City Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, July 11, 2016 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

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

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

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

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

APPEALS

1) Appeal Architectural Review Board Action – 137 East Granville Road

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

2) Proposed Charter Amendments

3) Financial Report

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT
APPEALS

1) Appeal – Architectural Review Board Action – 137 East Granville Road

An appeal of the Architectural Review Board’s action regarding 137 East Granville Road has been received. This is the hearing on the appeal. Attached is a memorandum from the Director of Planning and Building along with (a) the appeal letter; (b) the two applications submitted, (c) excerpts from the staff memoranda to the members of the Architectural Review Board and Municipal Planning Commission for the meetings on May 12, 2016 and May 26, 2016 regarding this item, (d) excerpts from the minutes from the May 12, 2016 and May 26, 2016 meetings of the Architectural Review Board and Municipal Planning Commission regarding this item, and (e) the section of the City’s Codified Ordinances on appeals of decisions by the Architectural Review Board.

The City Council determines the outcome of the appeal by motion. Language that can be used for a motion is included in the attached memorandum from the Director of Planning and Building.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

2) Proposed Charter Amendments

The Charter Review Commission held its last meeting on June 20th and recommends several amendments for Council’s consideration. An ordinance was introduced at the last City Council meeting incorporating all of the recommended changes section by section. The public hearing on the ordinance is scheduled for July 18th.

Attached to this memorandum are the introduced ordinance and a report from the Commission that details the decisions made and the discussions surrounding those decisions. Sue Cave, as Chairman of the Commission, will attend the meeting to present
the report and answer any questions Council may have. Each member of the Commission has been invited to attend this meeting or the public hearing on the July 18th. Although there are a number of amendments, the Commission forwards them to Council with the recommendation that they be submitted as a single ballot issue.

3) **Financial Report**

The Finance Director will present the Financial Reports for the month of June and the second quarter, which are attached.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

FROM: R. Lee Brown, Director

DATE: July 6, 2016

SUBJECT: Appeal of the Architectural Review Board’s decision to deny a request by DaNite Sign Company on behalf of the Sharon Memorial Hall Board – 137 East Granville Road (AR 64-16)

Background & Request:
This building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at the time. The VM zoning district does not reference limitations on the size of signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.

Architectural Review Board History:
The original request to install a freestanding sign was heard on May 12, 2016, with a large portion of the discussion focused on the need for a sign, size, placement and design. The application was tabled.

The applicant then resubmitted a new design for the sign that was heard on May 23, 2016 and was denied by a three to two vote. Four positive votes are needed for the application to be approved.

Project Details:
1. Placement of the sign is proposed 15’ from the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way and 40’ from the Morning St. right-of-way. The sign would be double-sided, sitting perpendicular to E.
Granville Rd. in the grass area north and west of the building. The setback from E. Granville Rd. would be similar to the location of the canon.

2. The sign would be non-illuminated.

3. Proposed are 22½ 13½ square foot sign faces inside a roughly 40 29 square foot structure with a pediment and columns. The cabinet and cap would be aluminum and the columns would be polyethylene. All elements would be painted white.

4. Black vinyl graphics are now proposed for use on the entire sign. The address continues to be shown in the pediment, but now would only identify the street number, “137”. On the sign face, “Sharon Memorial Hall” would be at the top in 2 different sizes; and 3 tenants would be listed below in matching fonts and sizes. The proposed graphics appear to meet Code requirements.

5. A 20” 16” high by 7’4” 6’6” wide base with brick veneer to match the building, and capped with aluminum painted gray is proposed.

Land Use Plans:
Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance
“While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.”

Sign Code
Styles - Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo. Colors - Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Staff Analysis:

1. The concern expressed by residents and Board members about whether a sign should be approved at all is valid. The building is a prominent memorial; easily identified with a sign on the building and a gun in front; and is in a corridor which is largely residential. If a new sign is deemed appropriate, #2-4 below should be considered.
2. The sign size has been reduced so the area is within Code requirements, and total height is under 7’.
3. The design of the structure seems complimentary to the building. The inclusion of several tenants rather than just the building name seems inappropriate for this historic site.
4. At least the building name should match the font and raised style of the lettering on the building. The other lettering style and sizes being the same would comply with the Code.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff is recommending that a freestanding sign may not be appropriate for the property. If City Council feels that the placement of a sign is warranted, the above changes should be considered.
City Council Options:
1. Approve
2. Approve with modifications
3. Deny

Motion:
When Council is ready for a decision, the following motion may be utilized:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW A FREESTANDING SIGN AT 137 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-16, DATED MAY 16, 2016, BE BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Standards for Review: Certificate of Appropriateness (Code Section 1177.05):

(a) The Board of Architectural Review, in deciding whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness, shall determine that the application under consideration promotes, preserves and enhances the distinctive historical village character of the community and would not be at variance with existing structures within that portion of the district in which the structure is or is proposed to be located as to be detrimental to the interests of the Districts as set forth in Section 1177.01. In conducting its review, the Board shall make examination of and give consideration to the elements of the application including, but not necessarily limited to:

(1) **Height**, which shall include the requirements of Chapter 1149;

(2) **Building massing**, which shall include in addition to the requirements of Chapter 1149, the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian’s visual perspective;

(3) **Window treatment**, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;

(4) **Exterior detail and relationships**, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;

(5) **Roof shape**, which shall include type, form and materials;

(6) **Materials**, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;

(7) **Compatibility of design and materials**, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;

(8) **Landscape design and plant materials**, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
(9) **Pedestrian environment**, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;

(10) **Signage**, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building; and

(11) **Sustainable Features**, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices such as solar energy panels, bike racks, and rain barrels.

**Attached to this memo are:**

- Codified Ordinances Chapter 1177, Architectural District
- Architectural Review application for 137 East Granville Road dated April 25, 2016
- Architectural Review application for 137 East Granville Road dated May 16, 2016
- Staff Memo for May 12, 2016 and May 26, 2016 ARB meetings
- Minutes of the May 12, 2016 and May 26, 2016 ARB meetings
- Appeal of the decision of the ARB by Jeremy Herman, President of the Sharon Memorial Board
- Letters from community members received at different times during the approval process:
  - Kate LaLonde – Worthington Historical Society
  - John & Stephanie Haueisen – Resident – 587 Fox Lane
  - Old Worthington Association
CHAPTER 1177
Architectural District

1177.01 Purpose.  
1177.02 District boundaries.  
1177.03 Application and notice.  
1177.04 Board of Architectural Review.  
1177.05 Standards for review: certificate of appropriateness.  
1177.06 Demolition of a building.  
1177.07 Repair or maintenance exception.  
1177.08 Appeals.

1177.01 PURPOSE.
The purpose of this chapter is to maintain a high character of community development, to protect and preserve property, to promote the stability of property values and to protect real estate from impairment or destruction of value for the general community welfare by regulating the exterior architectural characteristics of structures and preservation and protection of buildings of architectural or historical significance throughout the hereinafter defined Architectural District. It is the further purpose of this chapter to recognize and preserve the distinctive historical and architectural character of this community which has been greatly influenced by the architecture of an earlier period in this community's history. These purposes shall be served by the regulation of exterior design, use of materials, the finish grade line, landscaping and orientation of all structures hereinafter altered, constructed, reconstructed, erected, enlarged or remodeled, removed or demolished in the hereinafter defined Architectural District.  
(Ord. 36-90. Passed 10-22-90.)

1177.02 DISTRICT BOUNDARIES.
There is hereby established an Architectural District which shall include all lots within the area of the original Village of Worthington as laid out in 1803, bounded on the north by North Street, on the south by South Street, on the east by Morning Street and on the west by Evening Street including all lots abutting on the foregoing named streets and additionally the lot at the southeast corner of East South Street and Granby Street and to the south along Granby Street.
The Architectural Review District shall also include all lots abutting High Street within the corporate limits of the City on both the east and west sides commencing at North Street and extending north to the northernmost corporation line and commencing at South Street and extending to the southernmost corporation line; and all lots abutting Granville Road within the corporate limits of the City on both the north and south sides commencing at Morning Street and extending east to the easternmost corporation line and commencing at Evening Street and extending west to the westernmost corporation line; plus the lot at the northwest corner of Pingree Drive and East Dublin-Granville Road and the lot immediately adjacent thereto to the north along Pingree Drive; plus all lots within the Kenyon Brook Subdivision, the Bellebrooke Subdivision, Rehe’s Subdivision, the Maxton Place Subdivision, the Worthington Mall Subdivision, the lot at the northeast corner of High Street and East Wilson Bridge Road and the two lots immediately adjacent thereto to the east along East Wilson Bridge Road, the re-subdivision of Lots 21 and 22 of the Morris Addition (Greenwich Street East Subdivision.) and the parcel at 966 Proprietors Road created by Subdivision Without Plat (SWOP 02-05) approved September 6, 2005. The boundaries of the above described Architectural District are additionally set forth on the map of the City which is attached to original Ordinance 44-2005 and made a part hereof.
(Ord. 44-2005. Passed 10-17-05.)

1177.03 APPLICATION AND NOTICE.
(a) Whenever a structure, as defined by this Zoning Ordinance, whether public or private, within the above described district is proposed to be constructed or erected and whenever an existing structure is proposed to be altered, reconstructed, enlarged or remodeled, if such alteration, reconstruction, enlargement or remodeling involves the exterior design, material, finish grade line, landscaping or orientation of the structure, an application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be filed with the Director of Planning and Building together with a fee based upon the following scheduled:

(1) If the cost of the proposed project is to be two thousand dollars ($2,000) or less the applicant shall pay a fee of two dollars ($2.00).

(2) If the cost of the proposed project is to exceed two thousand dollars ($2,000) a fee of one dollar ($1.00) for each one thousand dollars ($1,000) or fraction thereof of the estimated total cost shall be paid. In no case shall such fee be less than two dollars ($2.00) or more than two hundred dollars ($200.00). (Ord. 09-2013. Passed 4-15-13.)

(b) The application shall be accompanied by a site plan and building elevations drawn to scale indicating at a minimum, the lot dimensions, size, shape and dimensions of the structure, the location and orientation of the structure on the lot and the actual or proposed building setback lines. In addition, the application shall be accompanied by a detailed narrative description of the proposed design or change of design, use of materials, finish grade line, landscaping and orientation of the structure. Except in single-family residential zoning districts, applications for structures to be constructed or remodeled, which remodeling would increase or decrease the total gross building area by fifty percent (50%) or more, shall be accompanied by appropriate, relevant colored elevations showing at a minimum, the design, use of materials, finish grade line, landscaping and orientation of buildings and any significant architectural features. In addition, the Board of Architectural Review may require the submission of colored perspectives or architectural renderings in applications where the Board feels it is required.
(Ord. 31-93. Passed 5-24-93.)

2013 Replacement
(c) Upon receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness, which is accompanied by the material required by the provisions of subsection (b) hereof, the Director of Planning and Building shall place the application on the agenda for the Board at its next regular meeting following ten days from the date the application is filed. The Director of Planning and Building shall further cause to be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, a public notice of the scheduled hearing date of the application together with a general description of the nature of the application. The applicant shall be notified by mail of the date of the hearing and the property in question is to be posted with a placard stating the date and location of the hearing. At the hearing, any party may appear in person or by attorney.
(Ord. 09-2013. Passed 4-15-13.)

1177.04 BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW.
The Board of Architectural Review shall consist of the members of the Municipal Planning Commission and two additional members annually appointed by Council. These two additional members shall represent the Architectural Review District and one or both of them shall be a resident freeholder of such District.
(Ord. 22-87. Passed 5-11-87.)

1177.05 STANDARDS FOR REVIEW: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.
(a) The Board of Architectural Review, in deciding whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness, shall determine that the application under consideration promotes, preserves and enhances the distinctive historical village character of the community and would not be at variance with existing structures within that portion of the district in which the structure is or is proposed to be located as to be detrimental to the interests of the Districts as set forth in Section 1177.01. In conducting its review, the Board shall make examination of and give consideration to the elements of the application including, but not necessarily limited to:

1. **Height**, which shall include the requirements of Chapter 1149;
2. **Building massing**, which shall include in addition to the requirements of Chapter 1149, the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the view's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. **Window treatment**, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. **Exterior detail and relationships**, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. **Roof shape**, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. **Materials**, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. **Compatibility of design and materials**, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. **Landscape design and plant materials**, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
(9) **Pedestrian environment**, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective; and (Ord. 22-87. Passed 5-11-87.)

(10) **Signage**, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building. (Ord. 25-2002. Passed 7-1-02.)

(11) **Sustainable Features**, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices such as solar energy panels, bike racks, and rain barrels. (Ord. 04-2010. Passed 3-1-10.)

(b) In conducting its inquiry and review, the Board may request from the applicant such additional information, sketches and data as it shall reasonably require. It may call upon experts and specialists for testimony and opinion regarding the matters under examination. It may recommend to the applicant changes in the plans that it considers desirable and may accept a voluntary amendment to the application to include or reflect such changes. The Board shall keep a record of its proceedings and shall append to the application copies of information, sketches and data needed to clearly describe any amendment to it. (Ord. 22-87. Passed 5-11-87.)

(c) When its review is concluded, the Board will determine by a vote of its members, whether the application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be approved. If approved by four or more of its members, the Board shall return the application and appended material to the Director of Planning and Building with the instruction that the certificate of appropriateness be issued, provided all other requirements for a permit, if applicable, are met. The certificate of appropriateness shall be valid for eighteen months from the date of approval, or such extension as may be granted by the Board. If not approved, the Board shall return the application and appended material to the applicant with a notice that the certificate of appropriateness shall not be issued because the application did not meet the criteria and standards set forth herein. (Ord. 09-2013. Passed 4-15-13.)

**1177.06 DEMOLITION OF A BUILDING.**

(a) Whenever a building within the District is proposed to be demolished, partially demolished or removed, an application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be filed with the City Clerk as provided in this chapter. Such application shall set forth the intent to demolish. (Ord. 36-90. Passed 10-22-90.)

(b) The Board of Architectural Review shall hear the request not sooner than twelve days nor later than sixty days from the date the application is filed and shall advertise such hearing to provide time for public comment. The Board may request a statement from the City's Division of Building Regulation on the structural condition of the building and the conformity of the building to applicable building codes. In addition, the Board may request at the City's expense a written statement concerning the proposed demolition by a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. Such statement shall be taken into consideration in determining the appropriateness of the request. The applicant may provide at his or her expense any evidence or testimony from a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. The Board of Architectural Review shall act on the request not later than thirty days after the initial hearing on the application. The applicant may waive this requirement by filing with the Director of Planning and Building a written statement waiving the right to have his or her application acted upon within such thirty-day period. (Ord. 09-2013. Passed 4-15-13.)
(c) The Board of Architectural Review shall determine by a vote of its members whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness based on the determination:

(1) That such building is not historically or architecturally significant;
(2) That if the building is found to be historically or architecturally significant, there is no feasible or prudent alternative or change that would allow preservation of the building; and
(3) The proposal for grading, landscaping and other design treatment once the structure is removed meets the standards of this chapter.

(d) In any circumstance, the Board shall not deny a request for a certificate of appropriateness if it determines either:

(1) That such denial will deny all reasonable use of the property or
(2) That such denial shall result in an unsafe condition because of the structural or physical condition of the building.

(e) No building shall be demolished or removed in the Architectural Review District without the owner or his or her representative first obtaining a certificate of appropriateness approving such removal or demolition, unless such building presents an immediate danger to public health and safety in the opinion of the City's Chief Building Official, in which event, the Chief Building Inspector may order removal or demolition of such building in order to protect public health and safety.

(Ord. 36-90. Passed 10-22-90.)

1177.07 REPAIR OR MAINTENANCE EXCEPTION.

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent any ordinary repair or maintenance of an exterior architectural feature or any ordinary planting and landscaping now in the District.

(Ord. 22-87. Passed 5-11-87.)

1177.08 APPEALS.

The Board of Architectural Review shall decide all applications for architectural review not later than thirty days after the first hearing thereon.

(a) Any person, firm or corporation, or any officer, department, board or agency of the City who has been aggrieved by any decision of the Board involving an application for architectural review approval may appeal such decision to Council by filing notice of intent to appeal with the City Clerk within ten days from the date of the decision, setting forth the facts of the case. (Ord. 09-2013. Passed 4-15-13.)

(b) Council may then elect to hold a public hearing on the appeal by the affirmative vote of a majority of its members, or failing to so elect, shall reject the application for appeal. In the event Council elects to hold a public hearing on the request for appeal, the hearing shall be held not later than sixty days after a final decision has been rendered by the Board. Council, by a majority vote of its members, shall decide the matter and its decision shall be final.

(Ord. 22-87. Passed 5-11-87.)
(c) If no notice of intent to appeal is filed with the City Clerk within the period specified in subsection (a) hereof, Council may at the option of a majority of its members and not later than ten days following the expiration of the appeal period, elect to review any architectural review decision of the Board. Council shall schedule a public hearing on the matter which shall not be held more than sixty days after a final decision was rendered by the Board. At a public hearing, Council by a majority vote of its members, shall decide the matter and its decision shall be final. (Ord. 09-2013. Passed 4-15-13.)
City of Worthington
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Certificate of Appropriateness
Application

1. Property Location
   137 Dublin Granville rd, Worthington, oh 43085

2. Present/Proposed Use
   Sharon Tipp Memorial Hall

3. Zoning District
   VM (Veterans Memorial)

4. Applicant
   Danite Sign Company
   Address: 1640 Harmon Ave, Columbus, OH 43223
   Phone Number(s): 614-444-3333

5. Property Owner
   Trustee of Sharon Tipp Memorial of Worthington Ohio
   Address: PO Box 61, Worthington, OH 43085
   Phone Number(s): 614-582-5082

6. Project Description
   Install a double sided non-illuminated
   monument sign with brick base and columns, per attached design.

7. Project Details:
   a) Design
      Brick base, columns, topper to mini building
   b) Color
      White, w/ vinyl graphics & red brick base
   c) Size
      7'2" overall Height, 7'4" overall width
   d) Approximate Cost $10,000
      Expected Completion Date 6-8 week lead time

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME:
The information contained in this application and in all attachments is true and correct to the best
of my knowledge. I further acknowledge that I have familiarized myself with all applicable
sections of the Worthington Codified Ordinances and will comply with all applicable
regulations.

Applicant (Signature)  4/21/16

Property Owner (Signature)  4/21/16
**Abutting Property Owners List for 137 E. Granville Rd.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Deville</td>
<td>132 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Myers</td>
<td>138 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Allison Chapman</td>
<td>144 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Masters</td>
<td>152 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene &amp; Kimberly Wells</td>
<td>151 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasure Blackston Post</td>
<td>239 American Legion Tr 700 Morning St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy &amp; Sherril Berridge</td>
<td>686 Morning St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel &amp; Rachel Gibson</td>
<td>PO Box 1284</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Laine</td>
<td>Aber Garneta 707 Morning St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC Rice</td>
<td>119 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Herban</td>
<td>120 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Worthington
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Certificate of Appropriateness
Application

1. Property Location  
132 Dublin Granville Rd, Worthington, OH 43085

2. Present/Proposed Use  
Sharon Twp Memorial Hall

3. Zoning District  
VM (Veterans Memorial)

4. Applicant  
Danite Sign Company
Address  
1640 Harmon Ave, Columbus, OH 43225
Phone Number(s)  
614-444-5333

5. Property Owner  
Trustee of Sharon Twp Memorial of Worthington Ohio
Address  
P.O. Box 61, Worthington, OH 43085
Phone Number(s)  
614-582-5087

6. Project Description  
Install a double sided, non-illuminated monument sign with brick base and columns per attached design.

7. Project Details:
   a) Design  
      Brick base, columns, topper on mini building
   b) Color  
      White w/ vinyl graphics on red brick base
   c) Size  
      7'2" overall height, 7'9" overall width
   d) Approximate Cost  
      $10,000  
      Expected Completion Date  
      6-8 week lead time

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME:
The information contained in this application and in all attachments is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I further acknowledge that I have familiarized myself with all applicable sections of the Worthington Codified Ordinances and will comply with all applicable regulations.

[Signature]  
Applicant (Signature)  
4/21/16  
Date

[Signature]  
Property Owner (Signature)  
4/21/16  
Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Deville</td>
<td>132 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Myers</td>
<td>138 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Allison Chapman</td>
<td>144 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Masters</td>
<td>152 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene &amp; Kimberly Wells</td>
<td>151 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasure Blackston Post</td>
<td>239 American Legion Tr 700 Morning St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy &amp; Sherrill Berridge</td>
<td>686 Morning St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel &amp; Rachel Gibson</td>
<td>PO Box 1284 707 Morning St.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Laine</td>
<td>Aber Garneta</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC Rice</td>
<td>119 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Herban</td>
<td>120 E. Granville Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharon Memorial Hall
VFW Post 2398
Blue Star Mothers Chapter 9
Buckley Financial Planning LLC
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SIDE VIEW

6'-0" BASE & 6'-0" SILL

#24629: D/F NON-ILLUMINATED MONUMENT SIGN, 3'-0" = 1'-0"

- CABINET & FACIA: ALUMINUM - WHITE PAINTED FINISH
- GRAPHERS: BLACK VINYL
- CAP: ALUMINUM - WHITE PAINTED FINISH
- COLUMNS: WHITE POLYETHYLENE
- POLE COVER: BRICK VENEER (COLOR TO MATCH BUILDING AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE)
- SHELF: ALUMINUM - PHC COOL GRAY 1C PAINTED FINISH

DATE: 5-10-16
Hi Lynda,

Last night at the Historical Society Board meeting, the topic of the proposed sign at Sharon Memorial Hall was discussed at length, and the Board has asked me to communicate the following in opposition the proposed design that appears in the Architectural Review Board/Municipal Planning Commission Agenda for 5/12/16:

- The Worthington Historical Society Board feels that the proposed signage for the Sharon Memorial Hall site is too large for the site, and the imposing nature of the sign is inappropriate to the Historic District and the ambiance of Old Worthington.
- The name as indicated in the drawings of “Sharon Township Veterans Memorial Hall” is not accurate, as the building is known historically as “Sharon Memorial Hall”. (see Worthington Landmarks, McCormick, pg 74-76)
- The Board also agrees with all staff recommendations as listed in the staff memo, particularly regarding the necessity for simplification of lettering and logos on the sign.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kate LaLonde
Director
Worthington Historical Society
614-885-1247

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
Dear Lee Brown, Lynda Bitar and Commission Members – Mikel Coulter, James Sauer, Kathy Holcombe, Edwin Hofmann, Thomas Reis, Amy Lloyed and David Foust,

As interested residents of the Historic District, my husband and I live a block away from Sharon Memorial Hall on E. New England Ave., we're surprised and concerned that the request for a very large sign at the Sharon Memorial Hall, 137 E. Granville Rd. is being recommended for approval.

The very permanent sign in the ARB agenda displays 3 names, the VFW, the Blue Star Mothers and Buckley Financial Planning LLC. It is public knowledge the permanent public service organizations of VFW and the Blue Star Mothers meet once monthly free of charge. Buckley Financial Planning LLC is commercial, isn't necessarily permanent as it's a rental arrangement.

This public service memorial in the Worthington Historic District, surrounded by residences should not be used to advertise or identify as a commercial enterprise. It has long been and is currently, clearly identified as "Sharon Memorial Hall" on its entablature above the front columns.

It is in exquisitely bad taste, an insult to the public memorial use for which Sharon Memorial Hall is intended. My father was a Sharon Memorial Trustee 30-40 years, ago. I recall that the responsibility and focus, by law, of the trustees was on the care and maintenance of the historic building and property.

This request, in regard to historic Sharon Memorial Hall, situated in a residential neighborhood in the Worthington Historic District, needs more thoughtful examination and understanding than it is currently receiving.

Sincerely,

Ellen & Douglas Scherer
112 E. New England Ave.
Worthington, OH 43085
TO: Members of the Architectural Review Board
     Members of the Municipal Planning Commission

FROM: Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator

DATE: May 6, 2016

SUBJECT: Staff Memo for the Meeting of May 12, 2016

______________________________________________________________________________

B. Architectural Review Board

a. Sign – 137 E. Granville Rd. (DaNite Sign Company/Sharon Memorial Hall) AR 64-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:
This building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at the time.

This request is for approval to install a freestanding sign on the property that would identify the building and tenants. The VM zoning district does not have limitations on the size of signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.

Project Details:
1. Placement of the sign is proposed 15’ from the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way and 40’ from the Morning St. right-of-way. The sign would double-sided, sitting perpendicular to
E. Granville Rd. in the grass area north and west of the building. The setback from E. Granville Rd. would be similar to the location of the canon.

2. The sign would be non-illuminated.

3. Proposed are 22 ½ square foot sign faces inside a roughly 40 square foot structure with a pediment and columns. The cabinet and cap would be aluminum and the columns would be polyethylene. All elements would be painted white.

4. Burgundy vinyl graphics are proposed identifying the address in the pediment as “137 Dublin-Granville Rd.,” and “Sharon Township Veterans Memorial Hall” at the top of the sign face. Both elements would be in the same font, but 3 different sizes are proposed. Below would be 3 tenant names in black vinyl, separate by burgundy lines. There appears to be 2 or 3 fonts and sizes being used for the 3 names. The text fonts and sizes are not identified on the drawing. A different logo is proposed for each tenant. The logos contain different designs and colors, but appear to be about the same size. With the logos, the total number of colors on the sign appear to be 7. A variance would be need for the number of styles, sizes and colors used on the sign.

5. A 20” high by 7’4” high base with brick veneer to match the building, and capped with aluminum painted gray is proposed.

Land Use Plans:
Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance
While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

Sign Code
Styles - Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.
Colors - Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Staff Analysis:
1. While there is no regulation for sign size in the VM district, the sign should not be larger than is allowed in other parts of the District. The graphic portion of the sign is smaller than the commercial district allowance, so just the structure would be larger. The sign, being in a residential area, would not be in competition with other signs.

2. The design seems appropriate for the building.

3. More uniformity is needed with lettering styles and sizes to simplify the sign. Also, deletion of the logos may help.
4. The use of raised lettering for at least the building name would add some character to the sign. The font could match the lettering on the building.
5. The address would be more easily seen if just the number was placed in a larger size. The use of raised characters would also be appropriate.

**Recommendation:**
Staff is recommending the sign graphics be simplified and modified per the above analysis.

**Motion:**
THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW A FREESTANDING SIGN AT 137 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-16, DATED APRIL 22, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Architectural Review Board
   Members of the Municipal Planning Commission

FROM: Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator

DATE: May 20, 2016

SUBJECT: Staff Memo for the Meeting of May 26, 2016

______________________________________________________________________________

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

   a. Sign - 137 E. Granville Rd. (DaNite Sign Company/Sharon Memorial Hall) AR 64-16

   Findings of Fact & Conclusions

   Background & Request:
   This building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at the time. The VM zoning district does not have limitations on the size of signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.

   The original request to install a freestanding sign was heard at the last meeting, with discussion including concerns with need for a sign, size, placement and design. The applicant has now submitted a new design for the sign.
Project Details:
1. Placement of the sign is proposed 15’ from the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way and 40’ from the Morning St. right-of-way. The sign would double-sided, sitting perpendicular to E. Granville Rd. in the grass area north and west of the building. The setback from E. Granville Rd. would be similar to the location of the canon.
2. The sign would be non-illuminated.
3. Proposed are $22 \frac{1}{4}$ $13 \frac{1}{2}$ square foot sign faces inside a roughly $40 \times 29$ square foot structure with a pediment and columns. The cabinet and cap would be aluminum and the columns would be polyethylene. All elements would be painted white.
4. Black vinyl graphics are now proposed for use on the entire sign. The address continues to be shown in the pediment, but now would only identify the street number, “137”. On the sign face, “Sharon Memorial Hall” would be at the top in 2 different sizes; and 3 tenants would be listed below in matching fonts and sizes. The proposed graphics appear to meet Code requirements.
5. A $20" \times 16"$ high by $7'4" \times 6'6"$ wide base with brick veneer to match the building, and capped with aluminum painted gray is proposed.

Land Use Plans:
Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance
While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

Sign Code
Styles - Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo. Colors - Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Staff Analysis:
1. The concern expressed by residents and Board members about whether a sign should be approved at all is valid. The building is a prominent memorial; easily identified with a sign on the building and a gun in front; and is in a corridor which is largely residential. If a new sign is deemed appropriate, #2-4 below should be considered.
2. The sign size has been reduced so the area is within Code requirements, and total height is under 7’.
3. The design of the structure seems complimentary to the building. The inclusion of
several tenants rather than just the building name seems inappropriate for this historic site.

4. At least the building name should match the font and raised style of the lettering on the building. The other lettering style and sizes being the same would comply with the Code.

Recommendation:
Staff is recommending that a freestanding sign may not be appropriate for the property. If the Board feels placement of a sign is warranted, the above changes should be considered.

Motion:
THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW A FREESTANDING SIGN AT 137 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-16, DATED MAY 16, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.
A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of minutes of the April 28, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Sauer moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye.” The minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

Mr. Coulter said the application for 643 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave. will be moved to the end of the ARB agenda.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished
a. Sign – 137 E. Granville Rd. (DaNite Sign Company/Sharon Memorial Hall) AR 64-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:
This building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at the time.

This request is for approval to install a freestanding sign on the property that would identify the building and tenants. The VM zoning district does not have limitations on the size of signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.

**Project Details:**
1. Placement of the sign is proposed 15’ from the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way and 40’ from the Morning St. right-of-way. The sign would double-sided, sitting perpendicular to E. Granville Rd. in the grass area north and west of the building. The setback from E. Granville Rd. would be similar to the location of the cannon.
2. The sign would be non-illuminated.
3. Proposed are 22 ½ square foot sign faces inside a roughly 40 square foot structure with a pediment and columns. The cabinet and cap would be aluminum and the columns would be polyethylene. All elements would be painted white.
4. Burgundy vinyl graphics are proposed identifying the address in the pediment as “137 Dublin-Granville Rd.”, and “Sharon Township Veterans Memorial Hall” at the top of the sign face. Both elements would be in the same font, but 3 different sizes are proposed. Below would be 3 tenant names in black vinyl, separate by burgundy lines. There appears to be 2 or 3 fonts and sizes being used for the 3 names. The text fonts and sizes are not identified on the drawing. A different logo is proposed for each tenant. The logos contain different designs and colors, but appear to be about the same size. With the logos, the total number of colors on the sign appear to be 7. A variance would be need for the number of styles, sizes and colors used on the sign.
5. A 20” high by 7’4” high base with brick veneer to match the building, and capped with aluminum painted gray is proposed.

**Land Use Plans:**
Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance
While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs
should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

**Sign Code**

**Styles -** Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.

**Colors -** Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

**Staff Analysis:**

1. While there is no regulation for sign size in the VM district, the sign should not be larger than is allowed in other parts of the City. The graphic portion of the sign is smaller than the commercial district allowance, so just the structure would be larger. The sign, being in a residential area, would not be in competition with other signs.
2. The design seems appropriate for the building.
3. More uniformity is needed with lettering styles and sizes to simplify the sign. Also, deletion of the logos may help.
4. The use of raised lettering for at least the building name would add some character to the sign. The font could match the lettering on the building.
5. The address would be more easily seen if just the number was placed in a larger size. The use of raised characters would also be appropriate.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending the sign graphics be simplified and modified per the above analysis.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar mentioned letters of concern received, and spoke of the large gun in front of the building that acts as an identifier. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Logan Dilts stated he was representing the DaNite Sign Company of 1640 Harmon Avenue, Columbus, OH 43223. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Dilts if there was anything else he would like to add to Mrs. Bitar’s presentation. Mr. Dilts said he talked to his clients and agrees the sign is pretty busy, with different font heights and such. This could be simplified and made of all one color. The issue with shrinking the sign is the columns, which are there to tie in with the building, and are only available in certain sizes. Forty-eight inches is the smallest available. The base could be reduced, or something could be done at the top. Mr. Dilts thought just putting the address numbers of 137 at the top instead of the whole address would help. The name could be simplified just to Sharon Memorial Hall, and also
agreed with simplifying the name of the tenants to have everything on one line. Mr. Dilts definitely agreed the sign could be simplified and said his client is open to that.

Mr. Sauer said what was discussed by Mr. Dilts is all good, and if they could do that it would go a long way toward being approved. Mr. Sauer suggested the address numbers of 137 could be down on the brick. The simplifications mentioned seemed logical and appropriate and he thinks that would help.

Mr. Foust said he has some issues with the application. To start, he thinks the policy in the past has been to change or to not encourage directory signs. He does not think the building needs any sort of directory in the front, which has been a concept throughout the community. Mr. Foust had an issue with everything listed on the sign. The second thing is that E. Dublin-Granville Road is primarily residential in nature. While this building is an old house that fits in well with the community, if any signage is out there at all, the wording needs to be very refined and very small. Mr. Foust continued to say that because people know the building and know where it is, this sign does not do anything to enhance the area or the streetscape at all, and he does not see the necessity for the sign. He said someone is going to have to sell him on the need for the sign.

Mr. Coulter said he tends to agree with the comments made so far and that he would like to see other memorial halls that have signs of a similar nature to compare. Mr. Coulter said the proposed sign is very busy, and when driving by at 30 mph, the sign will not be readable. Mr. Coulter also said he is surprised that this location does not have size regulations.

Mr. Sauer said he believes everyone in the community knows the building, the building has a prominent location and has always been known as the Sharon Memorial Hall. He would agree he does not see the need for the sign.

Mr. Reis agreed with what was said, and said the sign is overkill. He said someone would have to come back with something to convince him that any sort of identification is needed at all.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and two people raised their hands.

Ms. Shelia Bagley of 5812 Olentangy Boulevard, Riverlea, Ohio said she is against the sign for all the reasons stated. She said the groups listed on the sign only meet occasionally, and there is only one business in the building. There is a concern that maybe in the future the sign would be illuminated. Ms. Bagley believes this is very inappropriate for the residential area and this is an “insidious commercial creep for that area” because the building is zoned as a Veteran’s Memorial. Ms. Bagley said she is afraid this could be setting a precedent for turning the building into a more commercial type of venture. Another concern is the issue of what if the property was sold, there is nothing to preclude Sharon Township from selling the property, and once that sign is in place, the building could be commercial in the future.
Mrs. Bagley said the Sharon Memorial Board has been attempting to engage in providing an easement to others on their property which has been happening in a sort of secret executive session. Also, as some noted, the historical integrity of the building would be compromised by the huge plastic sign. The sign is going to be located in a large green space along State Route 161 and everyone likes the green space, so this is just a shame because the area is very park-like now. The current Sharon Memorial Board has really changed some the architectural and historical integrity of the building and this is just another change which is a concern to those of us who appreciate the history and integrity of the property. Mrs. Bagley said the other concern is she knows the area is zoned as Veteran’s Memorial and there are no sign requirements in this particular zoning district, so she would like to know why they are looking at the commercial sign requirements as an alternative to maybe looking at residential home requirements for a home business. She believes only a small wall sign would be allowed. Mrs. Bagley asked why is the sign needed and said she is concerned this beautiful, historic building could degrade into just another commercial building in a lovely residential area.

Mr. Sauer had a question about the little white sign in the picture and asked if the sign moves around. Mrs. Bitar replied that staff has issued temporary use permits for different events in the building in the past, like when the Blue Star Moms put together their packages and need people from the community to volunteer. That may have been one of those signs for one of the times that those was allowed. The City has never issued a permit for a business in the building to have an advertising sign out temporarily. Mr. Sauer asked if those were all temporary signs that he is seeing. Mrs. Bitar said she is not saying that particular sign was approved, but there have been approval in the past.

Mr. Cal Taylor, PO Box 1284 Worthington, Ohio, stated he lived across the street for 40 years and he put his heart and soul into renovating the building for 4 years. He wrote the Veteran’s Memorial Code since they did not have a zoning district fitting this unique building. This is the only building in the State of Ohio that is zoned as a Veteran’s Memorial at the local level. It was zoned as residential until 1971, it had been inhabited until the 1960’s. Mr. Taylor thanked Mrs. Bitar for some of the key points she brought up. Mr. Taylor said he is a retired Veteran, and the word Veteran has never been in the title of the building. This is a Veteran’s Memorial, but the building has always been known as Sharon Memorial Hall. He said there really should be four listings on the sign, Sharon Township being one. The other names, two groups that meet once a month, one of them is a business in the building. The other businesses that are in the building do not have names on the sign.

Mr. Taylor said if at some point they wanted their names, then this would become a changeable sign, and he does not think they are allowed. Most of the tenants do not think that they need a sign, because they have a sign out front - a WW II gun. There are no other brick buildings on State Route 161 with a gun out front. That gun was purchased from the American Legion for forty-eight dollars, which was the transportation cost. He has the checks and the original deed to prove that fact. He said the proposed sign is insensitive to the historic district. Mr. Taylor said when he wrote the zoning code, the neighbors were supportive of it. They did not envision this sign going up on the corner. He also would like to mention to Mr. Sauer the sign in the photograph was a BMW.
sign that was removed in 2009 because no one could come up with a permit for it, it was stuck out there. Others that have asked for signs have been directed to get temporary use permits.

Mr. Taylor said the name on the building is correctly called Sharon Memorial Hall. There are four business users, two churches, and two occasional users. The sign has two occasional users and one business are up there. Mr. Taylor wonders why one business is up there. He thinks there is more to it than that. He believes the sign is inappropriate and unneeded, future tenants cannot be added, and the gun has been a sign for the buildings for decade. No one asked for signage when he signed the original leases. Illumination could be an issue in the future. Mr. Taylor said that he does not want to see this building go back to being used commercially. He asked Mrs. Bitar why there was not a blue hearing sign on the property. Mrs. Bitar stated there should have been, but thought it might have fallen over or something might have happened to it. Mr. Taylor said again the building should stay with no new sign.

Mr. Coulter asked if there is anyone else in the audience that wanted to speak. No other speakers came forward.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Dilts to please come to the podium. He presented the option to table. Mr. Dilts requested to table this application.

Mr. Reis moved to table the application and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye” and the application was tabled.
A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Foust to explain the photograph on the overhead screen. Mr. Foust discussed some history about the Bishop & Lewis general store and meeting hall. The building was a dry goods store built in 1890. He said the second floor was designed to be a public meeting hall. The raised stage at the west end of the building is still there, but the surround was torn out approximately fifteen to twenty years ago. Mr. Foust said the building is the location of the Co-hatch application.

3. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

a. Sign - 137 E. Granville Rd. (DaNite Sign Company/Sharon Memorial Hall) AR 64-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:
This building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at the time. The VM zoning district does not have limitations on the size of signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.

The original request to install a freestanding sign was heard at the last meeting, with discussion including concerns with need for a sign, size, placement and design. The applicant has now submitted a new design for the sign.

Project Details:
1. Placement of the sign is proposed 15’ from the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way and 40’ from the Morning St. right-of-way. The sign would double-sided, sitting perpendicular to E. Granville Rd. in the grass area north and west of the building. The setback from E. Granville Rd. would be similar to the location of the canon.
2. The sign would be non-illuminated.
3. Proposed are 22 ½ 13 ½ square foot sign faces inside a roughly 40 29 square foot structure with a pediment and columns. The cabinet and cap would be aluminum and the columns would be polyethylene. All elements would be painted white.
4. Black vinyl graphics are now proposed for use on the entire sign. The address continues to be shown in the pediment, but now would only identify the street number, “137”. On the sign face, “Sharon Memorial Hall” would be at the top in 2 different sizes; and 3 tenants would be listed below in matching fonts and sizes. The proposed graphics appear to meet Code requirements.
5. A 20” 16” high by 74” 6’6” wide base with brick veneer to match the building, and capped with aluminum painted gray is proposed.

Land Use Plans:
Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance
While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the
buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

**Sign Code**

*Styles - Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.*

*Colors - Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.*

**Staff Analysis:**

1. The concern expressed by residents and Board members about whether a sign should be approved at all is valid. The building is a prominent memorial; easily identified with a sign on the building and a gun in front; and is in a corridor which is largely residential. If a new sign is deemed appropriate, #2-4 below should be considered.

2. The sign size has been reduced so the area is within Code requirements, and total height is under 7’.

3. The design of the structure seems complimentary to the building. The inclusion of several tenants rather than just the building name seems inappropriate for this historic site.

4. At least the building name should match the font and raised style of the lettering on the building. The other lettering style and sizes being the same would comply with the Code.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending that a freestanding sign may not be appropriate for the property. If the Board feels placement of a sign is warranted, the above changes should be considered.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Logan Dilts stated he is representing DaNite Sign Company, 1640 Harmon Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Jeremy Herman stated his address is 181 Rosslyn Ave., Columbus, Ohio, and he is the president of the veteran’s hall. He explained the veteran’s groups that operate at the hall do a lot for the community, so they would like the community to know they are there. Also, the current tenants financially support the hall. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW A FREESTANDING SIGN AT 137 E. GRANVILLE**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Reis made the amendment. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, nay; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; and Mr. Foust, nay. The motion was denied.
FYI

From: Herman, Jeremy A. [mailto:herman.207@buckeyemail.osu.edu]
Sent: Sunday, June 05, 2016 9:32 PM
To: Thress, D. Kay <DThress@ci.worthington.oh.us>
Subject: Jeremy Herman -Sharon Township Veterans Memorial Hall

Ms. Thress,

I am contacting you to inquire about appealing a decision made by the Worthington Architectural Review Board on the evening of May 26th. The Memorial Board does not feel the their decision to vote down a Motion regarding a proposed sign for the property was appropriate and made with good reason.

The property in questions is the Sharon Township Veterans Memorial Hall located at 137 Dublin-Granville rd.

If you have any questions or need any clarifications please do not hesitate to call.

Thank you very much for you time and help.

Respectfully,

Jeremy Herman
President of the Sharon Memorial Board
614-582-5087

http://www.eset.com
Hi Lynda,

Last night at the Historical Society Board meeting, the topic of the proposed sign at Sharon Memorial Hall was discussed at length, and the Board has asked me to communicate the following in opposition the proposed design that appears in the Architectural Review Board/Municipal Planning Commission Agenda for 5/12/16:

- The Worthington Historical Society Board feels that the proposed signage for the Sharon Memorial Hall site is too large for the site, and the imposing nature of the sign is inappropriate to the Historic District and the ambiance of Old Worthington.
- The name as indicated in the drawings of "Sharon Township Veterans Memorial Hall" is not accurate, as the building is known historically as "Sharon Memorial Hall". (see Worthington Landmarks, McCormick, pg 74-76)
- The Board also agrees with all staff recommendations as listed in the staff memo, particularly regarding the necessity for simplification of lettering and logos on the sign.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kate LaLonde
Director
Worthington Historical Society
614-885-1247
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Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building
6550 N. High St.
Worthington, OH 43085
May 12, 2016

Dear Lee Brown, Lynda Bitar and Commission Members – Mikel Coulter, James Sauer, Kathy Holcombe, Edwin Hofmann, Thomas Reis, Amy Lloyd and David Foust,

As interested residents of the Historic District, my husband and I live a block away from Sharon Memorial Hall on E. New England Ave., we're surprised and concerned that the request for a very large sign at the Sharon Memorial Hall, 137 E. Granville Rd. is being recommended for approval.

The very permanent sign in the ARB agenda displays 3 names, the VFW, the Blue Star Mothers and Buckley Financial Planning LLC. It is public knowledge the permanent public service organizations of VFW and the Blue Star Mothers meet once monthly free of charge. Buckley Financial Planning LLC is commercial, isn't necessarily permanent as it's a rental arrangement.

This public service memorial in the Worthington Historic District, surrounded by residences should not be used to advertise or identify as a commercial enterprise. It has long been and is currently, clearly identified as "Sharon Memorial Hall" on its entablature above the front columns.

It is in exquisitely bad taste, an insult to the public memorial use for which Sharon Memorial Hall is intended. My father was a Sharon Memorial Trustee 30-40 years, ago. I recall that the responsibility and focus, by law, of the trustees was on the care and maintenance of the historic building and property.

This request, in regard to historic Sharon Memorial Hall, situated in a residential neighborhood in the Worthington Historic District, needs more thoughtful examination and understanding than it is currently receiving.

Sincerely,

Ellen & Douglas Scherer
112 E. New England Ave.
Worthington, OH 43085
We would appreciate your sending this letter addressing our concerns regarding the proposed sign for Sharon Memorial Hall to all members of ARB.

Thank you,
John and Steffanie Haueisen

COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROPOSED SIGN MARKING SHARON MEMORIAL HALL

We have two concerns about the proposed free-standing sign for the Sharon Memorial Hall:

*Safety.* From the proposed placement and size of the sign, we seriously doubt that a car attempting to west onto Rt. 161 will have adequate visibility to safely pull out. The car will probably have to encroach well into the pedestrian crosswalk and almost out into traffic to be able to see the westbound traffic. Would you please have an official from the police department look into that scenario to see if safety is a concern?

*Historical appropriateness.* There are two other historical buildings operating as businesses in the business district, The Ripley House and High Road Gallery. Both businesses have small tasteful signs in front, which do not list any of the businesses inside. Neither of these historic buildings have any other signs which identify them by name.

Since the Sharon Memorial Hall has giant lettering across the front façade indicating the name and the iconic cannon out in front, this historic building is already well identified. It should need no further signage to name it.

We really need to be careful about the look and appearance of our historic buildings and how really special and unique we are in Worthington to even still have these buildings in use. The Sharon Memorial Hall is in a residential neighborhood, not the business district, and a large sign would look out of place and is clearly unnecessary.

Sincerely,
John and Steffanie Haueisen
587 Fox Lane
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July 5, 2016

Dear City Council Members,

Sharon Memorial Hall in the Worthington Historic District, surrounded by residences should not be used to advertise or identify as a commercial enterprise.

It is a prominent memorial and clearly identified as "Sharon Memorial Hall" on its entablature above the front columns. It is homage to our history and to our veterans following WWII, voters having approved a War Memorial Levy with the building being purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. We must not, now, disgrace this honor with a commercial sign.

The Old Worthington Association opposes a sign in the midst of our historic residential district, supporting residents and city staff in their opposition and the Architectural Review Board in their denial.

The Architectural Review Board deserves appreciation for having denied the proposed sign for Sharon Memorial Hall. Arguments against this sign, in that residential corridor of the historic district, are well reasoned and valid.

For decades City Council has guarded against sign pollution in the Architectural Review area. In this instance, a residential neighborhood requires sensitivity and protection. Allowing it would degrade the very standards the city has sought to protect.

At a time when all of us wish to preserve the elements of the Worthington Historic District, City Council should deny this request for a commercial sign on the Sharon Memorial Hall property. The Old Worthington Association urges you to maintain the high standards that enhance the appearance of the Architectural Review District and to vote against this request.

Respectfully,
Old Worthington Association Board of Trustees

c: Mr. Matt Greeson, City Manager
Thanks Suzanne for your thoughts.

Get Outlook for Android

Dear Lee and Bonnie,

I’m forwarding to you the letter below, that I sent to MPC/ARB members regarding the proposed sign at Sharon Memorial Hall. Jim and I are traveling but I understand that the decision is being appealed before City Council. I wanted to be sure that city staff and City Council are aware of my letter. I urge City Council to disallow any sign, except an historic one. Please help protect the residential area from becoming polluted with unnecessary, commercial signs.

Thank you,

Suzanne Seals

On Sat, May 21, 2016 at 12:13 PM -0700, "Suzanne Seals" <sseals@columbus.rr.com> wrote:

Chairman Coulter and Members of ARB/MPC:

I want to comment regarding the second request for a free-standing sign in front of Sharon Memorial Hall, coming up on your May 26 agenda. I am a long-time resident of the Historic District and an OWA Board of Trustee member, so what happens in the Historic District, and its environ, matters greatly to me. I oppose the request for a sign in front of Sharon Memorial Hall and I’m not alone; I have heard from a number of area residents who are also opposed to the sign. A free-standing advertisement sign is inappropriate in a residential area, especially one consisting of primarily historic homes; furthermore, it detracts from this stately, unique historic building; and finally, it isn’t necessary to identify the building for tenants since a cannon sits in front and the name of the building appears in very large letters on the front of the Hall.

To allow a sign of any kind to be placed here, other than one describing the history of the building, would not be in keeping with Worthington’s long-time efforts to reduce to a minimum, the clutter of signs. And it certainly would do nothing to enhance the appearance of one of our valued, historic buildings.

I urge you to maintain the high standards that enhance the appearance of the Architectural Review District and to vote against this request.

Respectfully submitted,
ORDINANCE NO. 24-2016

To Provide for the Submission of Amendments to the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, for a Vote of the City Electorate at a Regular Municipal Election Previously Ordered for and to be Held on November 8, 2016.

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio was originally adopted at an election held on November 6, 1956; and,

WHEREAS, Section 9.04 of the Charter authorizes amending the Charter in the manner set forth in Section 9 of Article XVIII of the Constitution of Ohio, and pursuant thereto has been amended at elections held on November 4, 1958; November 8, 1960; November 7, 1961; November 8, 1983, November 5, 1996, November 6, 2007 and November 3, 2015; and,

WHEREAS, Section 9.04 of the Charter requires City Council to appoint a Charter Review Commission not less frequently than every ten (10) years to review the Charter, to consider whether the Charter should be amended, and to recommend to City Council specific Charter amendments for submission to the City electorate; and,

WHEREAS, an eleven-member Charter Review Commission was appointed by City Council on February 8, 2016 and, thereafter, the Charter Review Commission commenced and completed a review of the Charter, determined that certain provisions of the Charter should be amended, and prepared and recommended proposed Charter amendments to City Council; and,

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the recommendations of the Charter Review Commission, City Council has determined that it would be in the interest of the City and its citizens to submit the proposed Charter amendments to the City electorate.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio, two-thirds of the members elected thereto herein concurring:

SECTION 1. That the question of amending the Charter of the City of Worthington by the enactment of amendments to certain Sections and the deletion of a Section of the Charter, as hereinafter specifically set forth, be submitted, as a single ballot question, to the qualified electors of the City at the Regular Municipal Election to be held on Tuesday, the 8th day of November, 2016, at the regular places and times of voting in the City:

(a) To Enact the following proposed amendments to the Charter of the City of Worthington:

Section 2.04 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:
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SECTION 2.04 SALARY.  

The salary of Council members and the President of Council may be established by non-emergency ordinance one time prior to the general election held in November 2019. After such one-time increase, the salary of the members of Council shall be established by non-emergency ordinance, provided that no salary of a Council member shall be increased during that member's term of office and no salary shall be decreased during such term of office except with the consent of such member of Council.

Section 2.05 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2.05 PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL, PRESIDENT PRO-TEM OF COUNCIL, MAYOR AND VICE-MAYOR.  

At its organizational meeting after each election of Council members, the Council shall elect a President of Council and a President Pro-tem of Council, from among its members, for a term of two (2) years. The President Pro-tem of Council shall act as President of Council in the absence of the President of Council.

At said organizational meeting, the Council shall also elect as Mayor and Vice-Mayor suitable persons from among citizens of this Municipality, qualified to serve on Council, for a term of two (2) years. A member of Council may not be elected either as Mayor or as Vice-Mayor.

The Mayor shall serve as judge of the Mayor’s Court to hear and determine misdemeanor cases arising under the ordinances of this Municipality, as provided by the laws of the State, unless and until another and different court is required by State legislative act. So long as there is a Mayor’s Court, the Mayor and Vice-Mayor shall each be an attorney admitted to the Bar of Ohio and be in good-standing with the Supreme Court of Ohio. Nothing in this Section 2.05 shall limit the City Council from appointing a magistrate to preside over Mayor’s Court in the absence of the Mayor and Vice-Mayor. City Council shall establish the qualifications of a magistrate and shall make such appointment by resolution.

The Mayor shall further be recognized as the ceremonial head of the Municipality but shall have no administrative duties. The Vice-Mayor shall act as Mayor during the absence of the Mayor. A vacancy in the office of Mayor or Vice-Mayor shall be deemed to occur for the same reasons set forth for a vacancy in the office of member of Council as provided in Section 2.03 hereof. Upon a vacancy in the office of Mayor, the Vice-Mayor shall serve for the unexpired term or until a Mayor is elected, whichever first occurs.
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Section 2.06 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2.06  SALARY OF MAYOR AND VICE-MAYOR.

The salaries of Mayor and Vice-mayor shall be established by ordinance, and neither salary shall be increased or decreased during the Mayor’s or Vice-Mayor’s term of office.

Section 2.07 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2.07  SPECIFIC POWERS OF COUNCIL

In addition to its legislative power and its executive authority and its power to prescribe by ordinance or resolution the manner in which any power of the Municipality may be exercised, the Council shall have the authority to:

1. Appoint and remove the City Manager, appoint an Acting City Manager in the event the position of City Manager is vacant, and establish the salary for such positions by ordinance;
2. Establish administrative departments, define their duties and procedures, and confirm the appointment of officers in unclassified positions and fix the salaries and wages for all employees;
3. Adopt the municipal budget;
4. Appoint and remove the members of the Municipal Planning Commission, the Board of Zoning Appeals, and of any board, commission, or committee created or authorized by this Charter or by ordinance or resolution of Council;
5. Adopt and modify the official map of the Municipality;
6. Regulate and restrict the use of public and private real estate in the interests of the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the people by establishing use zones and limiting area, land use, and building heights therein;
7. Adopt and approve subdivision plats and establish subdivision regulations therefor;
8. Authorize the levy and collection of taxes and the issuance of notes and bonds as provided in this Charter or as otherwise authorized by the laws of the State of Ohio;
9. Authorize an audit of the accounts of the Municipality or any officer or department thereof in such manner and means as Council shall deem necessary and appropriate;
10. Establish an Architectural District and appoint an Architectural Review Board, in accordance with Sec. 6.03(7) of this Charter, to exercise such powers within the Architectural District as are established by ordinance, (Amended November 8, 1983)
11. Adopt, and review at least annually, a policy on the investment of funds held by the City. (Added November 5, 1996)
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The Council may delegate the administration of any and all municipal affairs to the City Manager who shall be responsible to the Council for the performance thereof.

Section 2.10 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2.10 COUNCIL RELATIONS WITH CITY MANAGER

Except for the purpose of inquiry, the Council and its members shall deal solely and directly through the City Manager with respect to any matter related to the administrative affairs of the Municipality which are within the scope of the power, duty, authority and responsibility of the City Manager. Except to confirm the City Manager's appointment of officers in unclassified positions of the Municipality, the Council and its members shall not otherwise interfere with the appointment of officers in unclassified positions or employees in the administrative service.

Section 2.17 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2.17 PROCEDURE IN THE PASSAGE OF ORDINANCES.

Each proposed ordinance shall be in writing, shall contain a title and an opening clause: "Be It Ordained by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:", and shall set forth at length therein the action to be taken. Each ordinance shall contain but one subject which shall be summarized in its title. At a regular or special meeting of Council, a proposed ordinance shall be read by title only and may thereupon be introduced by a member of Council. At the option of the President of Council, a title may be read in summary fashion, which shall include the ordinance number and a succinct description of the action to be considered. Upon its introduction and in the absence of it being declared an emergency ordinance as hereinafter provided, a public hearing date on the ordinance shall be scheduled for a subsequent regular or special meeting of the Council as it shall determine. The Clerk of Council shall cause a notice of public hearing on the ordinance to be published once in a newspaper of general circulation in the Municipality prior to the scheduled hearing date and shall cause the notice to be posted on at least one electronic medium which shall be determined by Council from time to time. Such notice shall contain the title of the ordinance or a succinct summary of the title, the time, date, and place of the public hearing, and a statement that the ordinance is on file for public inspection in the office of the Clerk of Council. At the public hearing, the ordinance shall be read a second time by title only, or by a succinct summary of the title only as may be determined by the President of Council, and, thereafter, the public hearing commenced under such rules as Council may provide. At the
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conclusion of the public hearing, the Council shall vote to adopt, with or without amendment, or reject the ordinance. The adoption of an ordinance shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of the members of Council and the attestation by signature thereon of the President and the Clerk of Council.

In addition to those categories of ordinances specifically set forth in Section 2.19 of this Charter, an ordinance necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare of the Municipality may be passed as an emergency measure to be immediately effective upon its passage and publication either: (1) upon introduction, provided the notice of public hearing on the ordinance is waived and the ordinance is declared to be immediately effective upon its passage and publication; or (2) at the conclusion of the public hearing thereon provided the ordinance is declared to be immediately effective upon its passage and publication. A six-sevenths (6/7) vote of the members of Council shall be required to waive the waiting period, to declare the immediate effectiveness of the ordinance, and to pass the ordinance.

Section 2.18 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2.18  PUBLICATION OF PASSAGE OF ORDINANCES.

Public notice of the passage of an ordinance shall be published the Thursday following passage by one or more of the following methods:
1) By posting copies thereof in not less than four (4) of the most public places in the Municipality as determined by City Council, and on the City website;
2) By posting copies thereof in the office of the Clerk of Council;
3) By publication of a notice, one time, in a newspaper of general circulation in the Municipality and on the electronic medium determined by Council, setting forth the title and effective date of the ordinance and a statement that the ordinance is on file in the office of the City Clerk;
4) By publication at length, one time, in a newspaper of general circulation in the Municipality and on the electronic medium determined by Council;
5) In accordance with the provisions of Section 4.05 of this Charter in the case of the annual appropriations budget ordinance;
6) By setting forth their provisions at length in the Codified Ordinances made available for public inspection in libraries and in courts.
Publication of the passage of an ordinance shall be made by method one (1) above unless a provision of said ordinance provides another method.
(Amended November 6, 2007.)
Section 2.19 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2.19 EFFECTIVE DATES OF ORDINANCES.

Ordinances raising revenue, those appropriating money for current operations, those directing an election or a question to the electorate, those authorizing annual tax levies, and those declared to be emergency ordinances as provided in Section 2.17 of this Charter shall be effective upon passage and publication. Except as may be provided in Section 1.04 of this Charter, all other ordinances shall take effect on the twentieth (20th) day following publication in order to afford an opportunity during that period for the filing of referendum petitions thereon.

Section 3.02 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 3.02 CITY MANAGER; POWERS AND DUTIES.

The City Manager shall be the chief executive and administrative officer of the Municipality, shall be responsible to the Council for the proper administration of the affairs of the Municipality and, to that end and subject to the provisions of this Charter, shall have power and be required to:

(1) Appoint and, when necessary, remove any of the classified and unclassified employees of the Municipality.

(2) Prepare and submit to the Council annual appropriations budget estimates and lawfully administer the budget adopted by Council.

(3) Prepare and submit to the Council and to the public an annual report including, but not limited to, the financial and administrative affairs and activities of the Municipality for the preceding year.

(4) Inform the Council of the current financial condition and future financial needs of the Municipality.

(5) Appoint such temporary advisory committees as are necessary and desirable.

(6) Delegate to subordinate officers and employees of the Municipality such duties conferred upon the City Manager by this Charter or by action of the Council as are necessary or appropriate for the efficient and effective operation of the Municipality.

(7) Perform such other duties, not inconsistent with this Charter, as may be required by the Council.

(8) Execute, upon authorization of the Council, contracts, leases, deeds, easements, conveyances and agreements as are necessary and appropriate to the efficient and effective operation of the City. (Amended November 8, 1983)

(9) Execute, without having to obtain additional authorization from Council, contracts for the expenditure of funds from the General Fund which have previously been appropriated by Council as part of the annual operating budget process or amendments thereto;
(10) Execute contracts for the construction of public improvements or the acquisition of capital assets only upon the specific authorization of Council at the time it appropriates funds from the Capital Improvement Fund for such construction or acquisition.
(Added November 5, 1996.)

Section 3.05 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 3.05 DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS.

At the head of each department shall be a Director, responsible to and appointed by the City Manager with the approval of the Council, and who shall be an unclassified officer of the Municipality. The Director shall have supervision and control, subject to the direction of the City Manager, of the department and shall faithfully discharge those duties of the office and observe and enforce the provisions of this Charter and the ordinances of this Municipality. Two or more departments may be headed by the same officer and the City Manager may serve as head of one or more departments in addition to serving as City Manager, if approved by Council.

Section 4.03 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 4.03 PUBLIC HEARING ON BUDGET ESTIMATES.

At the meeting of the Council at which the budget estimates are submitted by the City Manager, the Council shall schedule a public hearing on the budget. A notice of public hearing shall be published once in a newspaper of general circulation in the Municipality and on the electronic medium determined by Council, at least seven (7) days before the hearing. Such notice shall state that the budget estimates and message are on file for public inspection in the office of the Clerk of Council. On the date and at the time and place advertised, the Council shall hold a public hearing on the estimates as submitted and may continue such hearing. After the hearing, the Council shall adopt by ordinance the estimates as submitted, or as amended, as the appropriations budget of the Municipality for the ensuing budget year. Adoption of the budget ordinance shall require a majority vote of the members of Council.

Section 4.10 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 4.10 PURCHASING.

The Council shall establish by ordinance a purchasing procedure for the City departments which may include a procedure for making emergency purchases by certain officers and employees of the Municipality.
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Section 4.11 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 4.11  COMPETITIVE BIDDING.

Purchase of supplies, materials and equipment and the construction of public improvements for the Municipality shall be made by any method authorized by the State of Ohio for public entities, pursuant to such procedures and subject to such threshold amounts as the Council shall determine by ordinance.

Section 4.13 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 4.13 SHORT TERM BORROWING.

At any time in the fiscal year when the Council determines that revenues will be insufficient, to meet authorized expenditures, it may, by ordinance, direct the issuance of notes of three different types: (1) those issued to finance emergency appropriations under Sec. 4.12 of this Charter, when unappropriated available revenues are insufficient for such purpose; (2) as permitted by law, those issued in anticipation of the collection upon real and personal property; (3) those issued in anticipation of the collection of other types of revenue. The total amount of the notes issued in each case shall not exceed a reasonable estimate of the applicable revenues to be received during the fiscal year and the succeeding year and all such notes shall be redeemed not later than the end of the next fiscal year after their issuance.

Section 4.14 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 4.14 CHARACTERISTICS OF SHORT TERM NOTES.

Notes issued pursuant to the provision of Sec. 4.13 of this Charter shall be signed by the President of Council and the Director of Finance and shall be negotiable. They may be sold at public or private sale by the Director of Finance at the lowest net cost to the Municipality, shall be payable on demand or at fixed dates, no later than the end of the next fiscal year, and may in the latter case be either subject to redemption prior to maturity or non-callable at the option of the Municipality. No renewal or extension shall extend the maturity date beyond the end of the next fiscal year following their issuance.
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Section 5.04 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 5.04  PROCEDURE IN BOND OR NOTE ISSUES.

In all respects not provided for otherwise in this Charter the procedure followed in authorizing and issuing bonds and notes and applying the proceeds shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Uniform Public Securities Act as established by the Revised Code of Ohio.

Section 5.05 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 5.05  FISCAL AGENT.

The Council shall designate the fiscal officer or trustee for the Municipality in all transactions under the Uniform Public Securities Act.

Section 6.03 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 6.03  POWERS AND DUTIES OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION.

The Municipal Planning Commission shall have the power to:

(1) Review and recommend any revisions to the Master Plan, official map, area plans, and development standards of the City as often as necessary but not less frequently than every five (5) years; (Amended November 5, 1996.)

(2) Recommend to Council the disposition of requests for subdivision platting;

(3) Recommend to Council amendments to the zoning plan and ordinance of the Municipality;

(4) Recommend to Council zoning changes and zoning for newly annexed areas;

(5) Determine or recommend to Council, as provided by ordinance, the disposition of requests for conditional use permits;

(6) Cooperate with the regional planning commission and the planning commissions of area municipalities;

(7) Act as the Board of Architectural Review as provided by ordinance. The Council shall annually appoint as additional voting members of the Board of Architectural Review two representatives of the Architectural Review District, one or both of whom shall be a resident freeholder of said District;

(8) Perform such other duties, not inconsistent with this Charter, as may be required by ordinance.

In rendering a decision or recommendation, the Municipal Planning Commission shall articulate its basis therefor, in writing, by reference to
the relationship that decision or recommendation has to the overall comprehensive planning goals of the City, which may be found in the Master Plan, the zoning map, a course of zoning or subdivision practices by the City, or any other acknowledged comprehensive strategy or goals previously established at the time of the decision or recommendation.

Section 6.05 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 6.05 POWERS AND DUTIES OF BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS.

The Board of Zoning Appeals shall have the power to hear and decide appeals from the refusal, issuance, or revocation of a building permit, occupancy certificate, or certificate of compliance by a municipal official; and to permit exceptions to and grant variances from zoning area regulations in individual cases when it is determined that practical difficulty exists. The practical difficulty standards to be applied in such cases shall be established by ordinance.

Section 7.03 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 7.03 NOMINATIONS.

There shall be no primary election for municipal offices. Nominations for the office of member of Council shall be made by petition only, signed by not less than fifty resident registered electors, on the forms for the nomination of nonpartisan candidates for such office, filed with the Board of Elections of Franklin County under such regulations and at such time as are prescribed by the State elections laws.

Section 9.01 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 9.01 OATH OF OFFICE.

Every officer and employee of the Municipality shall, before entering upon the duties of office or employment, take and subscribe to the following oath or affirmation, which may be administered by the City Manager, or designee, and filed and kept in the office of the Clerk:

"I solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Ohio and will obey the laws thereof and that I will, in all respects, observe the provisions of the Charter and ordinances of this Municipality, and will faithfully discharge the duties of ________________, upon which I am about to enter."
ORDINANCE NO. 24-2016

Section 11.02 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 11.02 CLASSIFIED AND UNCLASSIFIED SERVICE.

All positions in the service of the City shall be filled pursuant to open competitive examinations except:
(1) The Clerk of Council.
(2) The City Manager.
(3) The Assistant City Manager.
(4) The directors, assistant directors, and deputy directors of departments.
(5) The Administrative Assistants.
(6) The Assistant to the City Manager.
(7) The Executive Assistant to the City Manager.
(8) Seasonal, temporary, and part-time employees.
(9) The Chief Building Inspector.
(10) The Clerk of the Mayor's Court.
(Amended November 5, 1996.)

Appointment to and removal from the offices of City Council, Mayor, Vice-Mayor and members of boards, commissions and committees shall be made in accordance with the specific applicable terms of this Charter and ordinances of the City, and shall not be subject to the provisions of Sections 11.01 and this Section 11.02.

Section 11.03 of the Charter of the City of Worthington to be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 11.03 PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT.

There shall be established a Personnel Department and the City Manager shall appoint, with the approval of the Council, a suitably qualified person to serve part or full time as Director of Personnel who shall:
(1) Recruit qualified persons;
(2) Prepare, schedule and hold examinations;
(3) Create eligible lists;
(4) Certify eligibles to the City Manager, as the appointing authority, for appointment;
(5) Classify positions and establish job classifications;
(6) Develop and conduct training programs;
(7) Prepare and recommend to City Council, through the City Manager, for approval and publication, necessary rules to establish and maintain the merit system in the Municipality;
(8) Perform such other duties relating to personnel matters as the City Manager may direct.

(b) To Delete Section 10.07 of the Charter of the City of Worthington.
SECTION 2. That the ballot for said election shall conform to the election laws of the State of Ohio, and shall: (1) be entitled “Proposed Charter Amendments – City of Worthington;” (2) contain a statement that a majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage and approval of the amendment of the Sections as proposed herein; and (3) state the question to be submitted to the electorate of the City in condensed text form.

SECTION 3. That the Director of Law be and he hereby is authorized and directed to make such arrangements with the Board of Elections of Franklin County as are necessary for giving notice of said election and for placing the question on the ballot, and for printing the text of the proposed amendments for posting at polling places.

SECTION 4. That the Clerk of Council be and she hereby is directed to certify a copy of this Ordinance to the Board of Elections of Franklin County and to publish the full text of the proposed Charter amendments, as set forth in Section 1 of this Ordinance, once a week for not less than two consecutive weeks in The Columbus Dispatch, a newspaper published and of general circulation in the Municipality, or as provided in Section 731.211 of the Ohio Revised Code, with the first publication being at least fifteen (15) days prior to the election hereinbefore provided.

SECTION 5. That this Ordinance, directing a question to the electorate, shall take effect immediately upon its passage and publication as provided in Section 2.19 of the Charter of the City of Worthington.

Passed _______________________

__________________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

__________________________________________
Introduced July 5, 2016

P.H. July 18, 2016

Clerk of Council
To: Worthington City Council

From: Worthington Charter Review Commission

Date: June 27, 2016

Subject: Report - Recommended Amendments to Worthington City Charter

**Background**

The 11 members of the Worthington Charter Review Commission were appointed at the February 8, 2016 meeting of the Worthington City Council. The last time the Charter was amended on changes recommended by an appointed Charter Review Commission was on November 6, 2007. On November 3, 2015, the Charter was amended pursuant a citizen-initiated petition. The 2016 Commission was asked to review the Charter and consider whether changes should be made, and forward to Council specific prepared recommendations for Council’s approval for placement of those amendments on the November 8, 2016 general election ballot.

**Work of the Commission**

Sue Cave was nominated and elected to serve as the Chair of the Commission with Mark Senff chosen as Vice-Chair. The Commission held five meetings from March to June. Approval of recommended changes was made upon a majority of the Commission, or at least six votes. With two exceptions, which will be detailed later on, all of the changes were approved unanimously or nearly so. Many of the proposals discussed were based on submissions from the City administration. The Commission was given the opportunity to submit issues to discuss. One issue was submitted by Ken Pearlman related to duties of the Municipal Planning Commission; another set of proposed changes was submitted by Becky Princehorn related to financing and bond law processes. The Charter Review Commission was deliberative in its decisions and believes that the proposed amendments maintain the integrity of the Charter while conforming provisions to current City practices, changes in technology and revisions in Ohio statutory laws and procedures. The Commission recommends that Council approve these amendments for submission to the November general election ballot.

At the June 6 meeting of the Commission, the members discussed whether to consider any changes to Section 1.04, the Issue 38 amendment that was approved by the voters last November.
After most of the members agreed that it was in the Commission’s purview to discuss this section, the dialogue turned to whether it should be discussed, in light of its recent adoption. Many weighed in on the subject and the group ultimately determined that now is not the appropriate time to offer any recommendations for amendments to this section. Most wanted to allow time to pass to afford everyone the opportunity to see the effects of Section 1.04. The Commission ended the debate without any recommendations made.

Preservation of the Power of Local Self-Government

The core philosophy of our Charter is to reserve to the City the widest possible power and authority of local self-government. Our Charter is written in such a way as to permit the City to do all things a charter city may do under the Ohio Constitution while, at the same time, providing the City with the broadest flexibility for exercising that power and authority. The Charter is basically an enabling document which permits exercising the power and authority of local self-government through the enactment of legislation or the adoption of regulations. The charter sets forth all of the things the City needs to have the right to do; choosing whether to do those things and, if so, how to do them is mostly left to legislative and administrative decision-making.

Recommended Charter Amendments

The Charter Review Commission recommends that the following Charter amendments be submitted to the voters of the City of Worthington as one ballot issue:

Article II – The Council

Section 2.04 – Salary. The Commission members agreed that the salaries currently established for City Council are low, especially in comparison to other jurisdictions in Central Ohio. There was significant discussion about whether all Council members could receive a one-time increase in salary as a means to bringing them all more in line (or closer to) those other jurisdictions, even when that means that some current members would receive an increase during their term. Receiving an increase (or decrease) during a member’s term is currently prohibited by the Charter. The general consensus of the Commission was that a one-time increase for all Council members is warranted, but subsequently no raises should be voted for in-term members. A prohibition on emergency legislation to set the salaries was also approved.

Section 2.05 – President of Council, President Pro-tem of Council, Mayor and Vice-Mayor. This Charter section sets forth the qualifications for Mayor and Vice-Mayor. The chief duty of these appointed officials is to preside over Mayor’s Court. Under Ohio law, Ohio Mayor’s Courts can appoint a magistrate to act as judge, rather than the municipality’s mayor doing so. The City of Worthington in the past several years had to take the responsibility of appointing a magistrate when our Mayor and Vice-Mayor were unable to perform those duties in court. The recommended change makes it clear that our Charter permits the appointment of a magistrate.

1 This section was originally drafted by Mike Minister, former Law Director for the City. Because these statements still ring true to the process of the 2016 Charter Review Commission, I have included them in this report.
Section 2.06 – Salary of Mayor and Vice-Mayor. In order to simplify and bring the process for establishing a salary for the Mayor and Vice-Mayor in line with current budgeting practices, the Commission recommends broadening the language in this Charter section by directing Council to set that salary by ordinance.

Section 2.07 – Specific Powers of Council. The simple recommendations in subsection 2.07(10) are to change the reference to the Board of Architectural Review to the Architectural Review Board and to correct a cross-reference error to Section 6.03(7). Also, as explained in the Section 11.02 recommendation below, a change was made to subsection 2.07(2) to refer to ‘exempt’ officers as ‘unclassified’ officers. ²

Section 2.17 and 2.18 – Procedure in the Passage of Ordinances; Publication of Passage of Ordinances. The current Charter language requires the full reading of an ordinance title when it is introduced and when it is up for public hearing. A City Council member asked if those titles might be read in summary fashion because of the length of certain titles, mostly dealing with TIF or bond legislation. The discussion focused on whether to allow for the reading of the title and the publication of the title in the required newspaper advertisement (and electronically as described below) in an abbreviated fashion. The Commission decided to vote in favor of that concept. Ms. Cave indicated that the State legislature provides notification in this manner.

In order to bring the notification requirements more in line with current technology, the debate was centered on whether publication of public hearings on ordinances should be restricted to publication in a newspaper of general circulation, or whether additional (i.e., electronic) methods were warranted. After a lengthy dialogue, the Commission decided on maintaining the newspaper publication requirement, but adding to that requirement an electronic method of notification that would be determined by City Council. The Commission acknowledged that maybe when the next Charter Review Commission is appointed in ten years, the print notification requirement may be obsolete, but now was not the right time to eliminate it. There were divergent opinions on this particular issue (with some in favor of maintaining the print and others believing electronic methods are more effective and should be the only method used), resulting in one of the two 6-5 votes of the Commission. A similar change was approved for language contained in Article IV, Section 4.03, pertaining to the public hearing on the budget ordinance.

Section 2.19 – Effective Date of Ordinances. There are a few different types of ordinances passed by City Council that go into immediate effect. Section 2.19 lists what those are. The City is required, on an annual basis, to pass an ordinance and provide it to Franklin County authorizing the annual tax levies imposed upon Worthington property owners. The submission of the annual tax budget is a statutory requirement. Because the timing of the approval of this ordinance conflicts with the Council’s summer recess calendar, it is usually difficult to pass it in the ordinary course of our legislative process and submit it on time. Council often has passed the measure by emergency, solely to comply with the County’s statutory deadline. The proposed

² Similar recommended changes were made to Sections 2.10, 3.02(1) and 3.05.
language would eliminate that problem by allowing for the ordinance to become effective upon passage and publication.

There was an additional recommendation to cross reference the Issue 38 Charter amendment in Section 1.04 as an exception to all other ordinances that would become effective 20 days following passage and publication.

Article IV – Finance
   Article V – Taxation and Borrowing

Section 4.10 – Purchasing. The recommended change in this section addresses the way the City administers its purchasing function. Because the purchasing function may change from time to time, instead of requiring that function to rest in a single department, the recommended language was broadened to simply allow for City Council to establish the manner in which the City performs it. Our administrative code would be the appropriate section to establish that process.

Section 4.11 – Competitive Bidding. The Charter requires open competitive bidding for the purchase of supplies, materials and equipment and the construction of public improvements. In 2012, the State legislature allowed for public entities to utilize a variety of purchasing methods in addition to competitive bidding. In order to afford the City the ability to take advantage of the State amendments and to tailor its purchases in the most effective manner, the Commission agreed that it is in the best interest of the City to allow it to make purchases by any method authorized by the State for public entities.  

Sections 4.13, 4.14, 5.04 and 5.05 (Public Financing). Certain changes to these sections are recommended primarily to bring the Charter into conformance with State-authorized changes to the nomenclature and processes of the Ohio Uniform Public Securities Act.

Article VI – Boards and Commissions

Section 6.03 – Powers and Duties of the Municipal Planning Commission. Ken Pearlman requested a paragraph be added to the end of this section to address the decisions made by the MPC. Specifically, the clause he drafted requires the MPC to articulate the basis of a decision and how that decision relates to the overall comprehensive planning goals of the City. He explained that while Ohio does not require that zoning decisions be formally consistent with a written plan, they nevertheless must be done comprehensively and rationally. In the second of the two issues that garnered a 6-5 vote, and after a lengthy dialogue and debate about how the MPC may arrive at an articulated basis and whether it was beneficial to include this language in the Charter (as opposed to having similar language in the zoning code), the Commission approved a motion to insert the clause at the end of Section 6.03, which is included with the attached amended provisions.

---

3 Based on this recommendation, the reference to the authority of the City Manager in Sections 3.02(9) and 3.02(10) to execute contracts subject to the satisfaction of any requirements for competitive bidding was deleted.
Section 6.05 – Powers and Duties of the Board of Zoning Appeals. The authorization granted to the BZA by Charter in approving variances is by a method that has changed over time as court rulings have been handed down. Specifically, the recommended amendment is more consistent with the language in our Code and the standard by which those variance decisions are authorized.

Article VII – Nominations and Elections

Section 7.03 – Nominations. A significant amount of time was devoted to discussing this section, which sets forth the requirements for candidates to the office of City Council when submitting petitions. The current Charter language sets both a minimum and a maximum number of valid signatures required to be submitted to the Board of Elections. The Ohio Revised Code already has a procedure established for the Board of Elections in its acceptance of petitions, which provides for a maximum number of signatures to be submitted (3 times the minimum number, or in Worthington’s case, 150). The Commission members ultimately decided to eliminate the maximum number and instead rely on State law to control.

Article IX – General Provisions

Section 9.01 – Oath of Office. Section 9.01 requires officers and employees to take and subscribe to an oath of office. Because the Charter is silent on who administers the oaths and because there are some limitations under Ohio law regarding who is qualified to administer an oath, it is suggested that we include the City Manager or the City Manager’s designee as two individuals in the City who may do so. Elected officials and those authorized to administer an oath (i.e., a Notary Public) are also eligible individuals who may administer the City’s oath of office under the Ohio law. The Commission voted specifically to designate the City Manager or a designee.

Article X – Transitional Provisions

Section 10.07 – When Charter Amendments Take Effect. The Commission agreed with the information that was presented by the Staff that described this provision as a ‘belts and suspenders’ provision and not one that had to be included in the Charter in order for Charter amendments to take effect. Those amendments take effect when passed and certified or on the date provided for in the ordinance. The recommendation was made to delete this section of the Charter.

Article XI – Merit System

Section 11.02 – Exempt Positions. The Ohio Constitution requires that appointments to and promotions in public positions be made on the basis of merit and fitness and pursuant to open competitive exams. However, exceptions can be made for those employees that work in positions of trust, discretion and confidence, who are not required to be protected under this system and who serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority. The Charter lists each of those
positions that fall within the merit system exemption. Based on a suggestion by the Staff, the Commission was presented with two alternative suggested amendments to this section. The first involved eliminating the list altogether and instead referring that list to Council to establish by ordinance. This alternative would make it easier if changes in the list were warranted, due to the creation of new positions or changing the title of a specific position. There was a robust discussion on this topic with no decision made at the meeting when it was initially addressed, resulting in a request that additional information on this topic be presented at the next meeting.

At the following meeting, a second alternative was presented that removed the elected and appointed officials from the list (Council, Mayor, Vice-Mayor and members of boards and commissions) on the basis that the Charter, and not necessarily the merit system, provides for the election, appointment and removal of people in those positions. However, a clause was added to the end of the list clarifying that those positions fell outside of the merit system. This second alternative was accepted by the Commission and recommended for approval.

The Commission also approved changing the reference from ‘exempt’ positions to ‘classified’ and ‘unclassified’ positions, to conform to general statutory references and to help differentiate these employees from those who may be ‘exempt’ under the Fair Labor Standards Act for overtime purposes, unrelated to the merit system.

Section 11.03 – Personnel Department. One of the enumerated duties in this section for the Personnel Director is to “certify the payroll.” This is no longer a function of the Personnel Director and instead lies with the Finance Director. The Commission agreed that this duty should be eliminated.
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NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

A. INVESTMENTS:
Approximately 72.1% of available funds are invested in C.D.'S, StarOhio, and Fifth Third Investment accounts as of June 30, 2016. Certificates of Deposit provide a secure and stable investment instrument to meet our flexible cash flow needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As of 6/1/2016</th>
<th>As of 6/30/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balances</td>
<td>$22,588,262.93</td>
<td>$23,814,536.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Accounts</td>
<td>$16,890,516.98</td>
<td>$17,170,443.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Invested</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year to Date Interest Earnings</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$73,745.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Monthly Interest Earnings</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$25,716.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Interest Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. CASH POSITION:
- Fund balances for all accounts increased from $22,588,263 to $23,814,536 for the month of June with revenues exceeding expenditures by $1,226,273.
- Year to date fund balances for all accounts increased from $21,263,095 on January 1, 2016 to $23,814,536 as of June 30, 2016 with revenues exceeding expenditures by $2,551,442.
- Expenditures for all funds tracked at 90.4% of anticipated expenditure levels.
- Year to date revenues for all funds are above 2015 revenues by $854,055 and above year to date estimates by $1,272,050.
- The General Fund balance increased from $11,308,556 to $11,633,470 for the month of June with revenues exceeding expenditures by $324,914.
- The year to date General Fund balance increased from $11,250,077 on January 1, 2016 to $11,633,470 with revenues exceeding expenditures by $383,392.
- General Fund expenditures tracked at 92.3% of anticipated expenditure levels.
- Total General Fund revenues are below estimates by -$53,486 or -.40%. General Fund revenue variances are detailed on page 4 of this report.
- June 2016 income tax collections are above year to date 2015 collections by $175,929 or 1.41% and above estimates by $6,722 or .05%.
# CASH RECONCILIATION

as of June 30, 2016

## Total Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bank Balances</td>
<td>$ 6,642,562.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Depository Balances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Account Checking</td>
<td>$ 5,090,497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Lock Box</td>
<td>$ 1,552,065.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bank Balances</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 6,642,562.61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>$ 6,168,683.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposit (EMS Account)</td>
<td>$ 2,100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Ohio</td>
<td>$ 1,225,032.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Third Bank Money Market &amp; CD's</td>
<td>$ 7,321,775.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Instruments</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicentennial</td>
<td>$ 69,988.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.K. Memorial Library</td>
<td>$ 12,219.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF Bank</td>
<td>$ 272,744.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 17,170,443.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Petty Cash/Change Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash/Change Fund</td>
<td>$ 1,530.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Treasury Balance as of June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Treasury Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 23,814,538.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INVESTMENTS - INTERIM FUNDS

### June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposit - General Fund</td>
<td>$6,168,683.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposit - EMS General Fund</td>
<td>$2,100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Ohio</td>
<td>$1,225,032.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Third Bank Money Market Sweep &amp; CD's</td>
<td>$7,321,775.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Instruments</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicentennial</td>
<td>$69,988.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.K. Memorial Library</td>
<td>$12,219.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF Bank - CD's &amp; Money Market</td>
<td>$272,744.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments - Interim Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,170,443.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Interest Earnings for June 2016**  
$25,716.02

**Year to Date Interest Earnings**  
$73,745.56

**Certificates of Deposit Average Earnings**  
0.89%

**Repurchase Agreements**  
0.09%
City of Worthington, Ohio  
General Fund Overview  
as of June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Income Tax</td>
<td>1 $16,953,505</td>
<td>$19,295,446</td>
<td>$15,265,146</td>
<td>$10,068,819.14</td>
<td><strong>$10,062,195</strong></td>
<td>$3,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>2 2,564,036</td>
<td>2,710,000</td>
<td>2,710,000</td>
<td>1,355,000</td>
<td><strong>1,377,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,234</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>447,643</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>1175,000</td>
<td><strong>1175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance Tax</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td><strong>73,746</strong></td>
<td>31,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>2 178,214</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td><strong>91,222</strong></td>
<td>(38,778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Fire Service</td>
<td>2 430,599</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>237,500</td>
<td><strong>233,389</strong></td>
<td>(4,111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Membership/Progr</td>
<td>1,389,305</td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td><strong>686,425</strong></td>
<td>(28,575)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Transport</td>
<td>562,686</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td><strong>253,496</strong></td>
<td>(46,504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Revenue</td>
<td>943,006</td>
<td>1,215,700</td>
<td>1,215,700</td>
<td>477,850</td>
<td><strong>460,961</strong></td>
<td>(16,989)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Revenues | $25,529,026 | $20,360,846 | $26,360,846 | $13,519,668 | **$13,469,162** | **(53,486)** | **-0.40%** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Building</td>
<td>$637,665</td>
<td>$736,711</td>
<td>$736,711</td>
<td>$368,356</td>
<td><strong>$330,715</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20,641)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>5,728,342</td>
<td>6,916,272</td>
<td>7,063,802</td>
<td>3,679,775</td>
<td><strong>3,430,019</strong></td>
<td><strong>(240,756)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Operations</td>
<td>5,954,865</td>
<td>6,265,681</td>
<td>6,285,661</td>
<td>3,142,831</td>
<td><strong>2,000,885</strong></td>
<td><strong>(113,944)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>4,251,562</td>
<td>4,659,744</td>
<td>4,659,744</td>
<td>2,329,872</td>
<td><strong>2,150,851</strong></td>
<td><strong>(220,021)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Operations</td>
<td>5,162,794</td>
<td>5,665,100</td>
<td>5,665,100</td>
<td>2,841,050</td>
<td><strong>2,613,810</strong></td>
<td><strong>(227,240)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Engineering Department</td>
<td>2,260,415</td>
<td>2,535,540</td>
<td>2,547,055</td>
<td>1,273,028</td>
<td><strong>1,138,712</strong></td>
<td><strong>(134,619)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Expenditures | $24,015,832 | $26,610,028 | $26,695,074 | $13,635,411 | **$12,582,792** | **(1,052,619)** | **92.26%** |

| Excess of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures | $1,513,194 | $3,750,818 | $3,655,772 | $883,391 | | | |

| Fund Balance at Beginning of Year | $10,243,729 | $11,250,077 | $11,250,077 | $11,250,077 | | | |
| Unexpended Appropriations (98.0%) | 336,321 | 539,901 | 539,901 | | | | |
| Expenditures versus Prior Year Enc | 509,046 | 897,416 | 897,416 | 654,365 | 499,999 | | |
| General Fund Balance | $11,250,077 | $10,453,800 | $10,278,335 | $11,019,871 | **$11,033,469** | | |

1 - Income Tax budget based on individual monthly projections.  
2 - These revenue budgets are based on semi-annual payments.  
* - All other revenue budgets are spread equally over each month.

Revised Budget includes all revenue amendments and supplemental appropriation ordinances approved to date.  
Fund Balance at End of Year includes the General Fund Reserve.
CITY OF WORTHINGTON
INTERIM COMBINED STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND TRANSFERS
as of 6/30/2016
ALL FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$ 11,308,556</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,536,884</td>
<td>$ 330,000</td>
<td>$ 1,881,970</td>
<td>$ 11,633,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street M&amp;R</td>
<td>84,758</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>42,618</td>
<td>79,005</td>
<td>68,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Imp.</td>
<td>37,202</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>33,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13,336</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>9,008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>4,522</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Pension</td>
<td>94,937</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,348</td>
<td>351,589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Trust</td>
<td>49,341</td>
<td></td>
<td>353</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.M.V.L.T.</td>
<td>263,762</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,669</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>286,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement &amp; Education</td>
<td>47,055</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Technology</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Clerk Computer</td>
<td>227,801</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>228,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>377,903</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,968</td>
<td>7,171</td>
<td>389,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Grant Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R Revolving</td>
<td>400,706</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,359</td>
<td>65,966</td>
<td>388,099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Parks</td>
<td>69,689</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>69,377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicentennial</td>
<td>71,023</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71,023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>375,149</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>375,149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>7,593,719</td>
<td></td>
<td>799,171</td>
<td>156,789</td>
<td>8,236,101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Permissive Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Bond Retirement</td>
<td>1,115,289</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,115,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assment Bond Ret.</td>
<td>278,448</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>278,448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Acreage Benefit</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.B.B.S.</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash/Change Fund</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Station TIF</td>
<td>19,112</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Place TIF</td>
<td>67,795</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 22,588,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 330,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,481,382</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 330,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,255,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 23,814,536</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND</td>
<td>1/1/2016 Beginning</td>
<td>1/1/2016 Beginning</td>
<td>Estimated Revenue</td>
<td>Year to Date Actual</td>
<td>Estimated Expenses</td>
<td>Year to Date Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 General Fund</td>
<td>$11,250,077.33</td>
<td>$13,519,668.14</td>
<td>$13,466,182.42</td>
<td>$14,289,775.99</td>
<td>$13,082,790.22</td>
<td>$11,633,469.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Street M&amp;R</td>
<td>$37,238.10</td>
<td>$540,000.00</td>
<td>$481,595.76</td>
<td>$470,276.50</td>
<td>$450,463.38</td>
<td>$68,370.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 State Highway</td>
<td>$7,939.13</td>
<td>$77,750.00</td>
<td>$76,288.98</td>
<td>$69,001.00</td>
<td>$50,869.27</td>
<td>$33,331.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 Water</td>
<td>$22,076.38</td>
<td>$35,500.00</td>
<td>$29,644.35</td>
<td>$42,464.00</td>
<td>$42,712.55</td>
<td>$9,008.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Sewer</td>
<td>$9,287.04</td>
<td>$35,500.00</td>
<td>$28,997.26</td>
<td>$36,214.00</td>
<td>$30,278.70</td>
<td>$8,005.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Police Pension</td>
<td>$262,772.57</td>
<td>$375,000.00</td>
<td>$391,222.45</td>
<td>$325,000.00</td>
<td>$302,406.20</td>
<td>$351,588.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 Law Enforcement Trust</td>
<td>$40,090.28</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$12,883.78</td>
<td>$18,250.00</td>
<td>$3,280.00</td>
<td>$49,694.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Municipal MV License Tax</td>
<td>$212,417.24</td>
<td>$57,500.00</td>
<td>$74,013.51</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$286,430.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 Enforcement/Education</td>
<td>$45,301.42</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$1,853.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$47,154.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Community Technology</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 Court Clerk Computer</td>
<td>$222,377.93</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$7,140.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$685.00</td>
<td>$228,832.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Economic Development</td>
<td>$505,046.65</td>
<td>$33,333.33</td>
<td>$44,676.47</td>
<td>$211,500.00</td>
<td>$160,023.16</td>
<td>$389,699.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 FEMA Grant</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 Parks &amp; Rec Revolving</td>
<td>$176,963.39</td>
<td>$490,000.00</td>
<td>$562,617.52</td>
<td>$484,300.50</td>
<td>$351,481.51</td>
<td>$388,099.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229 Special Parks</td>
<td>$108,961.13</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$3,773.80</td>
<td>$60,181.22</td>
<td>$43,357.98</td>
<td>$69,376.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 2003 Bicentennial</td>
<td>$71,022.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$71,022.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 Trunk Sewer</td>
<td>$375,148.78</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$375,148.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$6,335,112.24</td>
<td>$2,521,704.54</td>
<td>$2,799,845.15</td>
<td>$2,014,281.12</td>
<td>$898,856.72</td>
<td>$8,236,100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 County Permissive Tax</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409 General Bond Retirement</td>
<td>$1,213,529.83</td>
<td>$1,602,500.00</td>
<td>$1,615,668.65</td>
<td>$1,680,000.00</td>
<td>$1,713,909.53</td>
<td>$1,115,288.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Special Assessment Bond</td>
<td>$278,447.93</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$278,447.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825 Accrued Acreage Benefit</td>
<td>$5,019.93</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$5,019.93</td>
<td>$5,019.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 OBBS</td>
<td>$2,027.24</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
<td>$2,141.67</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
<td>$2,162.62</td>
<td>$2,006.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838 Petty Cash</td>
<td>$1,530.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910 Worthington Sta TIF</td>
<td>$707.25</td>
<td>$18,750.00</td>
<td>$18,871.63</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$466.60</td>
<td>$19,112.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920 Worthington Place TIF</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$67,795.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total All Funds

| 1/1/2016 Beginning | $21,263,094.63 | $19,338,456.01 | $19,925,490.30 | $19,955,852.48 | $17,374,048.80 | $23,814,536.13 |
## STATEMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS

### CITY OF WORTHINGTON

as of June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ord. No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Bond Term</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Unvoted General Debt</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41-2015</td>
<td>2015 Refunding Bonds Community Center and Police Complex</td>
<td>2015-2021</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>$4,510,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,510,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Bonded Debt**

$4,510,000.00

### BOND ANTICIPATION NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Issuance</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/19/2016</td>
<td>#48-2015</td>
<td>BAN - Ladder Truck, Davis East Waterline Repi &amp; Community Center Window Replacements</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>$1,560,000.00</td>
<td>$1,560,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Bond Anticipation Notes**

$1,560,000.00

### OPWC - 0% Interest Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td>ADA Ramps - Old Worthington 20 year 0% Interest Loan</td>
<td>$93,720.60</td>
<td>$93,720.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>Kenyonbrook Siphon Removal Project 30 year 0% Interest Loan</td>
<td>$592,388.76</td>
<td>$592,388.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total OPWC 0% Loans**

$686,109.36

$686,109.36
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Second Quarter 2016
Financial Report – All Funds

1/1/2016 Beginning Fund Balances: $21,263,095

Total Actual Revenue: $19,925,490

Total Actual Expenditures: $17,374,049

6/30/2016 Fund Balances: $23,814,536
• Year to date revenues exceeded expenditures by $2,551,442 and $1,226,273 for the month of June.

• Expenditures tracked at 90.4%.

• Revenues for all funds are above 2015 revenues by $854,055 and above estimates by $1,272,050.
2016 Financial Report
All Fund Summary

Second Quarter
Revenue to Expenditures
All Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$15,432,309</td>
<td>$14,449,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$14,518,453</td>
<td>$14,338,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$12,869,765</td>
<td>$12,909,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$17,011,959</td>
<td>$14,686,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$17,645,216</td>
<td>$15,393,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$19,077,365</td>
<td>$16,967,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$19,435,370</td>
<td>$17,617,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$19,071,436</td>
<td>$17,410,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$19,925,490</td>
<td>$17,374,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1/1/2016 Beginning General Fund Balance: $11,250,077

Total General Fund Revenue: $13,466,182

Total General Fund Expenditures: $13,082,790

6/30/2016 General Fund Balance: $11,633,470
Year to date revenues exceeded expenditures by $383,392.

June revenues exceeded expenditures by $324,914.

Expenditures tracked at 92.3%.

Second quarter revenues are below estimates by $53,486 and above 2015 year to date revenues by $68,067.

Income tax collections are above year to date 2015 collections by $175,929 or 1.41%.

Income tax collections are above estimates by $6,722 or .05%.
## 2016 General Fund
### Second Quarter Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Revenue</th>
<th>Budgeted Revenue</th>
<th>Actual Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Income Tax</td>
<td>$10,086,818</td>
<td>$10,092,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$1,355,000</td>
<td>$1,377,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$197,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance Tax</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>$73,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$91,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Fire Service</td>
<td>$237,500</td>
<td>$233,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Membership</td>
<td>$715,000</td>
<td>$686,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Transport</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$253,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Revenue</td>
<td>$477,850</td>
<td>$460,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$13,519,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,466,182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 General Fund Revenue

June 2016 Year to Date
General Fund Revenue

- Municipal Income Tax: 74.94%
- Property Tax: 10.23%
- Property Tax: 1.47%
- Inheritance Tax: 0.00%
- Interest Income: 0.55%
- Fines & Forfeitures: 0.68%
- Township Fire Service: 1.73%
- EMS Transport: 5.10%
- Community Center Membership: 1.88%
- EMS Transport: 3.42%
- All Other Revenue: 10.23%
Second Quarter 2015
General Fund

June 2015 Year to Date
General Fund Revenue

- Municipal Income Tax: 74.28%
- Property Tax: 10.38%
- Local Government: 1.84%
- Inheritance Tax: 0.00%
- Interest Income: 0.43%
- Fines & Forfeitures: 0.73%
- Township Fire Service: 1.63%
- EMS Transport: 5.58%
- Community Center Membership: 3.37%
- All Other Revenue: 1.77%
Income Tax Collections

Second Quarter Income Tax Collections

Year | Tax Collections
--- | ---
2008 | $8,000,000
2009 | $7,000,000
2010 | $6,000,000
2011 | $7,000,000
2012 | $8,000,000
2013 | $10,000,000
2014 | $12,000,000
2015 | $13,000,000
2016 | $14,000,000
Income Tax Collections

Income Tax Revenue
as a % of Total General Fund Revenue

Property Tax Collections

Property Tax Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1,260,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,280,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1,320,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,340,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,380,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,420,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Government Fund Revenue as a % of Total General Fund Revenue
### 2016 General Fund

#### 2nd Quarter Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Expenditures</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures</th>
<th>Actual Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Building</td>
<td>$368,356</td>
<td>$339,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$3,679,775</td>
<td>$3,439,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Operations</td>
<td>$3,142,831</td>
<td>$2,900,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$2,329,872</td>
<td>$2,150,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Operations</td>
<td>$2,841,050</td>
<td>$2,613,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng/Service Department</td>
<td>$1,273,528</td>
<td>$1,138,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,635,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,582,792</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 General Fund Expenditures

June 2016 Year to Date General Fund Expenses

- Planning & Building: 2.70%
- General Government: 27.33%
- Fire Operations: 23.05%
- Parks & Recreation: 17.09%
- Police Operations: 20.77%
- Service/Engineering Department: 9.05%

Worthington
Founded 1803
2015 General Fund Expenditures

June 2015 Year to Date General Fund Expenses

- Planning & Building: 2.79%
- General Government: 24.87%
- Fire Operations: 23.96%
- Parks & Recreation: 17.19%
- Police Operations: 9.40%
- Service/Engineering Department: 21.79%
Second Quarter 2016
General Fund
Revenue to Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$11,332,281</td>
<td>$10,806,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$10,908,761</td>
<td>$10,918,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$10,573,337</td>
<td>$10,676,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$12,502,726</td>
<td>$10,989,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$13,002,288</td>
<td>$11,800,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$13,832,283</td>
<td>$12,316,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$12,970,135</td>
<td>$12,305,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$13,398,115</td>
<td>$12,122,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$13,466,182</td>
<td>$13,082,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Fund
Cash Position
Second Quarter Financial Report

Questions & Comments
Quick Facts

All Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balances</th>
<th>$23,814,536</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(January 1, 2016 balance: $21,263,095)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>$11,633,470</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(January 1, 2016 balance: $11,250,077)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

- 90.4% of appropriations.
- Revenues above expenditures by $2,551,442

Expenditures

- 92.3% of appropriations.
- Revenues above expenditures by $324,914

Highlights & Trends for This Quarter

Income Tax Collections

- Income tax revenues for the month of June are below June 2015 collections by $121,942 or 4.43%.
- Year to date income tax collections are above 2015 year to date collections by $175,929 or 1.41%.
- Actual income tax collections are above estimates by $6,722 or .05%.

Income Tax Revenue by Account Type

For the Month of June:
- Withholding Accounts – 61.73% of collections
- Individual Accounts – 22.34% of collections
- Net Profit Accounts – 15.93% of collections

For the Year:
- Withholding Accounts – 75.56% of collections
- Individual Accounts – 13.23% of collections
- Net Profit Accounts – 11.21% of collections

Second Quarter Income Tax Collections

[Graph showing income tax collections for each year from 2008 to 2016]

Income Tax Refunds as of 6/30

[Graph showing income tax refunds for each year from 2008 to 2016]
Highlights & Trends for This Quarter (continued)

June 2016 Year to Date General Fund Revenue

June 2016 Year to Date General Fund Expenses

Notable Initiatives & Activities

- Year to date revenues for all funds are above 2015 year to date revenue by $854,055 and above year to date estimates by $1,272,050.

- Year to Date General Fund revenues are above 2015 revenues by $68,067 and below estimates by $53,486.

- Year to date revenues exceeded expenditures for all funds by $2,551,442. June revenues for all funds exceeded expenditures by $1,226,273.

- Expenditures for all funds tracked at 90.4% of anticipated expenditure levels.

- Year to date General Fund revenues exceeded expenditures by $383,392. General Fund revenues for the month of June exceeded expenditures by $324,914.

- General Fund Expenditures tracked at 92.3% of anticipated expenditure levels.
Financial Tracking

Second Quarter Revenue to Expenditures All Funds

General Fund Cash Position
General Fund Selected Revenue Sources

**Income Tax Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Tax Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,420,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Government Fund Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$6,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>