Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 18, 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, April 18, 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, Douglas Foust, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent:

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

There were approximately fifty seven 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

Expressing Appreciation and Best Wishes – Police Chief James Mosic

Resolution No. 18-2016

Expressing the Appreciation and Best Wishes of the Worthington City Council to Chief James Mosic for his Outstanding Service to the Worthington Division of Police and for his Service to the Community.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 18-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Greeson shared that he had the opportunity in what seems like a short time ago to promote Jim Mosic to his position as Chief. He shared additional highlights around Chief Mosic’s thirty two years of service. He placed a huge emphasis on the Community and Community outreach.
Mr. Greeson thinks this type of citizen engagement is really important in public safety organizations today particularly in light of all of the national conversation about police relationships with communities. He hopes people know that it has long been a part of Worthington’s culture to conduct community based policing but from his perspective, Chief Mosic took it to the next level. He appreciates his hard work and his loyalty and the work he has done to advance this organization and our city government. He thanked Chief Mosic for his service.

Ms. Michael also thanked Chief Mosic for all of his community service over the years. She invited him to join her at the podium where she read Resolution No. 18-2016 in its entirety and presented him with a certified copy.

Chief Mosic thanked Council and staff for the recognition. He introduced his wife, Jenny, and his in-laws. He thanked all of his associates who were in attendance. He thanked council for all of the opportunities that he had over his thirty two years of service. He stated that he never once did not want to come to work. It has been great being a part of this wonderful community and he hopes he has made a difference in some way. He felt at times that he was a placeholder and that the true people that deserve recognition are our officers and our employees. They are the ones who really make the difference.

The Ohio State University’s Don Scott Airport

David Williams shared that he appreciates the opportunity to come before Council to share about the Don Scott Field, the Ohio State Airport, which reports to him as the Dean of Engineering.

Dean Williams reported that Don Scott Airport impacts the areas of Worthington, Columbus, Dublin, and Perry Township. For many years the future of the Airport was uncertain. The University did not know what it was to do with the airport. Recently the University has made the decision that Don Scott Field is an integral part of Ohio State University and it will be investing seriously in the Airport for the education of our students and research and we hope for the benefit of the community. He has been making presentations to different parts of the community to share the vision.

He shared that Don Scott Field is part of the general aviation system of this nation where individuals and companies that have their own plane choose to fly, which is quite rare for a major community. Don Scott Field is the fourth busiest airport in the state of Ohio with over 70,000 take offs and landings every year. It plays an important role in many businesses and in the economies of these communities as well as being a part of the education and research mission of the College of Engineering.

Dean Williams shared that Don Scott Field is designated by the federal government as an airport of national importance and less than 1% of the general aviation fields in this country have that designation. The federal government uses Don Scott Field as does the CIA, the DEA, and emergency responders like Med Flight. The airport is the base for a
critical number of international flights of local industries such as Worthington Industries. Governor Kasich and the state government use our airport, participants in major sporting events, and cultural events fly in and out of the airport and aviation education. These are all major contributors to economic development. They have over 300 students studying aviation and airport management and their transportation at our airport. More than half of those are employed at the airport so they can earn money to help pay for their education.

The New York Times reports of a shortage of pilots in our nation. This is an issue of national importance. Boeing projects the needs of 85,000 new pilots in North America over the next twenty years. The challenge has come because of the FAA mandated retirement age of 65 and the requirement of more education for pilots following the airline crash in Buffalo back in 2009. Ohio State is part of the solution to that particular problem because we are one of the few universities in the nation that has a major flight school. They intend to train our students to provide pilots for all of the national airlines but many of the local ones like NetJets, Lane Aviation, and Limited Brands also use Ohio State educated pilots to fly the people who lead their businesses.

The other side of any university in addition to education is research. Don Scott Field is the home to major research to support the aviation industry. GE Aviation has close to forty engineers at Don Scott Field carrying out research in jet engines, which are made in Cincinnati and supply both Boeing and AirBus around the world. The full scale testing of jet engines take place at Don Scott Field. They work for Wright Patterson Air Force Base on the reduction of noise in jet engines. They also work with the Federal Aviation Administration which has asked them to be part of a couple of major national centers on NextGen Aviation Air traffic management as well as flight safety.

There being too much traffic going into the airport where you were trying to land is an increasing challenge for aviation in this country because they still rely on the same radar and radio controls of their aircrafts as they did back in the 1940s. The FAA is about to commit 18 billion dollars over the next twenty years to install the next generation air traffic control which will merely bring air traffic up to the point where you are already with the use of GPS in your car. The next generation air traffic control is all about the appropriate GPS management of the flights. Don Scott is one of the centers of excellence for the study of next generation air traffic control.

Don Scott Field is also one of the nation’s major research centers in drones. The faculty at Ohio State are excellent in the ingestion of things into jet engines, which you would prefer not to happen when you are flying, however if it does happen when you are flying we help GE design engines which will survive the ingestion of birds and drones and other things. The fact that we can fly drones at Don Scott Field will allow us to be one of the few places in the nation where we can safely introduce drones into civil aviation space under FAA control to help ensure the safety of all who fly over the next generation as more and more drones take place.
Ohio State has serious education and serious research. They also have serious outreach to the community at Don Scott Field. Over 2,000 K-12 students tour the airport facility. As a professor for forty years, he knows there are two things that get young children interested in science and engineering. One is dinosaurs and the other is aircraft and space flight so the opportunity to reach out to this community through Don Scott Field is just huge. They have several youth partnerships out at Don Scott Field. They are also working the Driving Park neighborhood of Columbus where the Tuskegee Airmen were housed in World War II when they flew out of Rickenbacker. They have a display on the Tuskegee Airmen at OSU Airport.

Dean Williams reported that ten days ago the Board of Trustees gave permission for Ohio State to go out and seek a consultant for the next ten year plan for Don Scott Field, which will be submitted to the FAA in due course. Ohio State plans to invest in Don Scott Field. They received a $10,000,000 gift from the Knowlton Foundation in Cincinnati that Ohio State will be matching with $5,000,000 of its own money to build a new terminal and an education center at Don Scott Field. The infrastructure was put in place in 1943 and has not been improved very much since so that will be changed considerably. There will be new hangars this summer, which have not been built at Don Scott in over thirty years. Over 100 industries and owners of aircraft have not been able to hangar their planes up to this point. They will be supporting their customers, the industries in this region and their students by investing in that airport. Prior to any changes at the airport they have to get permission of the FAA, which controls everything that happens at the airport. So the ten year plan will talk about their investing in teaching and research and in building out the facilities at the airport to serve this community.

Dean Williams shared that one of the more contentious issues that everyone is well aware of is the extension of the north runway which has been in our ten year plan for thirty years. The extension will also be in their next ten year plan. There is concern that longer runways will equal bigger planes and more noise. He wishes to put that particular concern to rest as safety is the major reason for the need for a longer runway at Don Scott Field. When there is rain or snow on the runway it is not long enough for our customers to land their planes safely so they have to fly to Port Columbus. That is a disservice to their industries and customers. So while safety is the number one reason to lengthen the runway, the second reason is that a longer runway will allow for takeoffs with a heavier load of fuel or people. Again, when their customers can’t take off with a full load of fuel they will have to stop and refuel prior to completing their flights to the west coast or internationally. That means that Don Scott Field doesn’t sell all the fuel that they could, which goes to their bottom line. It means the business of that airport is not operating at maximum efficiency. Third and perhaps most important to this community is a longer runway allows for a steeper angle of approach when landing. Most planes land over Worthington as they come in from east to west because of the prevailing winds. A longer runway will allow for a longer angle of approach which will reduce the noise over Worthington. They will not take any larger planes than they take already. They can already land the largest business jets. In fact larger jets tend to be quieter than smaller propeller planes. Again, the reason is not to bring in larger jets but rather to allow for safer operations and appropriate fueling of those jets. All of that will
go to their bottom line and allow them to give better education and more research investments at Don Scott Field. There is a lot going on there. Dean Williams said he hopes that Worthington will see this as value to the area. He thanked Council for their time and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Myers commented that in the past, the long range planning that has been undertaken by Ohio State in regards to Don Scott has involved an element of public input. He asked if Dean Williams envisions that continuing and in what shape will it take. Dean Williams replied that with the announcement, the FAA requires serious community involvement. From what he has learned since his arrival is that Ohio State could have done a better job of involving the community in many of the discussions that have gone on. They have in the last couple of years instituted an airport Community Outreach Council that is chaired by Bob Tanner from NetJets and involves people from Worthington City Council, Councilmember Norstrom, as well as people from Columbus, Dublin and Perry Township. Representative Duffey is also on that particular Community Outreach Council so we were attempting to get word out to all of the stakeholders in this area about everything that is happening at the airport and as that plan is developed we will involve the Community Outreach Council and any of the people who wish to be engaged. There will be extension community outreach as they develop the plan.

Mr. Norstrom shared that he and Ms. Stewart serve on that committee. They have enjoyed working with the Dean and have both learned a great deal. The important thing for the audience, in considering some other issues being discussed tonight, is what the Dean said about the decision that the Board of Trustees made was a major decision and a major reversal of the position Ohio State had in terms of development of this property. The discussions previously of major residential and commercial areas along SR-161 are just not going to happen now. The University will be making investments in education and facilities so there could be some additional traffic to the airport but it is not what was contemplated a few years ago.

Dean Williams thanked Mr. Norstrom and Ms. Stewart who both serve on the Community Outreach Council.

Ms. Michael asked Dean Williams what impact he feels the changes with the airport will have on traffic and congestion along SR-161. Dean Williams shared that most of the traffic to the airport travels along Case Rd. rather than SR-161. Once the plan is put in place he will know the thoughts on where things will go. He suspects that since the main entrance to the airport and the current education and research areas are along the south side of the airport that they will continue to invest in those areas on that side of the airport. It is where the FAA tower is located and it is important to understand that that is an absolute crucial part of the training that they provide to students. The fact that the students learn to fly under FAA control sets them apart from almost all other flight education and programs around the nation. It actually allows them to qualify with fewer hours of service so all of that ties into their continuing to build where they are and where they’ve invested so far.
Stacy Bretherton, 130 Howard Ave.
Ms. Bretherton shared that she is an employee of the university but also a new resident of Worthington. Her family moved about a month ago from Falls Church, VA and they are really glad to be in Worthington as it is a really great city.

She is the mother of two boys, which is really why she wanted to come and address Council this evening. This airport like all airports have really functional purposes. This one has a great research component but she can also share first hand from the experience that her family had recently visiting the observation tower. It was inspiring. She is really proud that this airport is accessible to the public. She learned of the accessibility of the observation tower to the public from the Worthington Mom’s Facebook page. As somebody who relocated from Washington where it is very complicated to get anywhere it was wonderful to be able to just zip in and tour the tower. Her three year old’s eye lit up to see planes take off and for him to be able to ask questions to those on hand is a wonderful way to introduce children to the wonders of flight, which is something our state has a really great history of. She is proud that Ohio State continues that and has plans to enhance that. The new terminal sounds wonderful as it was a bit warm in the observation tower.

Ms. Bretherton offered her support of the airport and the next generation of aviation enthusiast, pilots and researchers of which she hopes she is the mother of two of those.

Randy Moses, 6878 Alloway St. W.
Mr. Moses shared that he has lived on Alloway St. for thirty years. He is a faculty member in Engineering at the Ohio State University. He notes that although he has lived here quite a while, Don Scott Field has actually been here 74 years, which is thirty years longer than his subdivision has been here. Being a faculty member he has become increasing aware of the importance in the education and research role that Ohio State plays in aviation. He thinks we are one of the few universities that own and operate an airport. Actually among research strong universities we are one of a small handful (he believes seven) of universities that own and operate an airport. The opportunities for education coupled with research are really phenomenal. He thinks the Dean covered most of the points with respect to some of the opportunities in air traffic control and the systems that play a role. As a Worthington resident he is proud that we have such a facility nearby. About ten years ago his children gave his daughter a flight lesson there. That is something that she probably never would have done at another community. She went up and flew for an hour. It was amazing to watch. For months afterwards when she would see a small airplane overhead she would just look up and stare and ask him if it would be okay if she became a pilot. He thinks the outreach to not only children but the entire community is important. He supports looking broadly and openly at development there.

Ron Erb, 428 Blandings Court
Mr. Erb shared that he supports the airport. Like Mr. Moses, his family has benefitted from taking flying lessons at the OSU Airport. If you’ve never done that it is something that you should do because it is a lot of fun. His business and his clients also benefit
from the services the airport offers. So that is something that has been very helpful to
him. Lastly, as mentioned previously, that airport has been there a long time. He grew
up in Columbus and when he was a kid he used to ride his bike out to Kern’s farm and
get donuts and the only thing between St. Andrew’s and Dublin was that airport. That
airport has been there a long time. Development has taken over that space over time but
he would hope that like any business that has been there they would be given the
opportunity to advance with the times.

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

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)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Hurley shared that the 2016 CIP program included funding dedicated to Heischman
and McCord Park playground replacements. These funds were to cover the cost of both
playgrounds. They are ready to begin the process for the Heischman Park playground
and he is requesting the appropriation of $95,000 to fund that part of the project. They
have drafted a proposed process for the Heischman Park playground replacement that
starts tonight with council’s discussion and hopefully approval. They would then secure
design options and invite the neighbors to view the proposals, provide feedback and
select a favorite during a public meeting at the park. They will bring the preferred
design to the Parks and Recreation Commission before coming back to Council for final
approval. He thinks they can get through the process and return to Council by June 6th
and hopefully having the playground ready to install in the month of July. He would be
glad to address any questions.

Ms. Dorothy asked if he was going to offer any choices. Last time he mentioned there
were other options that weren’t typical around Worthington at this moment. Mr. Hurley
replied that they had that discussion with the Parks and Recreation Commission and are
looking to identify certain parks for that. During his overview of the park planning
process he shared at the last meeting he shared that they are looking at the proximity of
certain playgrounds to other parks and/or playgrounds. Due to Heischman Park’s
proximity to McCord Park and the two large playgrounds there, they are recommending
a smaller tot playground that will be designed mostly for younger children. The idea
being that older children should be able to access the larger playgrounds at McCord
Park so that is one reason the funding requested is a little less expensive at $95,000 than
previous playground replacements. It is part of that process of trying to reduce the percentage of money that goes solely to playground improvements.

Ms. Dorothy wanted to make sure that it will still serve the needs of our community. Mr. Hurley reported that being their belief.

Mr. Troper asked when the last time was that the facility received an update. Mr. Hurley replied the Heischman playground was an early 1990s playground. They have this playground and two others that are pre-1995 so it is one of the oldest three.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 10-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7    Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers and Michael
No 0

Ordinance No. 10-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

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.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mrs. Roberts reported this as a housekeeping measure. The City received the first half property tax distribution from the Franklin County Auditor’s Office in March. Included in that distribution was the full TIF revenue related to the Heights at Worthington Place. As members will recall, we passed ordinance 45-2012 to establish the TIF District at the Heights of Worthington Place property. It was established as a non-school TIF meaning that the County was supposed to collect the taxes and distribute them to the Worthington school district accordingly. However, when the TIF was recorded at the Franklin County Auditor’s office this was missed so the full distribution came to the City. We now have to reimburse the school district for the funds that we erroneously collected. She added that Franklin County assesses some direct expenses related to the collection of those fees which we need to account for as a direct expense too.

Ms. Dorothy asked if the property value and therefore the tax revenue has increased since the Heights at Worthington Place has been built. Mrs. Roberts explained that the tax collected related to the TIF funds is on the increased value of the property from the development. Ms. Dorothy concluded that it is all increase. Mrs. Roberts agreed.
Mr. Greeson shared that the increased value when taxed, if you look just for school purposes the first half distribution is $224,100. The second half distribution will be another equal amount. So it is $448,200 in new revenue over and above the development that was there before, which was the former James Tavern and an empty parking lot. That is net new revenue to the schools.

Ms. Dorothy stated that the City collected tax increment financing revenue that in lieu of paying taxes to the county, is going into a fund that the City can use but we are also not taking any revenue from the school. She asked if that was correct. Mrs. Roberts agreed. Ms. Dorothy concluded that the schools are made whole with this TIF.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if we have any TIFs where the schools are not made whole, Mrs. Roberts replied Worthington Station. Mr. Greeson added that Worthington Station is our oldest TIF. Ms. Dorothy believes that it is almost done as it was a fifteen year TIF. She stated that all of this new net revenue, we are making sure that the schools are whole and we are saving the additional money to be able to improve the Wilson Bridge Corridor District. Mr. Greeson agreed that the City will receive will be available for improvements in that corridor. He thinks the schools are probably benefiting from the development as well.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 11-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No   0

Ordinance No. 11-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

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.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that staff has talked a number of times and shared presentations over the last several months on this topic in a workshop format. Council introduced legislation to and amend the Codified Ordinances a few weeks ago. Tonight is the public hearing for that ordinance. Council is in a position to vote on amendments to the code. Prior discussions were for the purposes of informing how the draft might change. Staff made the amendments there were discussed in prior sessions and the ordinance was prepared according to Council’s direction. The presentation is fairly lengthy and the purpose of that is because it is the public hearing. Staff wants to make sure that we lay
everything out on the table that was previously discussed and talk about what this ordinance will accomplish. He asked Mr. Brown to lead the presentation and staff is available to answer any questions members may have.

Planning and Building Director Lee Brown provided the attached presentation. The presentation provides:

1) Background – Slide 2-3
2) Existing Zoning – Slide 4
3) Recommendations – Slide 5-7
4) Process – Slide 8
5) Wilson Bridge Steering Committee – Slide 9
6) City Council Process – Slide 11

- 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 and again on March 11, 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
  - 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, then rezoning can occur with another 60-day referendum period after each rezoning.
7) Information – Slide 12

- 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.

8) 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
- Worthington Industries – Purchased building
- 350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. – Building Redevelopment
- 150 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. First Financial (formerly Insight Bank)
- Multi-use path and bike lane improvements
- Lower vacancy rate in the corridor
- Northeast Gateway Redesign
  - Wilson Bridge/Huntley/Worthington-Galena

9) Discussion Items – Slide 15

- Building Height
- Setbacks
- Tract Coverage
- Design & Materials
- Natural Features
- Traffic
10) Approach #2 Biggest Change – Slide 16 (Presented before City Council on March 14, 2016)

- Height and density reduced by half of what was proposed in the Wilson Bridge Corridor Study.

11) Strategies to move forward – Slides 17–18

- 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.
  - 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

12) Proposed Zoning Categories – Slides 19-21 and Slides 26-31

These slides showed a map of the corridor as it is currently and with the proposed zoning changes as well as the evolution of the different building heights per zoning category.
13) Zoning Districts – Slides 36-48

These slides identified and described four different Zoning Districts, showed the location of each district, provided a description of each district and identified changes that were made to the code language from the original scripting of the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning language.

14) Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning – Slide 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts:</th>
<th>Permitted Uses:</th>
<th>Conditional Uses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WBC-1             | Multi-Family Dwellings  
|                   | Home Occupations  
|                   | Public Uses  
|                   | Essential Services  
|                   | Accessory Uses  |  
|                   | N/A              |
| WBC-2             | Office Uses  
|                   | Essential Services  
|                   | Accessory Uses  |  
|                   | Public Uses  
|                   | Semi-Public Uses  |
| WBC-3             | Permitted Uses listed in the following districts:  
|                   | C-1 District  
|                   | C-2 District  
|                   | C-3 District  |  
|                   | Residential Uses  
|                   | Hotels & Motels  
|                   | Drive-in Commercial  
|                   | Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries  |
| WBC-4             | Office Uses  
|                   | Animal Hospitals  
|                   | Essential Services  
|                   | Accessory Uses  |  
|                   | Hotel  
|                   | Public Uses  
|                   | Semi-Public Uses  |
15) Discussion Items – Slide 52

- Building Height
- Setbacks – Right-of-Ways
- Tract Coverage
- Design & Materials
- Natural Features
- Traffic

16) Development Standards – Slide 56-57

- 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

Mr. Foust asked what it would look like if someone wanted to build a parking area and go to the 25 foot or would it have to be a surface only lot. Mr. Brown replied yes. Mr. Foust concluded that anything above ground would be fifty foot. Mr. Brown agreed. He explained that the current code allows for parking with screening 12 ½ feet from the property line. We worked with the steering committee on determining how to buffer and how do you provide those additional development standards. This scenario actually increases it for a parking lot to 25 foot plus have screening. The fifty kicks in for the buildings and/or parking garages/parking deck as we would consider that a building and a structure and it would need to be meet the fifty feet for that setback.

Mr. Greeson requested that Mr. Brown clarify what the current code states for a parking structure. Mr. Brown provided the example of the Holiday Inn. Currently on the Holiday Inn site there is parking about five feet from the property line. By zoning on the south side going towards Caren it could be sixty feet from the back of the residential lot but
then it bumps into thirty feet along Caren. So depending on which road you front on and
where you are, it kind of varies but in current code it is about sixty feet.

17) Slides 58-67 showed aerial views of the entire corridor and the rights-of-way were
identified in various locations along the corridor to show how they relate to
setbacks.

Mr. Brown shared that the conversation also included setbacks and buildings and
setbacks and a variety of items throughout the corridor (such as parking lots and/or the
buildings).

Ms. Dorothy commented that there is the right-of-way and then we are requiring the
setback after the right-of-way. Mr. Brown agreed. Ms. Dorothy concluded the right-of-
way can include bicycle and/or pedestrian improvements and if there isn’t enough room
then we can request that. Mr. Brown again agreed. Ms. Dorothy commented that is the
right-of-way where we can get our bicycle and pedestrian improvements and then after
we can have a setback. She asked what kind of setbacks are there in our walkable
downtown at places like Whitney House, Fresh Thyme or the Orange Johnson House.
Mr. Brown replied that much of the Central Business District in the downtown has a zero
setback however you usually have 12 to 15 to 20 feet of right-of-way to work with. For
example, Dewey’s is set about 12 feet off the right-of-way and Whitney House is located
right on the edge of the right-of-way. CVS has an eleven foot setback from High St.
Fresh Thyme is unique as it has a jog out of right-of-way where the drainage went under
High St. So it goes from a zero foot setback to a thirty two foot in setback for building
setbacks.

Ms. Dorothy commented that the Fresh Thyme building is straight across and the right-
of-way and setback are what jogs. Mr. Brown agreed. He wanted to show the slides and
snapshots setbacks throughout the city because council needs to also take into account
the available right-of-way. For example High St. across from J Liu’s, if you were five,
ten or twenty feet on the east side of High St. it would probably feel a little different than
if it were on the west side of High St. When a project comes before Municipal Planning
Commission and ultimately to City Council, members truly need to look at how that all
plays out in the setbacks.

Ms. Dorothy shared that much of how it feels when you are out in a pedestrian/bike
setting on that roadway is about speed of traffic. She thinks in the 25 mph zone in the
downtown corridor it feels much better to be a pedestrian than it does to be in the 35 mph
zone where people are consistently given tickets for going faster than that.

Mr. Greeson commented that in a previous presentation Mr. Brown provided pictures
from throughout central Ohio of various buildings and setbacks. We have those if that
becomes important to the conversation at some point.

Ms. Michael asked for clarification. The zoning categories that members are looking at
putting in place has a five to twenty foot range and that five to twenty foot range would
be off of the right-of-way. So if there is a higher right-of-way then there could be a shorter setback. If the right-of-way is very short then any planning would look at having a longer setback.

Mr. Brown shared that they really did not want each building to have the same setback. This gives the MPC the flexibility to vary the setbacks, which will help avoid the tunneling effect along the corridor. The architecture could play and the actual site layout of the development would go along to help.

18) Slides 68-76 showed examples of how various parcels along E. Wilson Bridge Road could be re-developed under the new guidelines.

19) Slide 77-89

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

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

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
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.

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 provided sustainable benefits and visual interest.

Development Standards:
- Buildings:
  - 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

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
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
  • 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.

Development Standards:
  • Buildings:
    – Parking
      • Design
        – Located to the rear or side of a building
      • Non-residential Uses
        – Parking shall not exceed 125% of what is required by Code
      • Residential Uses
        – A minimum of one parking space per dwelling unit
    • Bicycle Parking
      – Required to adequately serve the proposed use
    • Structured Parking
      – Permitted and encouraged within the WBC, and meet all standards outlined in the WPC for setbacks, screening and height

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

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.

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 EPA.
• Other impacts (water and sewer capacities, schools, fire & police)

Mr. Brown shared the following slide of the building at 500 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. He stated that one of the things that is unique about that building is the western portion that backs up to the parklands is actually on the wetland inventory and staff had some conversations with Franklin Soil and Water and our consultants. It is listed as a category 1 wetland, which is the lower quality wetland. He wanted to point out the various setbacks. One of the unique things that kind of halts any development on the western portion of this property is the 27” platted sewer that runs north and south
through the City and goes up into the Josephinum so no development can occur across the sanitary sewer line. This property has a development plan associated with it but this wetland would be left alone because of current EPA requirements and because of the 27” sewer line that acts as a barrier on the western portion of the site. With any redevelopment of this parcel or any parcel in the corridor meeting modern stormwater technology for water quality and quantity would actually help protect the area as well. He just wanted to point that out because many residents were concerned about that site.

OEPA recommendations, Cat 1=50’, Cat 2 = 75’, Cat 3 = 125’ which is additive to steep (12%) slopes.
You have about 35 feet of slope and a potential Cat 1, possible Cat 2 at best, which would mean 110’ feet

Traffic:
- The Wilson Bridge Corridor Plan is NOT automatic approval of all development. It is a plan to help us move forward in this corridor and capitalize on its vast potential.
- Each development will be required to perform a traffic study and mitigate its traffic impacts.
  - Turn lanes, etc. will be required when necessary to increase traffic carrying capacity as a condition of development approvals.
  - This is standard industry practice with development and conducted in all Central Ohio municipalities.
• Mixed-use development produces less traffic.
• The corridor has capacity for added traffic.
  – The issues are created by the intersections; primarily Wilson Bridge Road and High Street.
  – Wilson Bridge Road itself can handle much more traffic.
• The I-270/US-23 project will help alleviate traffic issues throughout the Wilson Bridge Road corridor
  – Some traffic issues occurring now are due to the construction
  – Some past traffic issues were due to the inadequate capacity of the interchange
  – These issues above have led to degradation of the Wilson Bridge Road and High Street intersection operations. Most, if not all, congestion in the corridor is directly related to this intersection; NOT the corridor itself.
• The project at Wilson Bridge Road and Huntley Road will also provide extra capacity in the corridor by providing a more attractive path to/from the corridor as opposed to going through the Wilson Bridge Road and High Street intersection.

Mr. Brown shared that since 1994 there are almost 16,000 less vehicles going through the Wilson Bridge to High St. corridor. That is not to say that there is not still traffic on Wilson Bridge Rd. but he did want to point out that the information is out there and it shows a decrease at that location. He thinks the decrease has to do with the increased lanes on I-270 and SR-315.

Mr. Brown concluded his presentation and stated that he is ready for questions.

Mr. Smith stated that he is still having a little trouble with the math on the setbacks, 5 to 20 feet on the setbacks. He hasn’t seen a map of where the right-of-ways are located. He asked if they are consistent throughout. Mr. Brown replied that the right-of-ways vary
parcel by parcel. There are different setbacks but they are truly measured from the actual right-of-way and not the actual street.

Mr. Smith asked if we know if the entire bike path is located in the right-of-way. Mr. Brown concurred that it is all located in the right-of-way. The landscaping and trees that were added are located on private property. Mr. Smith concluded that it is inconsistent with where the right-of-way stops. Mr. Brown agreed.

Mr. Hurley added that many of the trees that were removed were literally split by the right-of-way, so many of the replacement plantings were in a similar location although the path is wider than the old sidewalk.

Ms. Dorothy recalls Mr. Brown mentioning that if any parcel redevelops and it doesn’t have a wide enough right-of-way for a bike or pedestrian facility then we can request that the right-of-way be widened. Mr. Brown agreed. He added that the best example of that would be if anything developed on the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Rd. because there is only three feet to work with. The City would require dedication of enough right-of-way (12 to 15 feet) to at least be able to install the multi-use path that was recommended when that plan was adopted in the fall. The Holiday Inn site for example, staff has already told the applicant that they will need to do additional right-of-way dedication on the Wilson Bridge and High St. sides for any off-site improvements and for any improvements related to the corridor enhancement plan that was adopted in the fall.

Ms. Michael shared that several in the audience expressed interest in commenting on this topic. She requested that those addressing Council limit their remarks and if somebody has already shared a comment it is okay to agree with the comment but she requested that it not be repeated. She invited Mr. Wendling forward.

Larry Wendling, 7060 Rock Woods Place
Mr. Wendling shared that this has been a long process. He thanked Council, the City and the neighborhood for allowing this process to go on and continue to go on. He knows many have spent a great deal of time, energy and effort to put this together so that it creates a win-win for the neighborhoods, the City and it creates an enhancement for the community that everyone can be proud of. Through the process there has been several give and takes. It is probably a plan that the neighbors as well as the City are probably not 100% thrilled about but he thinks it does create a nice balance and a nice win-win. He thinks this is just the start as these are just guidelines. The real key is going to come when a developer comes before the Municipal Planning Commission to request some type of zoning adjustment. They need to remember that we went through a process and established guidelines. He stressed that it is up to everyone to make sure that the guidelines are followed and we don’t just allow a developer to come in and present a plan that doesn’t remotely fit within the guidelines. He is excited because we have a development moving forward. He shared that a couple of months ago they met with a developer that wanted to put some things in the multi-family area. His plan included all vinyl siding and very little natural materials. The plan didn’t have any fencing along the residential side or adhere to the tree replacement requirements that are in the guidelines.
He also wanted to far exceed the number of units allowed (58 on three acres instead of a maximum of 42). The developer felt that he had support for his plan until he met with the neighborhood. We met with him twice and voiced our concerns. These were four major items that the neighborhood fought hard to have included in the guidelines and we are hoping that as we continue to work together and work through this process that everybody remembers these guidelines and adheres to them.

Mr. Wendling shared that one item that is still a little concerning to him is the 2” tree minimum. Depending on the tree, a 2” tree could take forever to grow and actually replace the foliage that we have in our neighborhood. But that is part of that give and take but they still wanted to share that concern. They hope that staff will revisit that and go with a little bigger tree that would provide and enhance what they will lose out on.

Mr. Wendling closed by sharing that the reason their neighborhood has probably been a little more vocal is because they are the neighborhood that could be drastically impacted. They are going from a R-10 to Commercial in part and multi-family in part. He built his house twenty years ago long before this was even considered. Some of their other neighbors have made significant investments along Northigh Dr. and they just want to make sure that the investment they made long ago as good citizens of Worthington is continued to be protected and enhanced and that we all continue to work together to make it the best for everybody.

Ron Erb, 428 Blandings Court
Mr. Erb shared that he believes there is a need for a traffic study and he is glad there has been provisions made for future studies. He realizes that it is not practical to have a study done at this time given the current impact of the construction nearby.

Mr. Erb commented that as the legislation currently appears today, he asked if it is theoretically possible that the first developer in has the most opportunity to eat up whatever room for traffic increase is there. Mr. Brown thinks that is one of the reasons they have a traffic consultant on board. As each application comes in they will look at how that proposal will impact the corridor, the intersections, etc. Mr. Erb stated that realizing there is a maximum that any area can handle, being the first ones in they probably have the opportunity to make the biggest impact without having to worry about it long into the future. Mr. Brown reiterated that it will probably depend on the proposal.

Judy Anderson, 510 Olenwood Ave. and Val Knapp, 500 Olenwood Ave.
Ms. Anderson shared that one of their major concerns is traffic. They are asking that Council members consider conducting a preliminary traffic study that focuses on the capacity constraints along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. This would be along the whole corridor instead of development by development. One development impacts the entire corridor and they feel that they need to do an overall assessment across the entire corridor before implementing the new zoning categories. West Wilson Bridge Rd. has a unique situation related to traffic as much of the road is only two lanes with multiple office entrances into a short stretch of the road and it is limited by the two lane bridge so it really has limitations in terms of traffic along that road. Ms. Anderson stated that based on these
zoning standards with the setbacks, the allowable building heights and the parking garages along this office zone, the amount of density would be at least double and probably more than double along that area. So it is really a question, given the kind of density, of whether W. Wilson Bridge Rd. can handle that kind of traffic. At the heart of a responsible development is to involve residents, provide objective data and think through the consequences so as to make informed decisions about the future of the neighborhood in which residents live. So they believe a preliminary traffic study would provide needed data and information on the current traffic situation and an assessment of what level of density can be handled on W. Wilson Bridge Rd. now and in the future. As they stated in their letter to Council, they are not opposed to development in this important corridor, however they want to achieve the appropriate level of density to avoid negative impacts on the neighborhood and that is in relation to unworkable traffic congestion. By conducting a preliminary traffic study we will be increasing the likelihood of responsible development that will serve the City well in the years to come. They know the kind of density the plan calls for and there is a question of what the entire corridor can really handle and not development by development because it impacts the entire area.

Mr. Norstrom commented that Ms. Anderson stated that W. Wilson Bridge Road is going to be crowded. He asked if she was assuming it would stay the way it is now. Ms. Anderson replied yes that they are assuming unless they are planning on widening it. Mr. Norstrom stated that the experts Mr. Brown has consulted with say that there is plenty of capacity in the West corridor. What that means is that it could go from two to four lanes or two to three lanes. You are asking us to assume things are the same and we can’t do that. Ms. Anderson commented that she misunderstood because she thought from conversations with Mr. Brown that there was no intentions of widening that road. When you mention about the capacity she was assuming he was talking about it being able to hold the capacity as the road is now.

Mr. Smith shared that he was under the same impression. He asked Mr. Brown for clarification on what the consultant said. Mr. Brown invited Mr. Gallagher, the City’s traffic consultant from Carpenter Marty Transportation to comment. He added that in the discussion there was no plan to widen the road. He thinks off-site improvements can be turn lanes and de-acceleration lanes. Those were the types of things that they were thinking, at least in his mind it is what they were thinking. As he showed in the right-of-way there is a lot to work with if off-site improvements are needed. Mr. Norstrom pointed out that it could involve a turn lane which would increase the number of lanes that are currently there. Mr. Brown agreed.

Mr. Norstrom added that if members felt that the development would require increasing the lanes that is something that we have an option to do. For example, we are currently investing millions of dollars at the intersection of Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena Rd. to improve that intersection. So those are decisions that we make based on development. It is premature to do a study at this time. We know that traffic will increase with any development along that corridor, which is why we ask for traffic studies to be done on the individual developments.
Ms. Anderson again stated that she was under the misunderstanding that there is a possibility that the roads will be widened or a turn lane added. Mr. Norstrom stated that if the corridor were to develop to the maximum then he would say yes to handle the traffic there. Just like is coming up a little later tonight, members are looking at potentially increasing the lanes on SR-161 to the west because of development that has already occurred. Ms. Anderson replied that she didn’t understand that. The thinking too was that there is a two lane bridge and if you widen or put in turning lanes there (unsure where “there” is referring to) there will still be the congestion down by the bridge, which she doesn’t think Worthington owns and then on up on Linworth. So you are going to widen one area and then there will be congestion on down the road. Mr. Norstrom commented that she is making an assumption. Look at what just happened at the US-23 and I-270 location. There has been millions of dollars spent to increase the capacity of that area. The same thing could be done in the future by changing the bridge on W. Wilson Bridge Rd. and potentially expanding further west. Those are all options out there in the future. Ms. Anderson stated that clearly residents have to understand that this proposal that you are making was not under the assumption that you were not going to widen roads or make major changes so that is news. She thinks residents need to be aware of you talking about the possibility. She asked if the developer would make the decision that the road needs to be widened to four lanes. Mr. Norstrom replied that the developer would not do that but the city could put fees on the developer to help the city pay for the expansion. Ms. Anderson again stated this information is new and she thanked members for the opportunity to share.

John Gallagher of Carpenter Marty Transportation shared that he is not sure what specifically members want him to address. He thinks what Mr. Brown and Mr. Norstrom said is that there is capacity in the corridor. The intersections are the pinch points, which is true for almost every roadway countrywide. The new developer would come to the table in this corridor if this code change were to pass, that is specifically what we would have them look at. Ms. Anderson mentioned the impact of one development on the entire corridor. There is nothing that says we couldn’t make every developer look at all of the intersections in the corridor. However, if they were to develop on the far west side, they would have very little or minimal impact on the far east side and it probably wouldn’t be necessary but it could be done if the citizens demand that it be done. Primarily the improvements that these traffic studies show are improvements at intersections such as turn lanes or inter-connection of traffic signals to improve flow dynamics through the corridor. There are a lot of things that can be done to the corridor to improve the corridor as it exists now as well as to carry more traffic in the future.

Mr. Foust stated these are incremental changes. If you’re thinking that you are going to wake up one Tuesday morning and two lanes are suddenly going to be four lanes wide, that is really not what we are talking about. We are talking about incremental changes over a period of time based on development as it occurs over the long hull. Mr. Brown agreed. He added that he thinks that is one of the reasons at the March meeting that they looked at dropping the heights and densities in half. He thinks there was the caveat thrown out there by Mr. Norstrom and he agreed. If we want to go back to exploring increasing the heights or looking at what was recommended in the 2011 plan then a
detailed analysis of a worst case scenario or use, we would look at that. He thinks that is where it would come into play of what do you fit in roadway and bike and pedestrian wise in this width. He doesn’t think that there are any plans tomorrow to widen to three lanes, four lanes, or five lanes or anything that would propose that. Again, as it goes through the Planning Commission process and ultimately to City Council he thinks that would be one of the things that they would be concerned about and look at. If the proposal stated that to get to capacity it needs an overpass or its own off ramp, he thinks those are the type of things that members would look at and have a consultant on board to help staff, Commission members and Council members move the projects.

Mr. Greeson shared that it is really no different than today. You could have an applicant file and request variances with higher densities. Staff would require a traffic evaluation and the various bodies in city government would make choices on whether or not we want to allow that impact or require payments or construction of improvements to handle or mitigate the impact. He thinks one of the fundamental differences here is that we are not saying that we accept all rezoning even if they have traffic consequences that we don’t want to accept. We can still not accept certain impacts if that is the choice of the various bodies just like it is today. We are saying if your traffic impacts could be mitigated and dealt with and we find them acceptable, we will allow greater densities and here are a series of better land development standards than we have today that you will have to comply with. It has better natural features standards, better storm water standards, and better architectural standards, and all of which are important to the long term success of the development in this corridor. He still thinks we have choices to make. It is the same choices we have today but hopefully we are just making them with a better plan in place because we will get the development pressures regardless.

Val Knapp, 500 Olenwood Ave.

Ms. Knapp shared that she is coming tonight about the setbacks. She thinks development along the Wilson Bridge corridor is important to the future well-being of Worthington. There is diversity of neighborhoods and each area has a unique characteristic, even along the Wilson Bridge corridor. Even though it is unified by the name Wilson Bridge Road, each section has its unique characteristics and history and prospects for the future. That is why this evening they are asking that Council not make a blanket decision for the whole corridor for the setbacks of East and West Wilson Bridge Road. The way the ordinance is not written, the setbacks along the West and East Wilson Bridge Road will be treated the same period but they do not have the same characteristics or each individual as to where they are. They would like for Council to change the terms of the setback currently written as from five to twenty feet out from right-of-way to at least twenty feet for the second row of buildings, specifically the area from the Olentangy Park to Old Wilson Bridge Road. To increase the setback footage would drastically reduce the canyon and tunneling effect along the corridor. This stretch of West Wilson Bridge Road is only two lanes wide at one area and is bordered by residential neighborhoods on the south side and the Olentangy Park on the north side. Reducing the now current fifty foot setbacks required throughout Worthington to five foot setbacks would dramatically change the landscape in the area and experience people would have driving down to the park area.
Ms. Knapp shared that Council Chambers is probably fifty feet. It is quite a change from
the five to twenty feet that this change would allow. As they have stated to Council
before, they are not against future development along the corridor. Please recognize the
differences along the Wilson Bridge corridor and consider each side of the Wilson Bridge
Road as different entities; each contributing to future development in Worthington in
their own way.

Stacy Cochran, 160 Northigh Dr.
Ms. Cochran commented that she hopes the City adheres to the guidelines and the vision
that was agreed upon by the committee when they created this language when
developers and builders approach the City.

Benjamin Meehan on behalf of Carol Meehan, 130 Caren Ave.
Prior to reading a statement from his mother who was unable to attend, Mr. Meehan
asked Mr. Brown to display the following slide as it shows the location of his mother’s
property at 130 Caren Ave.

![Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning](image)

Ms. Meehan’s letter is as follows:

My name is Carol Meehan. I live at 130 Caren Ave., one of two properties adjacent
to the Holiday Inn parcel. The first house on Caren, the immediate neighbor to the
east was purchased by Mr. Patel of the Holiday Inn and is slated for demolition
while the two remaining houses, my house and my neighbor to the west, remain
residential. I want to tell you how the proposed variance will affect me, my property and Worthington in the future. At this time buildings adjacent to my backyard cannot exceed three stories in height, which is the height of the current Holiday Inn. If the variance being requested is granted, there will be two hotels, each four stories tall. These hotels will be directly behind me and my understanding is that they will be only fifty feet from my property line and 33% taller than the current building. While I recognize that the city of Worthington may benefit from two large hotels between Wilson Bridge and Caren Ave., the presence of two, four story buildings so close to my property will detract measurably from the sight lines from both the inside and outside rear of my house as well as the appearance of a quiet residential neighborhood. Allowing four story buildings to go up so close to residences set a dangerous precedence for the city. Nowhere else in the city is there a four story building only fifty feet from a residence. What other developers will see these buildings and decide that they too want to put tall buildings so close to someone’s house. If the city grants this variance it will be difficult and perhaps illegal to say “no” the next time this comes up. These creates a slippery slope. I vigorously oppose this project and ask that you deny this variance. Thank you for listening.

Jayne Rosandich, 140 Caren Ave.

Ms. Rosandich shared that she is one of the two houses that could be seen on the slide. She is asking Council to be thoughtful in considering the overlay and accepting it as presented, particularly in regard to the Holiday Day Inn and the four stories that members are willing to accept on that property. It’s just wrong. It is just not what Worthington is. They have owned three different properties in Worthington and have owned them all within the Worthington Estates’ area and Villa Charmante. It is just not what Worthington is to allow four stories next to abutting property lines that are residential. She agrees that it is a slippery slope. It is starting a precedent and Worthington Estates is one of our premiere neighborhoods. Worthington has great neighborhoods that are all different. We are also the second hottest real estate market in the nation. She thinks Council members probably know that. There was another report that came out that we garner the highest rates for rentals in Worthington. We are a hot real estate market. She just feels like they are not being considered. Please reconsider that four stories there or something in order to preserve the nature of the Worthington Estates subdivision and make it work and worth it.

Mr. Norstrom stated that he wants to make sure he understands the information shared by the last two speakers as they were talking about variances. He asked Mr. Brown if we have an application yet from the Holiday Inn. Mr. Brown replied that they do have an application that went before the Architectural Review Board but nothing in the past six to eight weeks. Mr. Norstrom commented that what they are proposing specifically says three stories in the western most 180 feet of that property. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Norstrom concluded that what is before Council tonight is three stories. If the hotel operators come in and request four stories then the two speakers are speaking to the wrong body. They would need to attend the ARB meeting rather than City Council. Mr. Brown added that it would also include the Board of Zoning Appeals because what was originally recommended for the Holiday Inn site was the five stories. When they were
drafting the regulations they felt that that was really kind of tall due to the parking change so they adjusted it to four stories. In talking with some of the residents staff realized that the area is the transition into Worthington Estates. So instead of allowing four stories on the entire site we kept the existing zoning rights that allow for three stores west of the 130 Caren address. Any increase to four stories would have to be east of that location.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the issue was raised of the five to twenty foot setback on West Wilson Bridge Road. He asked what staff considered in making the recommendation before Council. Mr. Brown replied that he thinks the range from a five foot setback to a twenty foot would allow for flexibility on the site. What they were looking at, at least on East Wilson Bridge Road and even on the south wide of Wilson Bridge Road is to be able to allow for development to occur on the site. He thinks the original recommendation was for the increase in height but we want responsible development so we felt that truly having that mobility and engaging the actual street front, even if just walking or driving by was truly the way to help get you there.

Jim Sauer, 379 Pittsfield Dr.
Mr. Sauer shared that part of the report included a number of photographs of examples of what could be expected or proposed so as we went through the report tonight there were many numbers and it is difficult sometimes to understand what a number means. So what does five feet mean or twenty feet? It is difficult to understand a lot of this. He visited many of the projects that were presented by pictures. There were three or four in Upper Arlington, several in Bexley, and a couple in New Albany. He didn’t see them all but he did see a number because he wanted to obtain flavor for what was being proposed and what was being suggested and representative of what is in the report in terms of the guidelines. Many of the projects that he saw were well done and were projects that would fit in our community. What he noticed though in the projects and in the communities was something that was different from here and that is that many of those projects really crowded the street. They were much closer than he thinks is appropriate. He knows that we have a couple of blocks in the Worthington area where the buildings are up close to the street downtown and it is very nice and very walkable. He knows one of the goals for the development of this area is for a pedestrian friendly environment and that makes a lot of sense. So the thought is if you move the buildings up closer to the street supposedly it becomes more pedestrian friendly. He questions whether or not that is the way to create a pedestrian friendly community. He is thinking that his house isn’t that close to the street and yet he thinks his street is quite pleasant to walk through. He guesses that Council members too live where the houses sit back a little from the street. There are only a couple of blocks within the city of Worthington where buildings are up close and yet he would suggest that Worthington is a very friendly, walkable community. There are some streets that could be improved but he doesn’t think just moving buildings up close to the street makes it walkable or friendly especially when you think of the area around High St. and Wilson Bridge Road. There are six and eight lanes there. There is a lot of traffic and it is moving much faster there than it is in central Worthington. Do you think moving the buildings closer to the street is going to make that intersection more
pedestrian friendly. He doesn’t think so. You are still going to have to fight your way to get across there.

Mr. Sauer added that the other thing is; what is special about the Worthington community? What would we like to see when we grow up? He asked if they have noticed the flags that are flying along the street downtown. It says “Tree City USA” so he thinks of there being many trees in the community and we value those. They look nice and add a great deal to the character of the community. He is concerned that we force our buildings so close to the street that we no longer have room for the pleasant landscaping. Yes you can put a tree between the sidewalk and the curb but in the community the really nice trees are beyond the sidewalk and he just wants to make sure as we develop this area, yes we like for it to be pedestrian friendly but don’t force people right up to the sidewalk and real close to the street because that isn’t necessarily the best way to get there. What he would like to see is the ability to maintain the streets, the trees, and the plant materials because he thinks that is part of the character of the community. He would like to see the setbacks currently written as five to twenty maybe moved back to at least fifteen to thirty or something like that but whatever is the right number, he would like to see it moved back a little farther.

Janet Warton, 490 Olenwood Ave.
Ms. Warton stated that she appreciates all of the work that Council members have done. There has been a lot of work on planning, proposals and reviews. As citizens they want to ensure that we have responsible development for our community and that it is resident driven as they care about what the community looks like and the potential changes. She would also like to ensure that as these guidelines are considered and before a final vote is taken that we surface any conflicts or potential conflicts of interest on the part of the Council members who are voting on this ordinance. She respectfully asked that each Council member disclose any personal or professional business interest in a firm, engaged development, real estate or related fields given that through the development of this corridor they could personally benefit from the development of these pieces of property. She further request that any individual that has a potential conflict of interest recuse themselves from further comment or voting on this proposal.

Mr. Norstrom stated that he needs to address that because that is exactly what members do if there is any conflicts of interest. They recuse themselves from voting. That is standard procedure. He asked if she is aware of someone who has a conflict of interest. Ms. Warton replied no but she is just saying that if someone does have a real estate interest or an interest in developing these pieces of property and could benefit from it personally then they need to recuse themselves. Mr. Norstrom shared that members are basically required to do that.

Ms. Michael added that for a conflict of interest to occur a member would have to be involved with a developer who is developing a specific site. Just because somebody may represent somebody doing residential real estate, residential real estate has nothing to do with the site and there is no conflict. Mr. Norstrom commented that if any member of Council owns property or things like that we would not have to have a relationship with a
developer. We could own property in the corridor and have a conflict of interest. There are many ways to have a conflict of interest but he just wants to make sure, because he has heard comments like that from the public before and if you don’t think we are doing our job by making statements when we have conflicts of interest then he thinks they are making assumptions that aren’t correct. Members understand what their duties are and if they have conflicts of interest, they are very conservative about making sure they don’t vote on an issue where they would have a conflict of interest.

When asked by Ms. Michael if Law Director Pam Fox would like to comment, Mrs. Fox replied that she thinks Mr. Norstrom’s comments were correct. Council members are always required on a true conflict of interest to recuse themselves keeping in mind that they are also members of this community and they have friends who work here and they have many relationships but any true conflicts of interest they are required to recuse themselves.

Ms. Michael shared that members have three options for this legislation:

1) Make amendments now before the vote
2) Table to amend later
3) Vote as presented

She asked for members’ thoughts.

Mr. Smith shared that about a month ago when members were approached with Approach 1 and Approach 2, he was under the impression that members could pick and choose categories based on geography. He guesses he was wrong on that but that is what he would like to do is chisel the legislation apart a little bit and approve. It looks like everybody has consensus on the east side language but the west side might need a little more time. He would like for members to consider tabling the ordinance.

Ms. Michael commented that the entire document would need to be rewritten. Mrs. Fox added that there are certain changes that could probably be easily made but the development standards are written to cross the entire corridor. There are zoning categories that cross over both east and west so there is nothing we can do tonight to rewrite this because we would have to go back through and pull out all of the areas where there are references to the entire corridor and those certain development standards that relate to that certain corridor so it would take more than the time we have tonight. She would not want to have to try to redraft this document this evening.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Smith what he is objecting to in the plan. Mr. Smith gave the example of the northern part of the West Wilson Bridge. It currently allows three to four stories and at some point it was five or six stories and included residential. Just a month ago we took this approach. To him, that is just a little quick and there are some questions that could be answered. Mr. Norstrom asked him for specifics.
Mr. Smith asked Mr. Hurley how far away from the street is the bike path. Mr. Hurley replied that generally speaking where it is consistent it is about four feet but he can’t say that is the case all the way along the path.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Gallagher how many feet would be needed to put in another lane generally speaking. Mr. Gallagher replied that generally you need twelve but as you can see there is twenty one to the south. Mr. Smith asked about the northern side because that would be a viable option as well.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the bikeway is located entirely in the right-of-way. He asked what his issue is. Mr. Smith replied that we would have to get rid of the bike lane if we were to improve the road. Mr. Norstrom replied that ten to fifteen years in the future assuming that it got developed to high density. Mr. Smith added that if there is a building located five foot from the right-of-way then. . . Mr. Myers stated that we would take more right-of-way. Mr. Norstrom added that staff has already addressed that. They would require more right-of-way. Mr. Smith stated that the math doesn’t add up. If there is already a building there five feet from the right-of-way. . .

Ms. Michael showed how it would fit on the diagram.

Mr. Smith stated that those are the questions that he wants to dive into a little bit further. What if we can’t go south and have to go north because traffic is going to continue to be an issue.

Mr. Foust commented that if members move forward with this legislation and keep the five to twenty foot range, he asked what would happen if a developer comes in with a proposal and it is five foot and Council or ARB looks at it and says “no”, we don’t want to let that go through at five because of some concerns like Mr. Smith’s and we make them change it to fifteen. He asked if we would be subject to any kind of legal action for not allowing that since it is within our own prescribed limits.

Mr. Norstrom asked to address the issue for both Mr. Smith and Mr. Foust. He stated that Council is approving guidelines. If a developer comes in with a plan that is too close, the developer is going to have to rezone the property to begin with and in that rezoning the City has the control to tell them whether five or twenty feet so what members are doing at this time is just putting the blueprint in place. Those kinds of questions are moot because a developer cannot come in and do what the question implies.

Mr. Foust thinks he was implying the opposite from how he was interpreting it. He knows that you are not going to wake up one morning and find a four lane bridge because it doesn’t happen overnight. These are guidelines and we do have the ability piece by piece to allow within those guidelines but if someone wants to do five feet and we say it has to be twenty, we are harmless in that decision. We have full control of that. That is his point.
Mr. Brown shared that he thinks that is one of the reasons they added the five to twenty because depending on where you’re located, there is nothing proposed for the north side of West Wilson Bridge Road but for example, you have direct access to the bike lane. He thinks their thought was if the parcels were developing on the north side they would probably ask for a parallel sidewalk to be installed so there is no direct access point and the chance of someone walking out and getting hit by a bike. In that scenario we would probably have a parallel walkway that would correspond and run along the bike path. The five to twenty would come into play then.

Mr. Greeson thinks Mr. Brown outlined a good example with the Holiday Inn redevelopment. In that case we are asking for additional right-of-way because: 1) There are existing conditions where we think we can improve the bike and pedestrian access; and, 2) Anticipation that there may be need for future improvements around a very busy intersection. So you make those judgments based on evaluations of those sites and your knowledge of traffic.

Mr. Smith shared another concern that he has about not separating the different quadrants up is that he hasn’t been convinced that three to four stories is the right number on the northern side of West Wilson Bridge. Maybe it is six stories and one or two stories on the front but we haven’t really talked about that.

Mr. Myers commented that we have been at this for eight years. It has been in front of Council for six months. To sit here and say we haven’t talked about that when we have made substantial changes based upon Council and citizen input to this document. He thinks it is time to vote. Our first speaker tonight said it as well as anyone could. Mr. Myers acknowledged there being things in the legislation that he doesn’t like. He stated that legislation is the art of compromise. What is here is a blueprint. It is a guideline. We don’t know what is going to go in there. We have an ordinance that has been introduced. He thinks it is time to move forward on this and either vote it up or vote it down. Another month or another two weeks is not going to change our disagreements.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 12-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Norstrom, Dorothy, Myers, Foust, Troper, and Michael

No 1 Smith

Ordinance No. 12-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

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.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that Thom Slack with District 6 of the Ohio Department of Transportation is present this evening. As members know, a couple of meetings ago Mr. Slack and he gave a presentation about the City’s participation in this multi-jurisdictional corridor study of SR-161, which has been a goal of the City to improve in terms of its aesthetics, it’s bike and pedestrian amenities, its charter and to reduce congestion. Both he and Mr. Slack are available to answer any questions. We also have some of our citizens, Mr. Shary and Dr. Robie present who may have some comments. Council members received the attached letter from them. We are appreciative of all of them sitting through such a long meeting this evening.

Mr. Slack thanked Council for their consideration as well as staff’s time and efforts on this study. It is any opportunity to improve safety and provide congestion relief in that section of SR-161, particularly in the Linworth area. It is an area that we’ve known as an identified need. We look forward to working with Council on this.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she would like to echo the document that Mr. Shary and Dr. Robie wrote. She wants to emphasize that she would like to make sure that considerations are taken for the last two pages of their four page document (pages 3 and 4). She agrees with much of what they shared. We are looking at not just a level of service for traffic but looking at level of service for all types of transportation. We want to make sure that we are making the neighborhood safety and a nicer place to live and not just to get as fast as possible from one place to another while making it less safe for the existing pedestrians and bicycles in the neighborhoods and increasing noise. That is definitely not what we want. She thanked them for waiting as members do take a lot of time and deliberation and try to listen to everyone who is involved. ODOT is definitely a huge stakeholder in this and she thanked Mr. Slack for coming and sitting through this entire meeting.

Mr. Norstrom commented that he is on record as he opposes the percentage of funds that the City is dedicating to this project.

Ms. Michael also thanked Mr. Shary and Dr. Robie and believes that many of the points that they brought up in their letter is consistent with the community and their neighbors and probably at least the Worthington part of the corridor if not the whole corridor.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 13-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, and Michael

No 1 Norstrom
Ordinance No. 13-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Ordinance No. 14-2016

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 for the Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs at Proprietors Road and SR 161 and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 618-15)

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

Ordinance No. 15-2016

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 Tennis and Basketball Court Resurfacing Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 629-16)

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

Ordinance No. 16-2016

Amending Section 1177.08(a) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Include a Member of City Council as a Person Who May Appeal a Decision of the Board of Architectural Review.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

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

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- Request to Bid – Tennis & Basketball Court Resurfacing

*Mr. Greeson shared that staff just needs a motion to authorize the request for bids on this item.*
MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion authorizing staff to bid the Tennis & Basketball Court Resurfacing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

- Volunteer Peace Officers’ Dependents Fund Board

Mr. Greeson shared that the state legislature created a requirement that the City create a Volunteer Peace Officers’ Dependents Fund Board. It will be very similar to the Firefighter’s Board that is related to volunteer firefighters that actually deals with our part time firefighters and what happens in case of a line of duty death which we hope we never have to go through. We need two members to serve on the board. In the case of the Firefighters Board it is the Chief and a council member (it was Dr. Chosy). One way to approach this is to have the Chief of Police (whoever that might be in the future) and a council member who is interested in serving.

Mr. Myers liked the idea.

When asked by Ms. Michael how soon an appointment needed to be made Mr. Greeson replied tonight.

Mr. Myers agreed to serve.

Ms. Michael asked for all those who agree to have Mr. Myers and the Police Chief serve on this board to say “aye”.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael reported there being the need for another appointment. This is our turn to have a representative on the COTA Board. She understands that Mr. Norstrom would like to serve in that capacity. Mr. Norstrom agreed that he would.

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to appoint Mr. Norstrom to serve as the City’s representative to the COTA Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

- Liquor Permit - Sbarro

Mr. Greeson stated that this is a transfer from JDK to Investments dba as Sbarro LLC. Members will recall that when this was Rotollo’s they TREXed in a liquor permit to serve alcohol in the expanded premises. Rotollo sold to Sbarro who has had a change in their corporate name.
MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to not object to the liquor permit transfer. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

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

Mr. Greeson reported there being a vacancy on the Bike and Pedestrian Board. Staff is not asking for that vacancy to be filled this evening although we will distribute the applications from folks that previously interviewed for the position. It can be discussed in Executive Session at a later date.

Mrs. Fox reported that the appeal for the denial of a variance on the Bakhshi property at 410 Tucker has been dismissed. The property owner decided to dismiss the action so we are done with that. She shared that they filed an amended plan that met all of the requirements.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Smith reported an update from last week’s sidewalk situation. He talked with some folks who were in the audience and will try to incorporate some of their plans by working with Mrs. Fox so more to come.

Ms. Dorothy reminded members that the Moses Wright Park has a cleanup day on Saturday and pre-cycle.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of June, 2016.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Department of Planning & Building

April 18, 2016

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
  – Pedestrian and bicycle friendliness of the corridor
    • Improve mobility & walkability
Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study

Background:
• This corridor is very ripe for redevelopment with freeway visibility
  — Extremely desirable to businesses.
• The anticipated benefits of the US-23/I-270 & SR-315/I-270 project are spawning redevelopment in the area.
• Office redevelopment, this corridor could be the economic engine of the City
• The mixed-used element has many benefits:
  — Residents have an excellent opportunity for short commutes to work and convenience shopping
  — Increase in walking means a decrease in short trips by car which both benefit health and reduce traffic congestion
  — Spurs revitalization
    • The Shops at Worthington Place
  — Provides more housing opportunities and choices
  — Creates a sense of place and community
  — Encourages economic development

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 uses to approximately 65 acres.
Recommendations:

**Promotion**
Objective 1
Enhance the image and brand of Worthington.

Actions
1.5 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. Create 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 an 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 defined 'street wall'.

4.4 Develop new standards that encourage and require new development to have pedestrian access from the street and include bike 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 dining.)

5.3 Enhance the entrance to McCord 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](image-url)
### 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>Multi Family</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Chic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Medium Density)</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>15-18 stories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Residential (High Density)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15-20 stories</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Residential (Medium Density)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5-10 stories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>10,000-20,000/sf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>o</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>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>30,000-60,000/sf</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Office</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.00-10,000/sf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Professional</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Professional</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mixed use residential and professional office on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Warner 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 18, 2015 to all those signed up on the City’s email, updated email went out on January 8, 2016, February 5, 2016 and again on March 11, 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
  - 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, 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

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
• Worthington Industries – Purchased building
• 350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. – Building Redevelopment
• 150 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. First Financial (formerly Insight Bank)
• Multi-use path and bike lane improvements
• Lower vacancy rate in the corridor
• Northeast Gateway Redesign
  
  – Wilson Bridge/Huntley/Worthington-Galena
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Discussion Items:
- Building Height
- Setbacks
- Tract Coverage
- Design & Materials
- Natural Features
- Traffic

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Biggest Change:
- Approach #2 *(Presented before City Council on March 14, 2016)*
- Height and density reduced by half of what was proposed in the Wilson Bridge Corridor Study.
  - Reduced heights from 6 stories to 4 stories, and heights reduced in other areas from 5 stories to 3-4 stories in height.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Strategies to move forward:

• 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.

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

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 Zoning Categories:

Approach #2 – Updated: March 14, 2016

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

Proposed Zoning:
- WBC-1: Medium Density Residential
- WBC-2: Professional Office
- WBC-3: Mixed Use
- WBC-4: Office
- WBC-5: Office High Density Residential

Legend:
- Residential (Medium Density)
- Residential (High Density)
- Office
- Park
- Proposed Roads
- Proposed Streets
- Proposed Greenway
- Neighborhood Office
- Mix Use
- Mix Use Hotel
- Public Space
- Fire Station Bridge
Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study Recommendations

Current Zoning:
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Current Zoning Permitted Height:

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:

- **3 stories**
- **4 stories**
- **2 ½ stories**
- **3 ½ stories**

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:

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

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’.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

- 3 stories for properties south of Wilson Bridge Rd.
- 4 stories for properties north of Wilson Bridge Rd.

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.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Proposed Building Heights:

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

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

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.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

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><strong>WBC-1</strong></td>
<td>Multi-Family Dwellings Home Occupations Public Uses Essential Services Accessory Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBC-2</strong></td>
<td>Office Uses Essential Services Accessory Uses</td>
<td>Public Uses Semi-Public Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBC-3</strong></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><strong>WBC-4</strong></td>
<td>Office Uses Animal Hospitals Essential Services Accessory Uses</td>
<td>Hotel Public Uses Semi-Public Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion Items:
- Building Height
- Setbacks – Right-of-Ways
- Tract Coverage
- Design & Materials
- Natural Features
- Traffic
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

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.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Wilson Bridge Road - Varying ROW Widths

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
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Approach #2 - Proposed Zoning Categories:

Example Development Scenario
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Approach #2 - Proposed Zoning Categories:

Example Development Scenario

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

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 provided sustainable benefits and visual interest.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Development Standards:
• Buildings:
  – 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:**
  – Parking
    • Design
      – Located to the rear or side of a building
    • Non-residential Uses
      – Parking shall not exceed 125% of what is required by Code
    • Residential Uses
      – A minimum of one parking space per dwelling unit
  – Bicycle Parking
    – Required to adequately serve the proposed use
  – Structured Parking
    – Permitted and encouraged within the WBC, and meet all standards outlined in the WPC for setbacks, screening and height

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 EPA.

• Other impacts (water and sewer capacities, schools, fire & police)
**Traffic:**

- The Wilson Bridge Corridor Plan is NOT automatic approval of all development. It is a plan to help us move forward in this corridor and capitalize on its vast potential.
- Each development will be required to perform a traffic study and mitigate its traffic impacts.
  - Turn lanes, etc. will be required when necessary to increase traffic carrying capacity as a condition of development approvals.
  - This is standard industry practice with development and conducted in all Central Ohio municipalities.
- Mixed-use development produces less traffic.
- The corridor has capacity for added traffic.
  - The issues are created by the intersections; primarily Wilson Bridge Road and High Street.
  - Wilson Bridge Road itself can handle much more traffic.
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Traffic:

• The I-270/US-23 project will help alleviate traffic issues throughout the Wilson Bridge Road corridor
  – Some traffic issues occurring now are due to the construction
  – Some past traffic issues were due to the inadequate capacity of the interchange
  – These issues above have led to degradation of the Wilson Bridge Road and High Street intersection operations. Most, if not all, congestion in the corridor is directly related to this intersection; NOT the corridor itself.

• The project at Wilson Bridge Road and Huntley Road will also provide extra capacity in the corridor by providing a more attractive path to/from the corridor as opposed to going through the Wilson Bridge Road and High Street intersection.

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

Historical Traffic Flow information – Wilson Bridge Road & High Street

Year 2014 - 37,350
Year 2010 - 38,140
Year 2006 - 37,340
Year 2003 - 45,670
Year 2001 - 42,470
Year 1994 - 53,170

*15,820 less vehicles since 1994
Questions

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning
Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

27" Sewer Line

Click to start drawing
April 6, 2016

Worthington City Council  
Attn: Kay Thress, City Clerk  
Worthington Municipal Building  
6550 North High Street  
Worthington, Ohio 43085  

Re: West Dublin-Granville Road Corridor Traffic Study  
Please include with the City Council Packet

Dear Worthington City Council Members:

As Worthington residents, we recognize that significant development of the West Dublin-Granville Road corridor has the potential to very positively or very negatively affect the character and long-term health of the City of Worthington and the Worthington schools. The impact we will experience over the next couple decades is much greater than simply traffic flow.

Our hope is that City Council will take into consideration the broader context of any adjustment to 161, which appears to be largely for the benefit of commercial development on the OSU property. We have included with this letter the more significant impact analyses we believe should be included in any study that Worthington is helping to fund, or whose conclusion it is planning to support.

Our intention with these questions is to fully understand what is anticipated on West Dublin-Granville Road, and how it might benefit Worthington. We are not opposed to being a good neighbor, and surely Worthington can benefit from high quality development that improves the overall neighboring community, but we want to make certain that the bargain we are striking is fair to Worthington, for the benefit we are providing our neighboring developers, especially if there is negative consequence to some residents and students in our city. As with any great city, we should regard how we manage traffic as essential to the character and financial well-being of our city and its residents.

Sincerely,

Mark D. Shary  
6565 Plesenton Dr  
614.323.8453

David Robie  
6585 Plesenton Dr  
614.563.0050

With individual copies to: Bonnie Michael, Scott Myers, Rachel Dorothy, Doug Foust, David Norstrom, Doug Smith, Michael Troper and Matt Greeson, City Manager
Key Considerations to be Addressed in a More Complete West Dublin-
Granville Road Corridor Traffic Study

We suggest that any recommendation to change or acquiesce to routing or lane addition
along 161 to accommodate development and growth outside of our city occur only with
consideration of at least the following items:

1) The type, nature, and density of the development to occur along the OSU property line. Prior
to signing off on any report, it should include core assumptions about the development that is
giving rise to the traffic, in the event that Worthington wishes to condition its
recommendation to those assumptions.

2) The exit volume of each direction of traffic entering Worthington from Linworth –
(north/south on Linworth; north/south on Olentangy; north/south on 315; through central
Worthington). Where are these cars heading, and what impact will it have on each of our
throughfares? How much is “cutting through” Worthington to reach other destinations, and
how much is terminating in areas of interest to Worthington?

3) The entrance volume of each direction of traffic exiting Worthington towards Linworth (as in
(2), above). What is the source of these cars – from which thoroughfares? How much is
“cutting through” Worthington to reach destinations west, and how much is Worthington
residents using the egress to Dublin?

4) The incremental persistence of audible traffic and the incremental decibel levels as heard by
the Worthington residents on 161 and the residents within ½ mile of 161, assuming an
additional lane and the additional volumes, at various assumed speeds (25-45 mph)

5) The additional traffic volume within 2 east-west blocks of the 315/161 intersection during
school restricted speed hours, and the impact on school traffic and student pedestrian safety
(at both high schools)

6) The additional traffic volume crossing the bike/walk path at the 315N ramp on 161, and the
cross-walks at 161/Olentangy, and the impact on pedestrian safety

7) The impact of additional road improvements in the area on the analysis (widening of
Sawmill, full opening of the Emerald Parkway/Sawmill connector, widening of Hard Road,
completion of the 315/270 interchange, completion of the 23/270 interchange, etc.). To what
degree do these improvements relieve 161 of traffic burden that today or tomorrow might
more easily flow on 161? If the answer is not material, does that suggest all of the
incremental traffic is due solely to cars entering/exiting properties on 161 between Sawmill
and 315? How is that possible?
Planning Considerations to any Bargain Struck with our Northwest Corridor Neighbors in Exchange for Adjusting Worthington Traffic Capacity on 161

Providing more fluid routing for traffic on 161 will not just make traffic move more smoothly; it will invite more traffic, too. Whether it enables more development to succeed or simply provides a better east-west alternative for existing traffic than Snouffer, Bethel, Hard Road or 270, there is no question that opening up 161 will bring more cars into Worthington, both to reach 315 and to High Street.

This isn’t automatically a good or bad thing, but since we (Worthington) hold some cards here, we should use them to make the best outcome we can for Worthington. In some priority, we need to decide what measures we should influence in order to:

1) **Prevent West 161 from becoming like East 161.** Unlike the east entrance to our community, there are no natural barriers (such as I-71, Jack Maxton, and Harding) to stopping the decline of housing stock and retail from infecting Worthington from the west, so it’s far more critical to our city that West 161 development standards be held higher and more in line with our school and community demographics. There is a bargain to be struck with the development influencers in Columbus, Don Scott (OSU), and Perry Twp on what we will accept in exchange for acquiescing to wider roads and intersections.

2) **Make 161 walk-ability and connectivity from the west side of Worthington to/from central Worthington more safe and inviting; not less.** Route 315 already divides our city unlike any other suburb of Columbus. School age children have enough of a challenge getting to school or making a trip to Graeters or Dairy Queen from west of the river as it is. It’s not that comfortable even for adults to traverse Olentangy and 315 on 161, today, with traffic at the current level and speed. Let’s make sure that 161 development does not further divide west and central Worthington by adding more traffic along walkways that are too close to a street on which traffic routinely runs 45 mph, and which is risky to cross between Olentangy and the high school entrance. Let’s use our leverage on this project to provide the kind of community access we see along busy streets in our neighboring suburbs, like Dublin, as long as 161 traffic is benefitting our northwest neighbor.

3) **Reduce noise in our west Worthington neighborhoods.** It wasn’t that long ago that the focus of noise in west Worthington was the airport. Thankfully that hasn’t gotten worse. However, anyone who has been in a Worthington yard near or on Olentangy recognizes just how much worse the noise pollution has become over the past 15 years with the increase in traffic on 315 – to the point that housing values for similar homes on the east end of Plesoneton or Robin’s Way are 25-30% lower for the same stock than the ones on the west end of the neighborhood. It isn’t merely speed, but the density of traffic – headed right through the middle of our residential areas, with such small setback from the highways that is the culprit. By adding the projected volume to 161 in this study, we need to protect our neighborhoods that are within earshot of 161 from the additional noise that will otherwise serve to lower neighborhood desirability and deteriorate the pastoral
nature of our community. Unfortunately, the approach our progressive suburban
neighbors, such as Dublin or New Albany, generally take to their primary thoroughfares
(huge setbacks, avoidance of prime housing stock in favor of commercial zones or
transitional housing stock, like condos or patio homes) seems impossible in light of the
recommendation to run more traffic between Linworth and 315, rather than around it
(which is what Dublin or New Albany would have done). If we can’t influence the
routing of traffic to go around Worthington, but instead allow it to use Worthington as a
short-cut, we should use our leverage to get more commitments (such as for 1) and 2),
above) to accede to the plan. Further, we should consider lowering the speed limit
further, in light of Linworth School and the need for west Worthington residents to bike
and walk along 161.

4) **Enhance the character of our city along our main east-west thoroughfare.** Currently,
161 between Olentangy River Road and Seabury is as much Broad Street through
Whitehall as it is in character with the rest of Worthington. Again, let’s look to our
thoughtfully planned neighboring communities (Dublin and New Albany, e.g.) and
consider how to avoid more of that Whitehallization to 161 further west. Boulevarding
with medians, slowing traffic, eliminating overhead wires, controlling development
standards, and the like are the kinds of protections we should be considering for a
significant brand impression that 161 has on all of Worthington. Again, we are providing
more traffic acquiescence almost entirely for the development benefit of Northwest Cols,
OSU, and Dublin, with little to no reciprocal benefit for Worthington. Let’s use the
leverage to balance the scales a bit more on things that matter to our community.

5) **Enhance the financial viability of our schools and preserve their community nature.**
It’s is totally unclear what additional development along West 161 will look like. The
earliest indications are that there will be mostly very dense housing (new apartment
complexes just west of Linworth and east of Sawmill are the newest developments in the
corridor). Driving along Hard Road may provide a harbinger of what’s in store without
clearer indications from OSU or Columbus regarding what their development plans will
be. Additionally, we’ve seen non-profit churches spring up in recent years on 161.
Neither of those trends (high density apartments or churches) portend more success for
our schools. More students with disproportionately low additional property tax revenue
is likely to further tip the balance away from better school resources per pupil. If we’re
opening up our community (roads…) to more development by our win-win neighbor,
shouldn’t we make certain that the bargain is a good one for our residents and our school
system?