) “Building Frontage” means the line of that face of the building nearest the front line of the lot.
(b) “Impervious Surface” means a hard surface area that prevents or substantially impedes the natural infiltration of water into the underlying soil, resulting in an increased volume or velocity of surface water runoff.

(c) “Parapet” means a low wall barrier at the edge of a roof or structure which may serve to prevent falls over the edge or serve as a stylistic feature.

(d) “Setback” means the minimum distance from a property line to where a Building may be built.

(e) “Setback Area” means the area between the property line and required Setback.

1181.04 GENERAL PROVISIONS
(a) Ordinary repair or maintenance and interior alterations not in conflict with the provisions herein are exempt.

(b) The following improvements shall subject property to the provisions herein:
(1) Construction of a new building;
(2) Expansion of a building's gross floor area based on the following:
   A. If the expansion area is less than 25% of the existing building’s area at the date of adoption of this Chapter, only the expansion area shall comply with this Chapter;
   B. If the expansion area is 25% or more of the existing building’s area, the entire building shall comply with this Chapter;
(3) Construction or expansion of parking facilities;
(4) Addition of landscaping, exterior lighting, fencing, or other accessory structures; and
(5) Construction and installation of signage.

(c) Proposals that address changes to existing conditions shall be subject to the provisions herein to the extent they can reasonably be applied.

(d) Redevelopment and/or change of use proposals in the WBC shall be a minimum of 3 acres of land and 200’ of frontage along the Right-of-Way.

(e) The owner of a tract of land proposing improvements that are subject to the provisions in Subsection (b) shall submit an application for review to the Director of Planning and Building in accordance with Section 1181.07.

1181.05 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
(a) Site Layout.
(1) **Setbacks.** Buildings and parking should be set back to provide a buffer between the sidewalk and building, with some variations in the Building Setback Line encouraged throughout the WBC.

A. Buildings 50,000 square feet in area or less shall be located between 5’ and 20’ from adjacent Right-of-Way Lines. Buildings greater than 50,000 square feet in area shall be located at least 20’ from adjacent Right-of-Way lines.

B. Buildings located along High Street north of Wilson Bridge Road shall be located at least 50’ from the adjacent Right-of-Way lines.

C. Buildings on properties abutting properties in “R” districts shall not be located closer than 50’ to the property line. Parking facilities and access drives on properties abutting properties in “R” districts shall not be located closer than 25’ to the property line.

D. Setback areas in front of retail uses shall be primarily hardscaped, and may be used for outdoor dining and other commercial activities. Residential units with individual entries may include landscaping, walkways, porches, raised planters, walls and fences.

E. As building height increases, the buildings should consider the relationship between the setback, the street corridor, and the building height. A variety of techniques will be implemented to mitigate any potential “canyon/tunneling” effect along the corridor, such as the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping.

(2) **Right-of-Way Dedication.** Dedication of Right-of-Way may be required to accommodate public improvements.

(3) **Screening.** All development on parcels abutting properties in “R” districts shall be permanently screened in the setback area with the combination of a solid screen and landscape screening. The solid screen shall consist of a wall or fence at least 6’ in height and maintained in good condition without any advertising thereon. Supporting members for walls or fences shall be installed so as not to be visible from any other property which adjoins or faces the fences or walls. This shall not apply to walls or fences with vertical supporting members designed to be identical in appearance on both sides.

Landscape screening shall consist of one of the following options at a minimum:

A. One large evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 40’ or greater for every 20 linear feet, plus one medium evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 20’ to 40’ for every 10 linear feet. Evergreen trees shall be at least 6’ in height at the time of planting. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24” in height, shall be provided for every 5 linear
feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.

B. One large deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 50’ or greater for every 25 linear feet, plus one medium deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 20’ to 40’ for every 15 linear feet. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24” in height, shall be provided for every 5 linear feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.

(4) Equipment. Exterior service, utility, trash, and mechanical equipment shall be located to the rear of buildings if possible and screened from view with a wall, fence or landscaping. Such equipment shall be completely screened from view. Materials shall be consistent with those used in the building and/or site. Equipment located on buildings shall match the color of the building.

(5) Tract Coverage. A maximum of 75% of the property shall be covered with impervious surfaces.

(6) Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks with a minimum width of 5’, Recreation Paths with a minimum width of 10’, or a combination of both shall be provided along all Rights-of-Way. Pedestrian connections from Sidewalks, Recreation Paths and parking lots to building entrances shall be provided.

(7) Drive-in Commercial Uses. Drive-in Commercial Uses shall be oriented so that the drive through is not between the primary street frontage and the building.

(b) Buildings. Building design should enhance the character of the WBC. A diversity of architectural styles is encouraged to provide visual interest and add to the overall appeal of the corridor.

(1) Design.

A. A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road, or as parallel as the site permits, and should have an operational entry facing the street.

B. The height of a building shall be a minimum of 18’ for flat roof buildings measured to the top of the parapet, or 12’ for pitched roof buildings measured to the eave. Maximum building height shall be per Section 1181.06 of the Code. Building Frontage that exceeds a width of 50’ shall incorporate articulation and offset of the wall plane to prevent a large span of blank wall and add interest to the facade. To avoid a potential “canyon/tunneling” effect along the corridor, the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be required.
C. Extensive blank walls that detract from the experience and appearance of an active streetscape should be avoided.

D. Details and materials shall be varied horizontally to provide scale and three-dimensional qualities to the building.

E. Entrances shall be well-marked to cue access and use, with public entrances to a building enhanced through compatible architectural or graphic treatment.

F. When designing for different uses, an identifiable break between the building’s ground floors and upper floors shall be provided. This break may include a change in material, change in fenestration pattern or similar means.

G. Where appropriate, shade and shadow created by reveals, surface changes, overhangs and sunshades to provide sustainable benefits and visual interest should be used.

H. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from view on all four sides to the height of the equipment. The materials used in screening must be architecturally compatible with the rooftop and the aesthetic character of the building.

(2) Materials.
A. Any new building or redevelopment of a building façade should include, at a minimum, 75% of materials consisting of full set clay bricks, stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding. Samples must be provided.

B. Vinyl siding and other less durable materials should not be used.

C. Long-lived and sustainable materials should be used.

D. The material palette should provide variety and reinforce massing and changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.

E. Especially durable materials on ground floor façades should be used.

F. Generally, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), are not preferred material types.

G. A variety of textures that bear a direct relationship to the building’s massing and structural elements to provide visual variety and depth should be provided.

H. The color palette shall be designed to reinforce building identity and complement changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.
(3) Windows and Doors.
A. Ground-floor window and door glazing shall be transparent and non-reflective. Above the ground floor, both curtain wall and window/door glazing shall have the minimum reflectivity needed to achieve energy efficiency standards. Non-reflective coating or tints are preferred.

B. Walls adjacent to the primary building frontage, shall have the pattern of window glass continued from the primary building frontage a minimum distance of 10’.

C. Windows and doors shall be recessed from the exterior building wall, except where inappropriate to the building’s architectural style.

D. For a primary building frontage of a commercial use, a minimum of 30% of the area between the height of 2’ and 10’ above grade shall be in clear window glass that permits a full, unobstructed view of the interior to a depth of at least 4’.

(c) Landscaping. There shall be landscaping that complements other site features and creates relief from buildings, parking areas and other man-made elements.

1. Natural Features: Natural Features shall not be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed without approval per the procedures in Section 1181.07. All healthy trees 6” caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of $150.00 per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.

2. Drought tolerant, salt tolerant, non-invasive, low maintenance trees and shrubs should be utilized.

3. Deciduous trees shall be a minimum of 2” caliper at the time of installation; evergreen trees shall be a minimum of 6’ in height at the time of installation; and shrubs shall be a minimum of 24” in height at the time of installation.

4. Street trees shall be provided.

5. Parking lot landscaping shall be required per the provisions in Chapter 1171.

6. Seasonal plantings should be incorporated into the landscape plan.
(7) The approved landscape plan must be maintained across the life of the development.

(d) Lighting. All exterior lighting shall be integrated with the building design and site and shall contribute to the night-time experience, including façade lighting, sign and display window illumination, landscape, parking lot, and streetscape lighting.

(1) The average illumination level shall not exceed 3 footcandles. The light level along a property line shall not exceed 0 footcandles.

(2) The height of parking lot lighting shall not exceed 15’ above grade and shall direct light downward. Parking lot lighting shall be accomplished from poles within the lot, and not building-mounted lights.

(3) For pedestrian walkways, decorative low light level fixtures shall be used and the height of the fixture shall not exceed 12’ above grade.

(4) Security lighting shall be full cut-off type fixtures, shielded and aimed so that illumination is directed to the designated areas with the lowest possible illumination level to effectively allow surveillance.

(e) Signs.

(1) General
   A. All new signs, including sign face replacement, shall be subject to the provisions herein.

   B. The provisions in Chapter 1170 shall apply to all signs in the WBC unless otherwise stated in this section.

   C. Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

(2) Freestanding Signs
   A. There shall be no more than one freestanding sign on parcels less than 2 acres in size, and no more than two freestanding signs on parcels 2 acres in size or greater.

   B. 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.

   C. Freestanding signs may include the names of up to eight tenants of that parcel.

   D. Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.

(3) Wall-mounted Signs
A. Each business occupying 25% or more of a building may have one wall sign and one projection sign. Wall-mounted signs shall not exceed 40 square feet in area, and projection signs shall not exceed 12 square feet in area per side.

B. Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building on a parcel abutting more than one Right-of-Way may have a wall sign facing each Right-of-Way.

C. Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building abutting the I-270 Right-of-Way may have a wall 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.

D. Wall-mounted and projection signs shall be designed appropriately for the building, and shall not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

(f) **Parking.**
   1. **Design.** Surface parking shall be located to the rear or side of the buildings on the site. If parking is located on the side of the building, parking shall not exceed 2 rows of parking with a drive aisle between, shall not exceed 60’ of street frontage, shall be located no closer to the Right-of-Way than the building, and shall be screened from view from the Right-of-Way.

   2. **Non-residential Uses.** Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed 125% of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.

   3. **Residential Uses.** There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.

   4. **Bicycle Parking.** Bicycle parking should be provided and adequate to serve the proposed uses.

   5. **Structured Parking.** Structured parking shall be permitted and encouraged within the WBC, and shall meet all other standards as outlined in this chapter.

(g) **Public Spaces.** A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every 5,000 square feet of gross floor area of multi-family dwellings, commercial or industrial space that is new in the WBC. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:

   1. An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of 250 square feet;

   2. Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of 16 inches in height and 48 inches in width;

   3. Public art;

   4. Decorative planters;
(5) Bicycle racks;
(6) Permanent fountains or other Water Features;
(7) Decorative waste receptacles;
(8) Decorative pedestrian lighting; and
(9) Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.

1181.06 ESTABLISHMENT OF WILSON BRIDGE CORRIDOR ZONING DISTRICTS
The following zoning districts are established for use in the WBC:

(a) “WBC-1” Medium Density Residential: An area along the WBC that allows for medium density residential housing, offering a variety of housing styles and pricing options that complement the residential and architectural patterns and styles in the City.
   (1) Permitted Uses: Multi-family dwellings, Home Occupations, Public uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.
   (2) Maximum Building Height: Three stories except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 30’.
   (3) Density: The maximum number of dwelling units allowed per acre for development within the WBD-1 shall be 14, with a desired number between 10 and 14 dwelling units.

(b) “WBC-2” Professional Office: Areas to promote small to medium sized office uses. A variety of office types and styles are encouraged to promote flexibility and adaptability.
   (1) Permitted Uses: Office uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.
   (2) Conditional Use: Public uses and Semi-public uses.
   (3) Maximum Building Height: 3 stories, except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 35’.

(c) “WBC-3” Mixed Use: An area along the WBC that allows for a mix of retail and office uses both vertically and horizontally. Retail uses are encouraged for the first floor of multi-floor developments. Pedestrian facilities and public spaces are encouraged. Some residential uses may be incorporated in this area.
   (1) Permitted Uses: Uses listed in Chapter 1147 of the Codified Ordinances as permitted uses in the following districts: “C-1” Neighborhood Commercial, “C-2” Community Shopping Center, and “C-3” Institutions and Offices.
   (2) Conditional Uses: Residential Uses, Hotels, Motels, Drive-in Commercial Uses, and Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries.
(3) Maximum Building Height: 3 stories for properties south of Wilson Bridge Rd; except for the WBC-3 Mixed-Use location south of Wilson Bridge Road and west of High Street, where the maximum building height shall be 3 stories within the westernmost 180 feet and 4 stories in the remaining area; 4 stories for properties north of Wilson Bridge Rd.

(d) “WBC-4” Office: Areas along the WBC that allows for large-scale office development and redevelopment, with such product offering prominent freeway visibility and serving local, regional and national tenants.

1. Permitted Uses: Office uses, Animal Hospitals, Essential services and Accessory uses.


3. Maximum Building Height: 4 stories except buildings abutting the Wilson Bridge Rd. right-of-way should be limited to 3 stories.

1181.07 PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW

(a) Existing Development Modifications. The City staff may approve site and building changes that conform to the Design Standards for the WBC. Such modifications shall be limited to the minor modification of existing buildings, the addition or modification of lighting, fencing, landscaping, accessory structures and wall-mounted signs; and the modification of freestanding signs. Staff approval under this subsection may be used for all properties in the WBC, regardless of the existence of an approved plan for the property per Chapters 1173, 1175 or 1181.

(b) Redevelopment/New Development. Shall apply to improvements such as construction of a new building; expansion of a building’s gross floor area; construction, alteration or expansion of parking facilities; and construction/installation of freestanding signs. Additionally, requested improvements that do not conform to this Chapter may be subject to the provisions herein.

1. Pre-application. The applicant may request review and feedback from City staff and the Municipal Planning Commission prior to preparing a Preliminary Plan. No discussions, opinions, or suggestions provided shall be binding to the applicant, or the City, or be relied upon by the applicant to indicate subsequent approval or disapproval by the City.

2. Preliminary Plan.
   A. The owner of a tract of land located in the WBC shall submit to the Municipal Planning Commission for its review, a preliminary plan for the redevelopment and/or change of use of such tract of land. At the time of filing of the preliminary plan, the applicant shall pay a fee of $350.00, no part of which shall be refundable.

   B. The Preliminary Plan submittal shall include the following:
1. A legal description and vicinity map showing the property lines, streets, existing Zoning, and land uses within 300’ of the area proposed for development;

2. Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan;

3. Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site;

4. A topographical survey of all land included in the application and such other land adjoining the subject property as may be reasonably required by the City. The topographical survey shall show two foot contours or contours at an interval as may be required by the Municipal Planning Commission to delineate the character of the land included in the application and such adjoining land as may be affected by the application. Elevations shall be based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88). In lands contiguous to or adjacent to the flood plain of the Olentangy River, existing contours shall be shown in accordance with the elevations set forth in Chapter 1105;

5. Existing Structures, parking and traffic facilities, Easements and public Rights-of-Way on the subject property as well as within 300’ of the proposed area;

6. Existing sanitary and storm sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations;

7. The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community. In areas located near the Olentangy River, stormwater quality treatment requirements, downstream surface water protection, and stream corridor protection areas shall be designated, protected, and/or mitigated as required by Ohio EPA’s “Construction Site Storm Water in the Olentangy River Watershed” General Permit or the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Rainwater and Land Development Manual, whichever greater. Wetland areas shall be delineated and mitigated as required by the Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404. A Flood Hazard Permit is required to be filed with the City for all work within the FEMA designated floodplain.

8. A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6” caliper or larger;

9. A preliminary grading plan;

10. Preliminary design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening, Public Space Amenities and other features as required by the City;

11. The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness of such facilities;

12. Parcels of land intended to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for public use, or reserved by deed covenant, and the condition proposed for such covenants and for the dedications;
13. Proposed Easements;
14. Proposed number of Dwelling Units per acre;
15. Proposed uses, including area of land devoted to each use;
16. Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for
   construction of each phase;
17. Homeowners or commercial owners’ association materials;
18. A written narrative describing the project; and
19. Any additional information as required by the Municipal Planning
   Commission and the City Council.

C. The Municipal Planning Commission may approve, approve with
   modifications, or disapprove the Preliminary Plan based on its conformance
   with the ordinances of the City.

(3) Final Plan.
A. Upon determination by the Municipal Planning Commission that the proposed
   WBC application as shown by the preliminary plan conforms to the
   requirements of this Chapter and all applicable requirements of this Zoning
   Ordinance, the proponents shall prepare and submit a Final Plan, which plan
   shall incorporate any changes or modifications required or suggested by the
   Commission. At the time of filing the Final Plan for review by the Municipal
   Planning Commission, the applicant shall pay a fee of $200, no part of which
   shall be refundable.

B. The Final Plan submittal shall include the following:
   1. An updated construction schedule;
   2. All items required in the Preliminary Plan, revised as necessary to meet the
      approval;
   3. Proposed final design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures,
      streets, drives, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site
      lighting, landscaping, screening and other features as required by the City;
   4. Evidence that the applicant has sufficient control over the land to undertake
      the proposed development; and
   5. Covenants and other restrictions which will be imposed upon the use of the
      land, Buildings, and Structures, and a copy of any bylaws.

C. For any development involving the extension of utilities, the owner shall also
   submit conceptual utility drawings containing the following information:
   1. The pipe size, slope, manholes and location of the sanitary sewer system;
   2. The size, shape and slope for all pipes, channels and basins of the storm
      sewer system with accompanying storm drainage calculations;
   3. The size and location of water lines and fire hydrants; and
   4. Street or drive grades, cross sections, elevations and contours at two foot
      intervals.
If a conceptual utility plan is required, the applicant shall pay a fee of $100.00 per acre for each acre in the development; however, such fee shall not be less than $300.00 for the purposes of reviewing such utility plans.

D. If the final plan is found to comply with requirements set forth in this Chapter and other applicable provisions of this Zoning Ordinance, the Commission shall submit such plan with its report and recommendations to the City Council which shall hold a public hearing on the WBC plan.

E. Following a public hearing, the Council may approve by Ordinance the final plan as submitted by the Commission or may approve modification of the plan if the modification is consistent with the intent and meaning of this Chapter and is in substantial conformity with the Final Plan as approved by the Commission.

(4) Requested modifications to the approved Final Plan shall be reviewed according to the following:

A. **City Staff.** The City staff may approve design modifications that are required to correct any undetected errors or that are consistent with the purpose of the approved Final Plan. Such modifications shall be limited to:
   1. Minor adjustments in location of Building footprints and parking lots, provided the perimeter required Yards remain in compliance;
   2. Minor adjustments in Building height;
   3. Minor modifications in Structure design and materials, and lighting provided there is the same general appearance; and
   4. Minor modifications of landscaping, including substitution of materials.

B. **Municipal Planning Commission.** The Municipal Planning Commission shall review modifications other than those listed in the above section, and any of the above modifications as recommended by City staff.
   1. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification keeps the essential character of the Final Plan, and otherwise meets the provisions of the Planning and Zoning Code, the Municipal Planning Commission may approve such modification.
   2. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification does not otherwise meet the provisions of the Planning and Zoning Code, or requires further review, the Municipal Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council for consideration?

C. **City Council.** Following a public hearing, Council may approve by resolution the amendment to the Final Plan as submitted by the Commission, may approve modification of the plan if the modification is consistent with the intent and meaning of this Zoning Ordinance or may deny the amendment.

(5) **Appeal.** Any person, firm or corporation, or any officer, department, board or agency of the City who has been aggrieved or affected by any decision of the
Municipal Planning Commission or City staff involving an application for the WBC, or any member of the City Council, whether or not aggrieved or affected, may appeal such decision to the City Council by filing notice of intent to appeal within seven days of the date of the decision, and filing a petition with the Clerk of Council within fifteen days from the date of the decision and setting forth the facts of the case. The City Council shall hold a public hearing on such appeal not later than thirty days after such petition has been filed with the Clerk of Council. The City Council, by an affirmative vote of four of its members, shall decide the matter on the merits of the case after giving due consideration to the deliberations and decisions of the Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council's decision shall be final.

(6) Expiration. In the event the applicant receiving approval of a WBC plan does not receive the required permits within 18 months of the date of approval, the City shall require the applicant to show cause why such approval should not be revoked. If the Commission determines that the best interests of the City will not be served by the applicant continuing to hold the approval, the Commission shall hold a hearing to revoke the approval.

(7) Guarantee of Natural Features Work. Prior to beginning construction, the owner or developer shall provide a bond, letter of credit acceptable to the City, or a certified check, guaranteeing the work of preserving and/or restoring and maintaining Natural Features. The bond, letter of credit or check shall be in an amount equal to the estimated cost of the work of preserving and/or restoring and maintaining Natural Features, and the same shall be released upon acceptance of the Natural Features work by the City and upon the furnishing by the owner or developer of an additional bond or letter of credit acceptable to the City, or a certified check in an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the estimated cost of the Natural Features work to guarantee maintenance of the Improvements and the Natural Features work for a period of one year following the completion of construction.

(8) The owner or developer shall, prior to beginning construction, deposit with the Director of Finance a sum of money as prescribed by the City Engineer to defray the cost of inspection and whatever engineering services may be required, and expense incurred by the City in the installation of any public improvements. Should the amount of such deposit be insufficient to pay the cost thereof, the developer shall immediately, upon demand, deposit such additional sums as are estimated by the Director to be necessary. Upon completion and acceptance of the improvement, any unexpended balance remaining from such deposit or deposits shall be refunded.

(9) Interpretation of Uses: When a proposed land use is not explicitly listed herein, the Municipal Planning Commission shall determine whether it is reasonably included in the definition of a listed use, or that the proposed use meets the
following criteria to the extent that it should be treated as a permitted use in that district:
(1) The use is not specifically listed in any other WBC.
(2) The use is generally consistent with the intent of the WBC and this Chapter.
(3) The use will not impair the present or potential use of other properties within the same district or bordering districts.
(4) The use has no greater potential impact on surrounding properties than those listed in the district, in terms of aesthetics, traffic generated, noise, potential nuisances, and other impacts related to health, safety and welfare.
(5) The use will not adversely affect the relevant elements of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study.

(c) Notice of Hearings. Notice of all Municipal Planning Commission hearings in Section 1181.07 shall be as follows:

(1) The property in question is to be posted with a placard stating the date and location of the hearing. At this hearing, any party may appear in person or by attorney.

(2) Notice of the time, place and purpose of the public hearing shall be given by mailing or e-mailing a notice not less than ten days prior to the date of the public hearing to owners of property contiguous to and directly across the street from such parcel or parcels.

(3) The meeting agenda shall be posted on the City of Worthington website prior to the meeting.

(4) The failure to notify as provided in this section shall not invalidate any decision made hereunder.

1181.08 COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF PART 11, PLANNING AND ZONING CODE
For any applicable procedures or requirements not contained or referenced in this Chapter, procedures and requirements contained elsewhere in Part 11 of the Codified Ordinances shall govern. In the event any procedures or requirements contained in this Chapter conflict with procedures or requirements contained elsewhere in Part 11 of the Codified Ordinances, the procedures or requirements contained within this Chapter shall govern.
Background & Purpose:
Chapter 1181 Wilson Bridge Corridor (WBC) is proposed for consideration to be added to the Codified Ordinances to implement the findings of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study. Adopted in 2011, the Study makes recommendations for the Wilson Bridge Road corridor from the Olentangy River to the west to the Railroad Crossing to the east. The Study recommends the need to promote the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into a mixed use area that will generate new economic growth within the City. These requirements are intended to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; encourage a mix of uses; enhance livability of the area; to augment pedestrian and bicycle connections; and to promote construction of high-quality buildings and public spaces that create and sustain long-term economic vitality.

District Boundaries:
The Wilson Bridge Corridor (WBC) includes all parcels with access from Wilson Bridge Road and Old Wilson Bridge Road, between the Olentangy River to the west, and the railroad to the east. The WBC also includes the parcels adjacent to North High Street, from I-270 to Caren and Highland Avenues, but excludes any parcels owned by the City that are used for parkland purposes. Several of these properties are also located in the Architectural Review District, in the event of a conflict between standards, the more restrictive standards shall apply. (Please attached maps)

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning Layout:
Chapter 1181
1. Purpose
2. District Boundaries
3. Definitions
5. Development Standards
6. Establishment of Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning Districts
   a. WBC-1 – Medium Density Residential
   b. WBC-2 – Professional Office
   c. WBC-3 – Mixed Use
   d. WBC-4 – Office
7. Procedures for Review

Chapter 1141.01 Division into Districts
   • Open Areas, Residential Districts, Commercial Districts, Industrial Districts and Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts

Chapter 1141.06 Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts

Chapter 1107.01 Variations to Council Action

**Description of Zoning Districts:**

“**WBC-1**” Medium Density Residential: An area along the WBC that allows for medium density residential housing, offering a variety of housing styles and pricing options that complement the residential and architectural patterns and styles in the City.

(1) Permitted Uses: Multi-family dwellings, Home Occupations, Public uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.

(2) Maximum Building Height: Three stories except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 30’.

(3) Density: The maximum number of dwelling units allowed per acre for development within the WBD-1 shall be 14, with a desired number between 10 and 14 dwelling units.

“**WBC-2**” Professional Office: Areas to promote small to medium sized office uses. A variety of office types and styles are encouraged to promote flexibility and adaptability.

(1) Permitted Uses: Office uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.

(2) Conditional Use: Public uses and Semi-public uses.

(3) Maximum Building Height: 3 stories, except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 35’.

“**WBC-3**” Mixed Use: An area along the WBC that allows for a mix of retail and office uses both vertically and horizontally. Retail uses are encouraged for the first floor of multi-floor developments. Pedestrian facilities and public spaces are encouraged. Some residential uses may be incorporated in this area.
(1) Permitted Uses: Uses listed in Chapter 1147 of the Codified Ordinances as permitted uses in the following districts: “C-1” Neighborhood Commercial, “C-2” Community Shopping Center, and “C-3” Institutions and Offices.

(2) Conditional Uses: Residential Uses, Hotels, Motels, Drive-in Commercial Uses, and Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries.

(3) Maximum Building Height: 3 stories for properties south of Wilson Bridge Rd; except for the WBC-3 Mixed-Use location south of Wilson Bridge Road and west of High Street, where the maximum building height shall be 3 stories within the westernmost 180 feet and 4 stories in the remaining area; 4 stories for properties north of Wilson Bridge Rd. (Revised 01.20.2016)

“WBC-4” Office: Areas along the WBC that allows for large-scale office development and redevelopment, with such product offering prominent freeway visibility and serving local, regional and national tenants.

(1) Permitted Uses: Office uses, Animal Hospitals, Essential services and Accessory uses.

(2) Conditional Uses: Hotel, Public uses and Semi-public uses.

(3) Maximum Building Height: 4 stories except buildings abutting the Wilson Bridge Rd. right-of-way should be limited to 3 stories. (Revised 03.15.2016)

**Building Setbacks:**
- Buildings 50,000 sq. ft. in area or less shall be located between 5 feet and 20 feet from the ROW line.
- Buildings greater than 50,000 sq. ft. in area shall be located at least 20 feet from the ROW line.
- Buildings on properties abutting properties in the “R” districts shall not be closer than 50 feet from a property line, access drives and parking facilities shall not be located closer than 25 feet.
  - Avoid canyon/tunneling effect along the corridor.
    - Use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be required. (Revised 01.20.2016)
- Buildings located along High Street north of Wilson Bridge Road shall be located at least 50’ from the adjacent Right-of-Way lines. (Revised 02.16.2016)

**Tract Coverage:**
- Maximum of 75% of the property shall be covered with impervious surfaces. (Revised 02.16.2016)

**Buildings:**
- Design:
  - Oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road, operational entry facing the street.
  - Height shall be a minimum of 18 feet for flat roof buildings and 12 feet for
pitched roof buildings
  o Avoid canyon/tunneling effect along the corridor.
    ▪ Use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of green
      commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be
      required. (Revised 01.20.2016)

  • Materials:
    o Building façade should include 75% of materials consisting of full set clay bricks,
      stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding.
    o No vinyl siding permitted. (Revised 01.20.2016)

Landscaping:
  • Natural Features
    o Natural Features shall not be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed without
      approval.
    o All healthy 6” caliper or larger trees shall be retained, or replaced with a total tree
      trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree.
    o When full replacement is not feasible, a fee of $150.00/per caliper inch is required
      to be deposited in the Special Parks Fund for reforestation on public property.
      (Revised 02.16.2016)
    o The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or
      restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding
      neighborhood and community. In areas located near the Olentangy River,
      stormwater quality treatment requirements, downstream surface water protection,
      and stream corridor protection areas shall be designated, protected, and/or
      mitigated as required by Ohio EPA’s “Construction Site Storm Water in the
      Olentangy River Watershed” General Permit or the Ohio Department of Natural
      Resources Rainwater and Land Development Manual, whichever greater.
      Wetland areas shall be delineated and mitigated as required by the Clean Water
      Act Sections 401 and 404. A Flood Hazard Permit is required to be filed with the
      City for all work within the FEMA designated floodplain. (Revised 02.16.2016)

Building Height:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts:</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBC-1</td>
<td>3 stories on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road except between Westview Drive &amp; McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 30 feet in height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-2</td>
<td>3 stories, except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 35 feet in height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-3</td>
<td>3 stories for properties south of Wilson Bridge Rd; except for the WBC-3 Mixed-Use location south of Wilson Bridge Road and west of High Street, where the maximum building height shall be 3 stories within the westernmost 180 feet and 4 stories in the remaining area; 4 stories for properties north of Wilson Bridge Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-4</td>
<td>4 stories except buildings abutting the Wilson Bridge Rd. right-of-way should be limited to 3 stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permitted Uses & Conditional Uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts:</th>
<th>Permitted Uses:</th>
<th>Conditional Uses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBC-1</td>
<td>Multi-Family Dwellings, Home Occupations, Public Uses, Essential Services, Accessory Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-2</td>
<td>Office Uses, Essential Services, Accessory Uses</td>
<td>Public Uses, Semi-Public Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-3</td>
<td>Permitted Uses listed in the following districts: C-1 District, C-2 District, C-3 District</td>
<td>Residential Uses, Hotels &amp; Motels, Drive-in Commercial, Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-4</td>
<td>Office Uses, Animal Hospitals, Essential Services, Accessory Uses</td>
<td>Hotel, Public Uses, Semi-Public Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Density:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts:</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBC-1</td>
<td>14 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-3</td>
<td>No density specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC-4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations:

- Staff is recommending approval of the proposed amendment to Code. Staff believes it further implements the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study. The proposed amendment to Code also complements the Wilson Bridge Corridor enhancement projects planned for the corridor.

- The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Steering Committee recommended approval.

- On September 24, 2015 the Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and recommended approval to City Council on an Ordinance to Amend the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington
Updated Information:

- Pg. #2 – Modified minimum acreage from 3-acres to 2-acres.
- Pg. #3 and Pg. #4 – Added language concerning building height related to setbacks along the street corridor. The goal is to mitigate any potential for canyon/tunneling effect along the corridor.
- Pg. #3 – Added language related to buildings located along High Street north of Wilson Bridge Road shall be located at least 50’ from the adjacent Right-of-Way lines.
- Page #3 – Added language as building height increases, the buildings should consider the relationship between the setback, the street corridor, and the building height. A variety of techniques will be implemented to mitigate any potential “canyon/tunneling” effect along the corridor, such as the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping.
- Page #4 – Maximum of 75% of the property shall be covered with impervious surfaces.
- Page #5 - To avoid a potential “canyon/tunneling” effect along the corridor, the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be required.
- Pg. #5 – Moved roof-mounted equipment to the end of the section under Building Design.
- Pg. #5 – Increased the percentage from 40% to 75% of materials must be full set clay bricks, stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding.
- Pg. #5 – No vinyl siding and other less durable materials should be used.
- Pg. #6 – Decreased the Tree Replacement Fee from $450.00/caliper inch to $150.00/caliper inch.
- Pg. #10 – Building Height WBC-3 – Mixed Use
  - The maximum building height was adjusted for the WBC-3 Mixed Use location, we adjusted the maximum building height: 3 stories for properties south of Wilson Bridge Rd; except for the WBC-3 Mixed-Use location south of Wilson Bridge Road and west of High Street, where the maximum building height shall be 3 stories within the westernmost 180 feet and 4 stories in the remaining area; 4 stories for properties north of Wilson Bridge Rd.
- Pg. #11 – Building Height WBC-4 – Office
  - The maximum building height was adjusted from 6 stories to 4 stories except buildings abutting the Wilson Bridge Rd. right-of-way should be limited to 3 stories.
- Pg. #11 & Pg. #12 – Removed WBC-5 – Office/High Density Residential
  - WBC- 5 District was completely removed. This area is now recommended to be in the WBC-4 – Office District in the future.
- Pg. #12 – Added language pertaining to natural features on a site.
  - The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community. In areas located near the Olentangy River, stormwater quality treatment requirements, downstream surface water protection, and stream corridor protection areas shall be designated, protected, and/or mitigated as required by Ohio EPA’s “Construction Site Storm Water in the Olentangy River Watershed” General Permit or the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Rainwater and Land Development Manual, whichever greater.
Wetland areas shall be delineated and mitigated as required by the Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404. A Flood Hazard Permit is required to be filed with the City for all work within the FEMA designated floodplain.

**City Council Process:**

- **City Council Briefing – November 9, 2015**
- **Outreach:**
  - Website updated to include all meeting materials, presentation and meeting dates.
  - Notify Me – Mass email went out on November 18, 2015 to all those signed up on the City’s email, updated email went out on January 8, 2016, February 5, 2016, March 11, 2016 and again on March 15, 2016.
  - Steering Committee updated on the status of the proposed regulations
  - Met with residents on Hayhurst and Caren
  - Met with residents on Olenwood and Hinsdale
- **City Council Briefing – January 11, 2016**
  - Email correspondence and meetings with residents who have questions and concerns.
- **City Council Briefing – February 8, 2016**
  - Email correspondence and meetings with residents who have questions and concerns.
- **City Council Briefing – March 14, 2016**
  - Approach #2 Presentation posted to the City’s website on March 15, 2016 and email went out to those on the Notify Me distribution list.
    - Alternate proposal presented at the meeting.
  - Email correspondence and meetings with residents who have questions and concerns.
- **Introduce Legislation – April 4, 2016**
- **Public Hearing – April 18, 2016**
  - 60-Day Referendum Period for proposed Code Amendment.
Proposed Zoning

- **WBC-1** - Medium Density Residential
- **WBC-2** - Professional Office
- **WBC-3** - Mixed Use
- **WBC-4** - Office
Proposed Zoning

- WBC-1 - Medium Density Residential
- WBC-2 - Professional Office
- WBC-3 - Mixed Use
- WBC-4 - Office
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

- 3-4 stories
- 3 stories
- 2½ stories
- 2 ½ stories

Approach #2 – Building Heights - Updated: March 14, 2016
ORDINANCE NO. 13-2015

Authorizing the City of Worthington to Participate with Other Central Ohio Jurisdictions in the Funding for a Study of the State Route 161 Corridor and 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 Thereof.

WHEREAS, in 2014, the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission undertook a preliminary traffic study of the State Route 161 corridor from Olentangy River Road to Sawmill Road to gather information such as current congestion levels, projected growth in the area and potential traffic growth over the next 30 years; and,

WHEREAS, that study was funded by Perry Township, the City of Columbus and the City of Worthington; and,

WHEREAS, sufficient information was obtained from that study to warrant a more comprehensive look at the corridor, which would consist of a planning, engineering and design study for the purpose of providing the affected jurisdictions with a set of alternatives for improvements; and,

WHEREAS, the State of Ohio Department of Transportation has agreed to facilitate the study for the benefit of all the affected jurisdictions with financial assistance from the City of Columbus, Perry Township, the City of Worthington and MORPC, as requested, in the share of the funding therefor.

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

SECTION 1. That it is declared to be in the public interest that the consent of Worthington City Council be and such consent is hereby given to the Director of Transportation to complete the above described study.

SECTION 2. That the City of Worthington shall cooperate with the Director of Transportation in the above described study and hereby appropriates from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.5010.533357 the sum of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($150,000.00) to pay the City of Worthington’s share of costs for the study.

SECTION 3. That the City Manager is hereby directed on behalf of the City to enter into contracts with the Director of Transportation necessary to complete the above described project.
ORDINANCE NO. 13-2015

SECTION 4. 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
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
FROM: Darren Hurley, Parks & Recreation Director
DATE: March 28, 2016
SUBJECT: Park Planning Process City Council Update

The Parks and Recreation Commission has been working for the past year on developing a Park Planning Document to provide recommendations on future park improvements and projects to City Council. A significant amount of work has been completed and drafting for additional community feedback and document formatting are underway. I would like to provide an overview of the process along with a review of our proposed outline for the final plan to City Council to obtain feedback on our direction at an upcoming City Council Meeting.
Park Planning Process
City Council Update

DARREN HURLEY, PARKS & RECREATION DIRECTOR
Park Planning

Reviving the tabled Vision 2020

Planning Process!
Who?

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

- 9 Member Advisory Commission
- Mixture of those involved in Vision 2020 and those appointed after
What Approach to Take?

1. Considered desired outcome
2. Evaluated resources available
3. Assessed timing and feel of process
Process Overview

Determined internal, staff facilitated process using the expertise of the Commission was the best approach.
Process – 3 Broad Steps

1. Education/Research
2. Identifying Needs
3. Park by Park Planning
Education/Research

1. Park Inventory and Benchmarking
2. Park by Park Analysis re: Maintenance
3. Park Trends
Benchmarking

International City/County Managers’ Association’s (ICMA) Center for Performance Measurement
Benchmarking cont.

1. Developed Park Acreage per 1,000
2. Number of Athletic Fields per 1,000
3. Similar Comparisons – Playgrounds, Tennis Courts, Trails, etc.
Maintenance Analysis

Presentation from Parks Manager to educate members of challenges currently in place
Overall Themes Serving as Challenges to Meet Expectations

**Structure/Infrastructure**
- Lack of or Failing Irrigation/Drainage
- Branding and Related Upkeep of Existing 28 signs
- Fencing Replacement/Repair
- Bleacher Pads/Overall Surfacing Challenges

**Amenities**
- Play Structure Repair and Replacement Schedule
- Aging Buildings

**Flora/Fauna**
- Invasive Species Control
- Ash Tree Removal
- Whitetail Deer

**Equipment**
- Outdated/Under-Purpose Items
Park Trends

What trends are out there that we may want to consider in planning process?
The Easy Stuff

THE MOST COMMONLY PLANNED ADDITIONS INCLUDE:

Dog parks (planned by 26.7 percent of parks respondents who will be adding features)
Splash play areas (26.2 percent)
Trails (24.4 percent)
Park structures such as shelters and restroom buildings (21.6 percent)
Playgrounds (20.3 percent)
Skateparks (17.5 percent)
Synthetic turf sports fields (17.2 percent)
Disc golf courses (16.7 percent)
Open spaces such as fields, gardens and undeveloped areas (16.5 percent)
Bleachers and seating (12.1 percent)


The Bricks and the Mortar

Features that saw an increase in the number of parks respondents who plan to add them in 2013 vs. 2012 include splash play areas (up 2.8 percent), skateparks (up 2.7 percent) and synthetic turf sports fields (up 0.3 percent). Bleachers and seating did not appear among the top 10 planned additions in 2012.
The “Scary” Stuff

- Ideas
  - Natural (Unstructured) Play
  - Partnerships
  - Engagement
  - Electronics
  - QR codes
  - Virtual Tours
  - Coupon Programs
  - Geocache
  - Crossfit/Adventure Racing

Oh no, they have ideas.
Identifying Needs

1. Playground Discussion
2. Resident Survey
3. Brainstorm Needs/Wish Lists
Playground Challenges

How to maintain 14 playgrounds given the current funding levels, life span, and community standards?
Resident Survey

1. Build off of 2008 Survey

2. Community Feedback from General Park Users
   – Navigate Special Interest

3. Create Community Engagement
50 yard signs
prominent at every
Worthington Park with
QR code links to survey

if my park could talk

IF YOUR FAVORITE WORTHINGTON PARK COULD TALK, WHAT WOULD IT SAY?

TELL US AT WORTHINGTON.ORG WE'RE LISTENING.
City Events

Fri, Jul 10
Shootout for Soldiers

Fri, Jul 10
Worthington Libraries’ Summer Concert Series: Dr. Tony’s Original Ragtime Band

Sat, Jul 11
Shootout for Soldiers

Sat, Jul 11
Worthington Farmers Market

Sat, Jul 11
Walk Worthington Yoga Walk

Sun, Jul 12
Walk Worthington Concert Walk!

In the News

If my park could talk
Take a quick survey here

Farmers Market Saturdays - Visit the Worthington Farmers Market every Saturday through October from 8:00 am to Noon in historic downtown Worthington. Read on...

Concerts on the Green - Music fills the air for the summer Concerts on the Green on the historic Village Green. Read on...
Question 2.
Regarding the parks you visit, please rate the importance of the following amenities with 1 being low importance up to 5 being high importance.

SURVEY RESULTS

MOST IMPORTANT AMENITIES:
1. Bike/Recreation Paths 146
2. Nature Areas 127
3. Drinking Fountains 109

LEAST IMPORTANT AMENITIES:
1. Basketball Courts 106
2. Tennis Courts 101
3. Athletic Fields 79
Wish Lists/Ideas

1. Commission Members Ideas Captured
2. Added Staff Input
3. Incorporated Survey Responses
Park by Park Planning

1. Wish Lists Ranked by Park
2. Park by Park Subjective Discussions
3. Final Listing of Projects by Park in Priority Order
Other Key Steps

1. Historical Financing Reference
2. Operating Budget Impact Evaluation
3. Additional Public Feedback – Open Houses
4. Alignment with Other Planning Docs
Proposed Outline of Final Plan

I. Introduction
II. Background
III. Methodology
IV. Current Conditions
V. Current Park Information
VI. Benchmarking Information
VII. Park Trends
VIII. Survey Results/Public Feedback
IX. Playground Challenges
X. Park Maintenance
XI. Park by Park Vision
XII. Most Critical Improvements
XIII. Overall Recommended Park Improvement Projects
XIV. Funding Options
XV. Conclusions