CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Tuesday, January 16, 2018, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 PM.

ROLL CALL


Member(s) Absent:

Also present: City Manager Matthew Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Law Tom Lindsey, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Director of Service & Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning & Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire & EMS John Bailot, Chief of Police Jerry Strait, Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

There were nine visitors present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Michael invited all to stand and join in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

• Organizational Meeting – January 2, 2018
• Regular Meeting – January 2, 2018

MOTION

Ms. Kowalczyk moved to approve the aforementioned meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion to approve the minutes as presented carried unanimously by a voice vote.
VISITOR COMMENTS

No visitor comments

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance 01-2018

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

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Ms. Michael reported this item adopts the replacement pages that updates our code with all of the ordinances and state law changes.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 01-2018. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Robinson, Kowalczyk, Foust, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 01-2018 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ms. Michael shared that the agenda is going to be changed because the individuals from Kemper House will not be here until at least 8:00 p.m. because of a prior commitment. She would like to discuss of the Northeast Gateway Project at this time.

Policy Item(s)

- Northeast Gateway Project Aesthetics

Mr. Greeson shared that staff is really excited to be at this juncture in this project. We are presenting aesthetic concepts tonight and are seeking Council approval to move forward and include those aesthetics in the design document that will ultimately be bid. Because this is an important gateway into our community, we would like members input and certainly your approval for these features that we think help highlight this important corridor. He asked Mr. Whited to present the information in greater detail.

Mr. Whited recapped that this presentation is a review of the Northeast Gateway project. We are happy to have some of our consultants with us tonight to provide an update on the project and then provide aesthetics updates. Neil Schwartz, Michael Brehm, and Franco Manno are here tonight from EMH&T to present. He also introduced Henry Stephenson, a recent hire as our GIS Analyst & Engineer who has been a project manager with this
project and has been doing a great job keeping up on things. He is glad to have him here tonight as well.

Mr. Brehm shared that they are here to provide a general project update on the Northeast Gateway improvement, which is focused on some aesthetic elements that they would like to incorporate to highlight this as an important gateway into the community. The graph below has the intersection of Worthington-Galena Rd, Wilson Bridge Rd, and Huntley Rd. highlighted.

This intersection has a history of congestion. The Northeast Gateway improvement is the proposed solution to that congestion.

The next graphic is the signalized realignment alternative that was approved by Council in January 2016. They will refer to this graphic throughout the presentation as they orient members to the location of aesthetic elements that hopefully will be incorporated into the project.

Mr. Brehm shared that the general concept from several years ago is to realign Huntley Rd. and the north leg of Worthington-Galena into a continuous North/South movement as that is the dominant flow of traffic. It will also realign the southwestern leg of Worthington-Galena to the west creating a new signalized intersection with the north leg of that intersection being a commercial entrance into Rush Creek Commerce Center.
Mr. Brehm shared that there are a number of aesthetic elements that they wanted to present tonight. Some are gateway elements such as the style of traffic signal, light poles, medium and sidewalk treatments while some are treatments of regulatory signage, retaining walls, and guardrails. He added that the aesthetic elements of this project have very much been selected to be consist with and complimentary to a number of the plans and construction that has occurred at the SR-23 / I-270 improvements as well as those in the Wilson Bridge Rd. Corridor Plan. He invited senior landscape architect Franco Manno with EMH&T to present the aesthetic elements.

Mr. Manno began by showing a graphic from the 2015 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement Plan of Focus Area 3, which is the North Entry into Worthington along High St. / SR-23). Some of those elements will be reflected in this proposal for the Northeast Corridor such as street trees, street lights, and gateway signage.

The Northeast Gateway project is east of McCord Park. He showed proposed improvement elements of that Park that are similar to what is being proposed for the Northeast Gateway such as street lighting, street trees, improved crosswalks, etc. (examples below).

Mr. Manno reported that the Signage & Wayfinding Program that is currently being implemented in the Old Worthington area will be used in this area as well.

One of the main pieces of this program is the new Gateway signage that was proposed with fencing, brick, and masonry (example below from the Signage & Wayfinding Program, June 2015).
Mr. Manno showed another diagram from the Signage & Wayfinding Program that showed gateway locations throughout the City along with samples of directional signage. The Northeast Gateway is a “perceived” gateway in that it is not at the jurisdictional line but rather where that line is “perceived” to be located when you enter the City.

Mr. Manno shared that the following images will focus more specific on our focus area for tonight, the Northeast Gateway.

This image shows the intersection of Wilson Bridge Rd. where it comes together with Huntley Rd. There is a detention basin and some green space that is newly brought into the project because of the abandonment of the Old Worthington-Galena Rd.
Ms. Dorothy commented that the pedestrian crossing looks long and not very pedestrian friendly. She asked if they had an idea of how long it will take people to cross there. She shared that she has heard from citizens who have not had enough time to cross a street that is not as wide as this one. This looks like it will be very hard to cross. Mr. Brehm reported that they took that into account in the signal timing. There are obviously a number of lanes, particularly in the north/south direction. With the addition of the bikes lanes, it does make for a wide intersection. If a pedestrian walks at three feet per second from one side to the other, which is a typical standard, then they have allocated enough walk time for that to occur. That is the main consideration for those longer crosswalks.

Ms. Dorothy stated that it would be a shame if we have nice pedestrian features but then didn’t have nice pedestrian accommodations so people feel safe. She believes this road is 35 mph. If the lane widths are too wide, people will feel like they can go a lot faster than 35 mph and then it won’t be friendly for pedestrians and we would be throwing money away. Mr. Brehm reported that lane widths are generally eleven feet. That is not as wide as a typical ODOT lane of twelve. When you have six lanes that does add up in to some savings of distance. He added that bike lanes are generally five feet with a two foot buffer in between.

Ms. Michael noticed the bike lane that goes to the north but as you come south, it appears to be in the middle of the road. She asked how a bicyclist coming south would go west. Mr. Brehm replied that the bike lane stays next to the thru lane. Since there is no receiving bike lane on Wilson Bridge Rd., somebody on a bike that wanted to turn and go west would have a couple of options. They could exit the roadway and jump on the shared use path or they could turn right and ride their bicycle in the thru lane on Wilson Bridge Road.

Mr. Manno commented that the detail below is on Huntley Road looking south and be considered the “perceived” Northeast gateway into Worthington. What they developed here was a two tiered system of a gateway. There is a vehicular gateway as well as a pedestrian/cyclist type of gateway. The aesthetic elements of the sign is pulled from the
They added a little height by adding a stone base to the bottom. That provides a light background for the plantings that are in the foreground. In the background you can see the two brick piers and the pedestrian elements as well as the decorative street lights and mast arms.

Mr. Smith shared that he is looking at a Google map of the site. He knows that Huntley shifts a little bit from the west to the east. He asked how much space is being shifted because in the drawings it looks like a decent amount of green space. Mr. Manno agreed. He went back to a previous slide (shown below) and commented that a red arrow shows the green space at the top of the rendering. The numerous evergreens is where the old roadway was located. That area will become a nice buffer between the roadway, the gateway, the bike path and the Commerce Center.

When asked by Mr. Smith if the City would own that land, Mr. Manno replied yes. Mr. Brehm added that currently that is right-of-way that would essentially be vacated to become available for utilities and landscaping.

Mr. Manno shared that the idea is to add some landscaping for a buffer but we also get that space to help with the buffer.
Mr. Myers recalls that public art was part of the wayfinding discussion probably two or three years ago. He asked if any thought had been given to public art as this seems to him like a good place to put it. Mr. Manno replied that they have not looked at public art in this plan, at this particular location. They have focused on large landscape beds. He added that there is probably room within the intersection that an open space could be developed for an artist.

Ms. Dorothy commented that this is kind of like a linear park that the city would own. Mr. Manno agreed. He doesn’t know that it would necessarily be programmed as a park but it would be open space. Employees and/or residents in the area could go out and stroll around the area. Ms. Dorothy concluded that it would be green space that the city owned and could do whatever we wanted to do with it. Mr. Manno agreed but added that anything added would be over top of existing utilities that would not be moved.

When asked if work on top of the utilities would be a problem, Mr. Brehm reported there being a triangular area left between the right-of-way that is encumbered by the utilities now and the new right-of-way for the road. There is some City owned space there that is available and could theoretically be programmed however the City sees fit.

Mr. Manno shared the following detail of the Worthington signage.

Mr. Manno shared that there are three traffic signals associated with this project, the design of which would match those on N. High St. (US-23). The street lighting would also be similar to that on N. High St.

When asked by Mr. Myers if they envision the crosswalks to be stamped concrete or something else, Mr. Manno replied that in this area it would be the asphalt road with the striping. The brick at the crosswalks is just on the pedestrian landing in the area once you are outside of the roadway.

Mr. Manno reported that there will be a large traffic median on Wilson Bridge Rd. as well as at the I-270 underpass. This is an opportunity to introduce a little different material to the roadway. They will actually be clay brick pavers instead of stamped concrete.
When asked by Mr. Myers what their experience has been with maintenance on the clay pavers, Mr. Manno replied that the pavers are color fast and will last forever.

When asked if they have issues with settling, Mr. Manno replied that depending on how it is built. The plan calls for this to be on a concrete base, which should mitigate the issue of settling.

Street signage will include a black post, backplate, and rain cap.

At the underpass at I-270 there is the shared use path and the sidewalk. In order to help those features fit in the limited available space a retaining wall will be required. The plan for the retaining wall is large block simulated stone. Because of the stone base for the sign, we are able to use that in other places. While he doesn’t think our wall will be as tall as the one in this picture, Mr. Manno stated that its function will be similar to what is shown.

Culvert Headwall and Wingwall

Mr. Manno commented that because of where Rush Run crosses the proposed roads, there will be headwalls as it flows in and out of culverts. Those will be visible to folks on the shared use path as well as on the roadway.

They are looking at a form liner for those walls that is also used to simulate stone. From a distance it will look like pressed stone similar to the retaining wall. It will give it a little bit of texture and something other than just plain concrete.
At those same locations pedestrian railing will be required for fall protection. In that case we are looking at a bicycle friendly wooden rail with horizontal rub rails. It eliminates the vertical rails that you might get caught up in if you were to go off trail and provide a little safety. This coordinates pretty well with the next feature of the timber guardrails.

At the intersection of Huntley and Wilson Bridge there is the storm water basin which requires a guardrail. Steel backed timber guardrails are being looked at instead of just steel. It will provide the same safety function but will blend in a little bit better.

Mr. Manno concluded their presentation and asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Dorothy asked if she is correct in that the materials will be durable and lasting. Mr. Manno replied that the brick medians are the longest lasting materials available. Ms. Dorothy then asked about the cast that looked like the retaining wall. She wants to make sure that this isn’t going to lessen the life that we would get out of this if we weren’t going to have these upgrades. Mr. Manno thinks the life of the upgrades will either be equal or greater that other materials.

Ms. Dorothy commented that not much was said about the landscaping. She requested more details. Mr. Manno shared that the specifics have not yet been identified. There is a large landscape bed that will likely contain flowering shrubs, perennials, ornamental grasses and things that will provide year round interest. There will be some evergreen for the winter time and maybe some spring/summer flowering. There will obviously be maintenance involved in the upkeep of all of that as well as irrigation. The irrigation will help with the maintenance but pruning the plantings and maintaining the irrigation will be required.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if staff is aware of the added maintenance requirements, Mr. Whited confirmed that they were. It is a good looking corridor and therefore it is important to have these features there.
Mr. Manno shared that they kept the more intensive areas of landscaping focused at the intersection near the gateway sign and where pedestrians and cyclist might be the closest. While the street trees have been shown on all of the plans, he understands that they will not be installed as part of this project. They will be planted by City staff as is typical with street trees.

Mr. Whited shared that while they considered landscaping the medians, from a maintenance perspective and a life perspective it didn’t make any sense to do that which is why the brick was chosen.

Ms. Michael noted that in the first drawing the Worthington sign was red. She asked where that sign was located. Mr. Manno replied that it will be at High St. and Wilson Bridge Rd. It was proposed as part of that 2015 corridor plan. He thinks the only reason it is red/orange is so that it stands out. The actual brick will be more subtle. That is one of the locations proposed to have a similar sign to the one on this project. He thinks this will be the first large gateway sign constructed. Ms. Michael shared that she isn’t a fan of the bright orange color.

Mr. Myers asked if the anticipation is that the storm water basin will be full most of the time or will it ebb and flow. Mr. Brehm replied that it will be a wet basin that will always has a normal pool of water. It will however fill during storm events.

Mr. Myers asked if there are any plans to agitate that for a fountain or to do something aesthetic in that location. Mr. Brehm liked that question. It is not included in the plan at this time but it would be a great thing that we need to think about, particularly as we are making aesthetic enhancements at that intersection we don’t want a pond full of algae.

Mr. Myers observed this being a significant enhancement and he likes everything that he has seen. He would like to bump it up one more notch and explore if that is even feasible. It would be nice to have something interesting at that corner that would set it apart particularly if it becomes a stop off spot for cyclists and/or pedestrians. He always encourages public art if we can find a spot for it. He stated that he would appreciate it if those items could be looked into.

There being no additional comments:

MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion authorizing staff to include the proposed design aesthetics of the Northeast Gateway Project with noted requests. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

Mr. Myers believes this was covered but asked if the light poles and mast arms are consistent with those at Wilson Bridge and High St. Mr. Manno confirmed that they were.

When asked by Mr. Myers if the signage was consistent with our wayfinding package, Mr. Manno agreed that it was.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 03-2018
Adopting a Job Description for the Position of Planning and Building Assistant and Amending the Staffing Chart and Pay Resolution to Accommodate Said Position.

Introduced by Mr. Robinson.

MOTION
Ms. Kowalczyk made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 03-2018. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

Mr. Greeson reported it being customary when a vacancy exists to review the job description to determine if the title and the duties outlined are consistent with the job as it functions now or as we desire it to function in the future. Mr. Brown has reworked this job description to reflect what we want this job to accomplish going forward.

Mr. Brown shared that an employee left in early September and they took some time to re-evaluate the Clerk position for the building department. They really looked at what the employee actually did on a day to day basis, determined what we wanted them to do and then we re-worked the job description to reflect that. The hope is to provide a realistic expectation for anyone interested in applying for the position. This is kind of like a junior planner position that will assist both the planning and the building department.

Ms. Dorothy concluded that we are creating a new position but not creating another full-time position. Mr. Brown agreed.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if we are currently looking for people, Mr. Brown replied that we are indirectly looking and once passed by Council he will encourage the HR Director to get it posted. He is glad they took the time to re-evaluate the position but it is a position that definitely needs to be filled.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 03-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 04-2018
Re-appointing Scott Myers to the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION
Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 04-2018. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she appreciates all of the time and effort Mr. Myers has put in up to this point and with keeping members abreast of what has been going on. She looks
forward to him continuing in that position. Mr. Myers replied that he knows what that means and he appreciates it.

Mr. Robinson commented that he is enthusiastic about Mr. Myers continued service. He witnessed his heroic effort a couple of months ago to insert some significant values into the conversation of MPC and it really turned the conversation around. He thinks he is an outstanding representative of Council on MPC and he thanked him for his continued service. Mr. Myers thanked him. He invited members to stop by the meetings anytime.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 04-2018 carried by a voice vote of six “yea” and one abstention (Foust).

Resolution No. 05-2018 Recommending Beth Kowalczyk to Represent the City of Worthington on the Old Worthington Partnership Board of Directors.

Introduced by Mr. Robinson.

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

There being no comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 06-2018 Designating Rachael Dorothy to Represent the City of Worthington on the OSU Airport Community Outreach Council.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION Ms. Kowalczyk made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 06-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

There being no comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 06-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 07-2018 Appointing Bonnie Michael and Matthew Greeson to Represent the City of Worthington at the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC).

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 07-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.
Ms. Dorothy thanked Ms. Michael and Mr. Greeson for all of their service. She looks forward to their continued service in these capacities.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 07-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

After some conversation it was decided that the policy item of an economic development TREX be discussed next.

Policy Item(s)

- TREX Request – Porch Growler, LLC

Ms. Michael reported this being an economic development item related to the transfer of liquor permits into Worthington. The Porch Growler, LLC has applied for the City’s support to TREX in a liquor permit to their new location at 892 N. High St.

Mr. Greeson reported that this agenda item was prepared by Mr. McCorkle who is currently out of town. He explained that Mr. McCorkle has been working with Mr. Adams who is creating a new business called Porch Growler, LLC. He further explained the definition of a TREX.

Mr. Greeson revealed that Mr. Adams wants to occupy space in the new building that is adjacent to Pet People on N. High St. He is proposing a total investment of $440,000 with four to six jobs and an approximate annual payroll of $130,000. His new business will serve craft draft beer either on site or off site through Growlers. He invited Mr. Adams to comment.

Mr. Adams shared that he looks forward to a very long and interactive collaborative relationship with the City once he is able to open. He invited members to visit his establishment at that time. He explained that Porch Growler is intended to be more of a tasting room and not a bar. TV usage will be very limited. It will be more about the education and celebration of craft beer. He anticipates two thirds of the sales being taken off site with a third of sales on site. It will be more sampler flights, education, and things of that nature. This petition helps him get another step towards that end goal.

When asked by Ms. Michael where he will be located in the building, Mr. Adams replied that he will be taking the southern third of the two story building south of Pet People. He understands that the landlord will be looking at one to two other retail establishments for the ground floor. He will be using about 2,000 sq. ft. of the 6,000 available.

Mr. Myers commented that this is a true growler where he can bring his jug in, have it filled and take it home. Mr. Adams agreed. They will fill 64 oz. re-sealable glasses as well as 32 oz. vessels. Pints or 5 oz. sampler flights will be available for on premise consumption.
When asked by Mr. Myers if he will be carrying local brews, Mr. Adams replied that the plan is for sixty taps. There will be twenty from metro Columbus, twenty for the rest of Ohio, and the remaining twenty for the rest of the country.

To Mr. Robinson’s question about whether or not they would be serving food, Mr. Adams replied that on site they will offer the menus of local establishments to bring in but they will not have a kitchen on-hand, at least initially. He will however be talking to Mr. Brown about food truck options maybe down the road.

When asked by Mr. Robinson about the anticipated hours of operation, Mr. Adams reported that they plan to be open Monday – Thursday from 3:00 pm to 10:00 pm, Friday from 3:00 pm to midnight, Saturday from noon to midnight and Sunday from noon to 8:00 p.m.

Ms. Michael reported that the Pub Out Back has set it up with a restaurant that food can be ordered and brought in similar to what Mr. Adams is suggesting. Mr. Adams shared that the landlord has worked with the builders for grease traps as they are really looking for a restaurant on the other side and if they can collaborate with them then all the better.

Mr. Smith reminded Ms. Kowalczyk, who is Council’s representative to the Old Worthington Partnership that the Partnership purview is North St. to South St. which will include Porch Growler. Anything they can do to help facilitate traffic to that corridor would be great. Ms. Kowalczyk made note of that information.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy how early they will open for the English Premiership matches, Mr. Adams replied that on some Saturdays and Sundays when there are games prior to noon they may open earlier and have the games on. TV will be very limited so it will not be every Saturday and Sunday but rather as the schedule permits.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy how soon he anticipates opening, Mr. Adams replied that he had hoped for a March/April opening. This TREX however is slowing things down so it may be May.

Mr. Foust shared that he really likes the concept. That said, we have had some issues with the outdoor dining and late hours in the downtown. He asked if any thought has been given to potential impact on neighbors in the area and whether that will be a factor here. Mr. Adams reported there being a patio that faces High St. and will be unseen by the neighbors.

Mr. Robinson expressed being very excited about this business but he is curious as to why he choose Worthington to locate his business in and why that site in particular. Mr. Adams replied that it has been a labor of love to find a location in this metro area that he thinks best suits the craft beer craze that has started to permeate the city and Columbus is amply covered in certain areas. As he started looking around the demographics in Worthington are exactly what he is looking for. He thinks the saturation is fairly low here. He lives in the Worthington Hills area and would love to see this area a little closer to home. He knows the demographics are shifting a little towards his age group from some of the non-
craft beer drinking. He just thinks it is the right time. He would love to get in before his competitor gets in because it will happen here. Mr. Robinson predicts it will be a success and added that he will do his part to make that happen.

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to support the transfer of the TREX as an economic development project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 03-2018

Amending Ordinance No. 41-2017 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvement Fund Unappropriated Balance in the Amount of $86,000.00 to Provide for Funds for the Payment of Lease Obligations.

Introduced by Ms. Kowalczyk.

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

Ordinance No. 02-2018

To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from I-1, Restricted Industrial Research and Offices to PUD, Planned Use District and Authorizing Variances (800 Proprietors Road).

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Brown began with an explanation of a PUD (Planned Unit Development). The Code was updated in 2013 to include PUD as a zoning category within the district. He thinks there has been misconceptions about what it can and cannot do so he would like to try to clear that up.

What is a PUD?

• PUD zoning does not automatically provide for density that wouldn’t otherwise be allowed.
• It is intended to facilitate a more integrated development which may involve a mix of uses and provides for greater control over the details of what is built on the site and maintained over time.
• With PUD zoning, the details of the development are negotiated as part of the rezoning.
• If at some point in the future, the owner wants to change those details, a renegotiation of the zoning is required, which would need to be approved by MPC & City Council.
  • This action would be subject to the 60-day referendum period.
• Greater control is in place for the future than when rezoning to a more traditional straight zoning category which is based solely on uses.
• If future changes involve a different use, the use would need to go back through the rezoning process to be approved.
  • This action would be subject to the 60-day referendum period.
• PUD - Requires a Development Plan & Development Text – any modification would need board approval.

Planned Use District
**1174.01 PURPOSE.**
The purpose of Planned Unit Development is to promote variety, flexibility and quality for the development of properties in the City of Worthington. Planned Unit Development allows for more creative planning and design, and enables a greater range of uses than traditional Zoning regulations. Planned Unit Development allows for the design and mix of uses necessary to meet changing economic and demographic demands; permits implementation of development standards, plans, studies, and guidelines adopted by the City Council; and provides the opportunity to retain and enhance the character of the City, and the health, safety and general welfare of the inhabitants.

Planned Unit Development is a process to create a Planned Use District (PUD) in which development standards and uses are established for a Lot or Lots, and becomes the Zoning for the property.

**1174.03 GENERAL PROVISIONS – 2 Step Process**
(a) Preliminary Plan. The Preliminary Plan shall be submitted to the Municipal Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council, and which, if approved by the City Council, becomes the Zoning for the property and permits preparation of the Final Plan. The Preliminary Plan shall establish uses and development standards for the property as detailed in drawings and Development Standards Text.
(b) Final Plan. The Final Plan shall be submitted to the Municipal Planning Commission to review for conformance to the adopted PUD. The Final Plan
may be approved in phases, each of which shall implement the Development Standards and confirm uses for the property as detailed in drawings and Development Standards Text.

Mr. Brown commented that what members will see tonight is a Preliminary Plan on steroids. It is 90% there towards what will be the Final Plat.

Ms. Dorothy commented that even though this application is more detailed than it needs to be it is still the Preliminary Plan. Mr. Brown agreed. He added that this plan has gone much farther into details than what it technically required by code.

**PUD PROCEDURES**

- **Pre-application**
  - Initial review and feedback from City staff and/or MPC
- **Preliminary Plan**
  - Establishes uses and development standards outlined in the Development Plan and Development Text submitted to MPC
- **Action**
  - MPC makes recommendation to Council for approval, approval with modifications or denial
  - If approved by Council, becomes zoning for the property and permits preparation of the Final Plan. Subject to the 60-day referendum period.

Mr. Brown added that since this project is located in the Architectural Review District, it will have another layer of approvals on top with the architecture.

- **Final Plan**
  - Submitted to MPC to review for conformance with the approved PUD Ordinance
  - **Action:**
    - Approve
    - Approve with modifications – does not change the essential character
    - Recommend to City Council with changes that require an amendment
      - Subject to a 60-day Referendum Period
    - Disapprove
• **Modifications – Final Plan**
  - City Staff - Minor adjustments approved by City staff
  - Minor adjustments in lot lines, no additional lots
  - Minor adjustments in location of building footprints and parking lots, provided the perimeter required yards remain in compliance
  - Minor adjustments in height
  - Minor modifications in design, materials and lighting
  - Minor modifications of landscaping

• **Municipal Planning Commission**-
  - Reviews for compliance with the essential character of the approved PUD and does not require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance.
    - MPC approves
  - MPC determines that proposed modification requires an amendment to the PUD.
    - MPC shall forward a recommendation to City Council of approval, approval with modification or denial

**Design Regulations:**
- Character – Harmonious in design, traffic, parking and landscaping
- Design – Site layout, buildings, accessory structures, landscaping and lighting compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and community
- Screening – Commercial and industrial uses, parking facilities and refuse containers
- Tract Coverage – Ground area occupied by all buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance

**Traffic & Parking:**
- Traffic – Ingress and egress, offsite improvements needed
- Parking –
  - Design – designed and located to protect the character of the area
  - Non-residential Uses – adequate to serve the proposed uses, not to exceed 120% of parking requirement
• Residential Uses – one parking space per dwelling unit
• Bicycle Parking – adequate to serve the proposed uses

**General Requirements:**
• Environment – Environmental studies if needed
• Natural Features
  • Preserves, restores, maintain or enhances the natural features and character
  • Healthy trees 6” caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree – Tree Preservation Plan
• $450/caliper inch – Special Parks Fund

*Mr. Brown noted that this project has a very significant tree located on the site that will be discussed and protected as we move forward.*

• Public Area Payments
  • Dedication of a portion of the PUD for a park, playground or recreational uses
  • Commercial or industrial space - $100/1,000 gross sq. ft. – Special Parks Fund
  • Residential dwelling units - $250/new dwelling unit created – Special Parks Fund
• Public Space Amenities –
  • One Public Space Amenity/5,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area
    • Public plaza, sitting space, public art, planters, bicycle racks, fountain, waste receptacles etc.

Below is a checklist of items required to be addressed upfront before it goes to staff and on to Municipal Planning Commission for discussion:

**Preliminary Plan Submission Requirements:**
(Use as a checklist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Plan &amp; Development Standards Text</th>
<th>Preliminary design and location of structures, accessory structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, sidewalks, parking, entry features, lighting, landscaping, screening, public amenities, etc...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal description &amp; vicinity map</td>
<td>Parcels intended to be dedicated for public use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names and addresses of owners, developers and surveyor, engineer or architect | Proposed easements
---|---
Date, north arrow and total acreage | Number of dwelling units per acre
Topographical survey | Proposed uses
Existing structures, parking and traffic facilities, easements and public rights-of-way | Proposed phasing of development, including a schedule for construction
Existing sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities | Homeowners or commercial owners
Natural Features | Development Standards Text
Tree preservation plan | Additional information as required by MPC and City Council
Preliminary grading plan

**Final Plan Submission Requirements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development – Extension of utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit showing which phase of the Preliminary Plan is part of the proposed Final Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated construction schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All items required in the Preliminary Plan, revised as necessary to meet the approved PUD Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final design and location of structures, accessory structures, streets, drives, sidewalks, parking, entry features, etc...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that the applicant has control over the land to undertake the proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants and other restrictions imposed on the use of the land, buildings and structures and a copy of any bylaws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Brown shows a flow chart of the development process that includes:

Step #1 – Pre-Application Meeting
Step #2 – Application Submitted
Step #3 – Staff Review and Public Notification
Step #4 – Public Hearing – Preliminary Plan (MPC & ARB)
Step #5 – Public Hearing – (City Council) – If approved then 60 day referendum period
Step #6 – Public Hearing Final Plan and Public Notification (MPC & ARB)

Mr. Brown stressed that after the referendum period has passed, the applicant can make application to bring their final plan back to MPC/ARB for approval. That is when it is reviewed to make sure it is in conformance with what City Council approved. If it
deviates from what was approved, those modifications would have to go back through the entire process with MPC and then Council approval. An example, if Council approved this application for fifty four units and they decided they wanted fifty six or sixty instead the increase number of units would require it to go back to Council for approval. That would also begin the clock again on another 60 day referendum period.

Mr. Robinson asked for clarity about what types of changes can be made by staff and which ones require rezoning. As an example he is thinking about the Masonic projects. He asked if it was staff approved or did it require an actual rezoning when the project went from two condos to a single home. Mr. Brown replied that the decrease in density only went to MPC. Staff does not have the ability to do that. If they would have wanted to add an additional unit, it would have required MPC back to City Council for approval. That would have also restarted the 60 day clock.

When asked by Mr. Robinson if there is any recourse either by a Council member or a member of the public if a decision is made by staff and yet there is a feeling that it should have gone before Council for approval. Mr. Brown stressed that there is always an approval process. Usually with staff they error on the side of caution. The only thing that he knows that may be approved by staff would be the shifting of a window or the type of a window. Most of it would be something that would require MPC to at least review and hold a public hearing on. Then it would go on to City Council. If it only went to MPC, an appeal could be filed and requested to City Council.

Ms. Michael explained that if anyone has a problem with MPC then the appeal process is City Council. If somebody has a problem with BZA, then their only appeal is to Municipal Court.

Mr. Robinson commented that if there is an appeal made to an MPC decision, would that be an appeal about whether in fact it should have gone to Council and through the rezoning process or would the appeal be strictly about the decision of MPC so if in fact it went one way or the other there would be a 60 day period. Mr. Brown replied that his gut would be both but he would refer to legal counsel. Mr. Lindsey reported that if in fact the question was whether or not it should have been heard at one level or another, than that would be just a normal appeal to Council. If it was actually the decision made as to a rezoning of the property and then the referendum or zoning measure would be the appropriate 60 day period. So there are times when somebody will appeal that it should have been heard by somebody else versus I don’t like the decision that was made.

Mr. Robinson then asked a theoretical question. He asked if there is any concern that by using the PUD tool that over time we are sort of dismantling the zoning map of the City one project at a time. Mr. Brown replied no. In looking at the surrounding jurisdictions, probably 90% of them have developed a PUD. He thinks it actually gives a neighbor and/or a Council member more information about what is going on because it has that text and that development plan that go hand in hand. Whether it be five years or fifty staff can pull that information out and see what was approved, what it was supposed to look like, locations of ingress/egress, signage, etc. It is kind of a hybrid in what we have
in Worthington. We have straight zoning categories, then in Worthington if you have certain properties that meet certain acreage requirements it has a development plan, then there is the Architectural Review District. So many of the different developments that they see that has straight zoning and a development plan and ARB almost act as a hybrid PUD. He thinks it gives you more of an idea long term of what to expect on this site. Then if it needed to deviate from any of the requirements there is a built in the two step public process that at least goes to MPC and on to City Council for approval and then ultimately subject to that 60 referendum period.

In referring to the development plan, Ms. Kowalczyk asked about this particular use for the property that is being proposed and the safety of the people who will be residing there. She asked if considerations like that are appropriate for a development plan and then what steps will be taken to ensure safety or noise control and things like that. Mr. Brown replied that members will be able to ask specific questions like that of the applicant later in the presentation. He added that if there is a need to make modifications or changes to the text we could have them incorporate that into the text during the approval process. If it is just a question, you can at least get it on the record.

Mr. Smith had another PUD 101 question and he vaguely remembers the conversation from years ago. As with any concern for development if hypothetically an applicant comes in and goes through the approval process but then builds something completely different from what was approved without any further approval, then what actions can we take to force them to what was approved. Mr. Brown replied that we would have to do our due process. Usually Ms. Bitar and/or he have an eagle eye as does the Board of noticing it looks different. He also relies on Council members to get a phone call or text and ask for clarification. Then we are able to at least address it before it gets too far down the road. Ultimately it will be our due process and require legal action.

Mr. Myers commented that if they built a gas station here instead of a memory care unit, we could make them tear it down. When Mr. Smith stated through the legal system, Mr. Myers replied yes. He added that one thing he wants to make certain that everyone understands is that under tab 2 of their binder, the Development Plan Text becomes your zoning. So through negotiation, as opposed to permitted and conditional uses, that development text becomes the zoning. It is proposed by the developer and negotiated with staff and MPC. Council can also add or subtract to that if we want to but this is now what they will have to follow. That becomes your zoning which is why that development text is really critical. Now here they have referenced their plans and their plans are more detailed than we typically would have asked for with this process but because they referenced them, in his mind they become part of that development text and we have to hold them to that. The final approval on architecture will be MPC and ARB. There will not be many changes. He envisions tweaks like whether it be a five foot sidewalk or an eight foot multi-use path. So when members look at one of these that is what you really need to scan and understand.

Mr. Brown commented that he thinks one of the other benefits is that you can craft that development text to list permitted uses that can occur in the district and put a percentage
on those (70% office, 20% restaurants and 10% basic retail). He has even seen it go as far as regulating the hours of operation (7:00 am to 3:00 pm or whatever). It is a little different for this application but if it was truly a mix of uses on this site and we needed to establish those goals and percentages, we could craft the development text and the plan to go hand in hand. So it gives us a little more teeth and a little more control.

Mr. Foust shared that he is looking at the colored documents (tab 7) that are labeled E2, E3, E4, and E5 for example, he asked if he is reading it right that Faris Design is the designer because it looks like they have captured much of what we asked for. Mr. Myers emphasized that they have been very good to work with so far. He wished he had a dollar for every person who has come into MPC and he asked that they please drive by the Orange Johnson House, the Township Hall, the Masonic Lodge, and Bird Song. Would you please go look at these buildings for us and they come back in and they have something that looks like Williamsburg or something and say well this is close but they never go by. Mr. Kenney drove by and it shows. Mr. Foust believes they clearly did their homework and it shows. Mr. Myers agreed. What he liked about the plan and we will get to this later but it also picks up that this is Summit Station or the train that went by there and they picked up some of the elements of a train depot and the Township Hall. He was very impressed and thinks they did a nice job.

At Ms. Michael’s request, Mr. Brown presented the following information:

Request:
Applicant: The Griffin 105 Group LLC
Agent: David Hodge, Esq.
Owner: 900 Proprietors LLC
Location: 800 Proprietors Road
Acreage: 4.8+ acres
Request: Requesting to rezone 800 Proprietors Road from the I-1 District, Restricted Industrial Research and Offices to a PUD, Planned Unit District for a 54-unit Alzheimer’s/Dementia/Memory Care Facility.

Mr. Brown reported there being three separate parcels on the southern part of what was once Worthington Foods. Silcott and the Railway are located further to the east.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy how long the area has been vacant, Mr. Brown replied about thirteen years. He thinks the original development proposal was around 2005.

Mr. Brown reported there being a 200+ year old oak to the north side of the site. There is an old right-of-way that was vacated decades ago as well as an access drive from Proprietors Rd. to the Silcott property and the railroad tracks.
Mr. Brown noted there being a huge mix of zoning in the area with AR-3 to the west (medium density apartments), R-10 (low density residence), I-1 (Industrial and Office) and to the south at the Harding site is S-1 (Special) category.

**Existing Zoning:** I-1 District – Restricted Industrial & Offices
Areas for service industries, offices, light manufacturing, processing or assembly which, because of their small scale and/or lack of objectionable characteristics, can exist in relative close proximity to commercial and residential uses.

**Proposed Zoning:** PUD – Planned Use District:
- Proposed Use is an 49,657 sq. ft. Alzheimer’s, Dementia & Memory Care Facility located in 4 buildings, interconnected by exterior walkways.
  - Three one story pods housing 18 resident rooms, with a 2-story main building housing the office & service component of the facility.
  - 54 private & semi-private rooms
  - 399 sq. ft. average room size
  - Secure enclosed courtyard patios in the 3 residential buildings
  - Facility programing space throughout the interior to accommodate a full range of congregate services, dining, health and wellness, and memory functions.

**2005 Development Plan:**

2005 Approval:
- 88,000 sq. ft. of office condominiums – 12 separate buildings
  - Only 17,200 sq. ft. constructed

Mr. Brown reported that with the down turn in the economy only four of the twelve units were actually constructed. He added that the gentleman that was leading this development passed away which is another reason it has set vacant for quite a while. In his time in Worthington he and Ms. Bitar have talked to at least a dozen people who have wanted to do high density residential and/or mini storage warehousing on the site.
Subdivision & Access Easement:

Mr. Brown reported that if this rezoning is approved, there will be a subdivision that combines those three separate parcels. An actual easement will be platted because currently the easement of access to the properties to the east goes through the middle of this development. The applicant and their attorney have worked with the railroad to readjust that access easement to allow for this property to actually be developed.

Mr. Foust commented that he thought the Silcott business that was referred earlier has been gone for quite some time. Mr. Brown thinks they still have nineteen or twenty years left on their lease. He added that they do still have some equipment back there. The underlying property owner is the railroads and they have a lease agreement with the railroads for that portion of the property.

When asked by Mr. Foust if that is being incorporated into this plan or staying outside of it, Mr. Brown replied that it is completely separate. The applicant’s property is everything west of the sound wall to Proprietors Road. Everything east of the sound wall through the gate goes into the Silcott and Railroad properties.

Subdivision & Access Easement:

Mr. Brown reported that as part of this development, the applicant is actually buying the 4.8 acres before Council tonight and three separate tiny parcels to the north. We will be cleaning up the plat in the coming months to just create two legal lots of record. Additionally, there is currently a highway easement along the hillside on the south to the center line of SR-161. We will be asking for that as actual right-of-way dedication instead of easement. Depending on the recommendation of the Bike and Pedestrian Committee related to a sidewalk or bike path, there may be a need for some right-of-way dedication along Proprietors as well. That will all be addressed in the final plat.
Mr. Foust asked what the plan is for the piece of property outlined on the left side of the diagram. Mr. Brown replied that it is to be determined. It is not a part of the rezoning portion so the I-1 zoning will stay in place on that property.

Mr. Brown provided numerous pictures of the site being discussed.

Mr. Brown reported there being a development plan and a set of text that go along with what is being considered tonight. There are four different buildings (three main residential pods and an operations building in the center).

**Development Standards:**

Mr. Brown noted that the existing access easement will be re-platted as part of the development and will allow for maneuverability from Proprietors Rd. and still allow for access to the east.

Mr. Brown commented that this diagram shows the overall development with SR-161 to the south and Proprietors Rd. to the west. The applicants will have a one-way entrance with a limited amount of parking for drop-off to the office and then a one-way exit. The main entrance drive will be on the northern part of the site. Those three access points and the space needed for them on the site will require the other variances. The main access for employee parking and long term visitation will be on the north side of the site and to the rear of the buildings.

Ms. Dorothy commented that the parking arrangements assume that the majority of the people are traveling by cars and not walking or biking. Mr. Brown replied that they are
hoping they will bike along SR-161 to our sidewalk and/or bike path. One of the things we will run into as part of this is the 200+ year old oak. He will speak more about that in a few minutes.

Development Standards:

Mr. Brown repeated the Proposed Use information previously shared and added the following information specifics:

• Tract Coverage:
  • 23.5% by Buildings
• Lighting:
  • All parking lot lights & building wall-mounted lights will meet all ARB requirements.
  • Decorative light poles – 15-feet, no exposed base
• Signage:
  • Freestanding sign – entry feature
• Parking:
  • Minimum – 43 spaces
  • Permitted – 52 spaces
  • Providing – 51 spaces

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if bike parking is required in addition to car parking, Mr. Brown confirmed that it is required as part of their review. It is also one of the public amenities that is required. He added that with the PUD language there is minimum parking required as well as a maximum.

• Stormwater:
  • Preliminary Grading Plan – Meets all Worthington requirements
  • Final Grading Plan required prior to construction
• Public Area Payments:
  • $100/1000 sq. ft. = $4,965.70+
• Public Amenities:
  • 200+ Year Old Oak
  • Up-lighting & Lightening protection

Mr. Brown shared that the key item in the public amenities is the protection for the 200+ year old oak tree. After a number of arborists and he walked the site it was recommended that the buildings be pushed back on the site and that no sidewalks and/or any type of pavement be allowed near that tree at this time.

• Accessible plaza and leisure path (around the oak)
• Public sitting place
• Decorative landscaping
• Bicycle Parking
• Decorative waste receptacles
• Pet waste station
• Landscaping the hillside of SR-161
• Wall treatments and accent landscaping at the intersection of SR-161 & Proprietors Rd.
• Picket fencing
• Replica clock
• Sidewalk/pathway along Proprietors Road
• Bike & Ped Advisory Board

Access:
• Proprietors Road – Three separate access points for ingress/egress.
  – No direct access to E. Granville Rd. (SR-161)
  – Low impact from a traffic generation standpoint
• Northern Access Point:
  – Two-way access point for guest, staff parking and the relocated access easement for Norfolk Southern Railroad and the Ohio Railway Museum to the east.
• Variances Needed:
  – Northern curb cut to exceed 45-feet, proposing 65-feet to accommodate the access easement to the east.
  – Spacing between access points to be less than 300-foot intervals.

Tree Preservation Plan:
Mr. Brown shared a diagram of the Tree Preservation Plan that included the 200+ year old oak tree that will have a protection zone around it. There is to be no sidewalk/path under the dripline for the tree that actually goes out into the Proprietors Road right-of-way and hangs a little bit over the road. One of the recommendations from our arborist and the applicant’s arborist was to not construct any sidewalks or bike path at this time as they feel that will negatively impact anything on the site related to that tree. He added that eight trees on the site will be preserved.

Look of tree when Worthington Foods

Look of tree today.
Mr. Brown added that the tree has a high root zone, which is one of the concerns with doing any type of pervious or impervious pavement that could negatively impact that tree.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if there is anything that can be done to build up around it and put pervious pavement or pervious mesh or any sort of walking path because there is no way we want to disturb the root system of that tree that was dedicated in ’76. Mr. Brown replied that they have looked at it but many of the recommendations were to leave it alone.

Mr. Brown shared that one of the options they worked with the applicant on was a five or eight foot pathway that will stop at the first drive and then follow the five foot sidewalk east towards the main entrance of the building and then follow it back north around the tree to exit the site. The hope is that it will connect with a sidewalk or a bike path in the future.

Ms. Dorothy stated that a worker who is takes the bus off SR-161 can get dropped off and will have a path to get to work. Mr. Brown agreed. He added that there is a sidewalk further north on the west side of Proprietors but at least at this time there will be a gap at this location. In the event that something happened to the tree sometime in the future, the installation of the rest of the sidewalk or the path could be installed at that point in time. But at least for now it does not just dump you without any way to connect to a walk/path.

Mr. Brown added that the four units that were constructed as part of the previous development have right-of-way that is very tight through there so we will have to work to get easements for the sidewalk/bike path to move forward as you go north on Proprietors. This will at least get the first leg started.

Ms. Dorothy suggested looking at reducing the speed because it has more residential uses then it did previously. She thinks it is 35 mph currently and suggested reducing it to 25 mph.
Mr. Brown reported that they will be meeting with the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board on Monday and will be looking at the entire corridor (SR-161 to Schrock). Some of the hurdles include street trees, pinch points and right-of-way, parking lots and buildings. So they will look at everything going on in the corridor and ultimately leave with a recommendation that could be incorporated into this plan with the Final Plan going to MPC. That will also provide staff with some direction with any future projects to the north as far as needing right-of-way and/or sidewalks/path, etc.

When asked by Ms. Michael who will install the walkway along Proprietors up to the circle driveway, Mr. Brown replied that it will be the developer. The only item not being developed on the previous rendering is the sidewalk/path that runs between the drives and the one the runs in front of the oak tree.

Mr. Brown showed numerous renderings of the plan to this point.

Proprietor Rd. entry courtyard  
Corner courtyard at Proprietors and Dublin Granville Rd.

Corner courtyard at Proprietors and Dublin Granville Rd.  
View from Dublin Granville Rd.

Mr. Brown shared that the landscaping along the hill on Dublin Granville Rd. will receive all new plantings. The maintenance of that area will then become the responsibility of the developer so that at least will take one area off of our Service crews.

Mr. Robinson questioned earlier slides of the development as they seem to show two story buildings other than just the office building. Mr. Cini (with the Griffin 105 Group) reported it being a one story building with a faux second story. Mr. Brown shared that the ARB worked with the applicant so the development wouldn’t only be linear.

Ms. Dorothy asked who is responsible for maintaining the railroad bridge underpasses, which she knows is not part of this project but rather right outside of the scope of this
Mr. Greeson replied that they are the responsibility of the Ohio Railway Museum and the Railways. When asked by Ms. Dorothy how often we talk to them, Mr. Greeson replied sporadically. Mr. Brown shared that staff probably has more interaction with the Railway Museum. Ms. Dorothy remarked that it would be awesome if we could improve that gateway into the City as well. Mr. Greeson noted there being a jurisdictional issue that also complicates things as one side is Columbus and the other is Worthington along that stretch.

Mr. Brown showed additional slides of the area as it currently stands.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she is aware that we just installed new ladder crosswalks at this location. Maybe after we have our first pilot project of leading pedestrian intervals we might be able to get a leading pedestrian interval at this intersection too with more use in the future. Mr. Whited agreed to look at whether it is possible.

Mr. Brown quickly addressed the landscaping plan assuring members that there will be a large amount of new landscaping throughout the area. There were renderings/diagrams of items such as a bench, decorative lighting, U-shaped bike rack, and a clock. The final plan still needs to be approved by the MPC/ARB. He added that the information is included in the materials packet that he distributed.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Comprehensive Plan:**

- An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region.
- Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed.
- Enhance the tax-generating capacity of the corridor.
- Office & mixed office/industrial uses are preferred.
- The City should protect the corridor as an employment center.

**Public Meetings:**

1. October 26, 2017
   - MPC & ARB – Tabled
2. November 9, 2017
   - MPC & ARB – Tabled
3. December 14, 2017
   - MPC – Approved, recommendation sent to City Council
   - ARB – Tabled until Final Plan
4. January 2, 2018
   - City Council – Introduced
5. January 16, 2018
   - City Council – Public Hearing
Mr. Brown added that the project page on the website has been updated throughout the process. He thinks the attendance tonight, which is minimal, is similar to what they have seen to date. He added that those who requested the “notify me” with updated information to this project received the updates.

Next Steps:

• 60-Day Referendum Period, if approved
• Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board approval on the Final Plan.
  • Final design of buildings, lighting, landscaping, screening, etc...
  • Final Plan submitted to MPC to review for conformance with the adopted PUD.
• Any major modification or change will require MPC and City Council approval and the 60 day referendum period again.

Recommendation:

• Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and unanimously recommended approval of the proposed development to City Council on December 14, 2017.

Mr. Robinson asked if the three buildings will all provide the same services.

Mr. David Hodge, attorney with the law firm of Underhill and Hodge and attorney for the applicant.

Mr. Greg Cini reported that he will be operating the property.

Mr. Cini replied that they will not differentiate between units. They have found that on initial fill up separating degrees of dementia/Alzheimer per unit makes sense but as you fill the property and somebody moves out or passes on, the last thing they want to do is disrupt someone’s life by moving them to a different unit. So they keep a resident in their location until end of life. So no, they offer the same service throughout the entire community and it is every stage of Alzheimer through end of life.

Ms. Kowalczyk reported that her day job is working with the aging population so she is very interested in what they are doing. She thinks it does fill a great need for the community. She asked if they are connected with the Kemper House in Cleveland. Mr. Cini acknowledged that they were. He shared that he has known Betty Kemper for eighteen years and has been working with her on a consultant level. The Kemper family will be running this facility with them. Mrs. Kemper is a pioneer in the industry and has been doing Alzheimer and dementia care for over thirty years. She ran the first standalone pilot program, Memory Care in the Midwest. They couldn’t find anyone better to help them.

When asked by Ms. Kowalczyk how many facilities they have throughout the state, Mr. Cini replied that currently they have two. At one time they had eight or ten but have since sold those. Mrs. Kemper’s husband is now in her Strongsville location so it is sort
of helping them reinvent who they are because it has become even that much more personal. They plan on Worthington being their flagship and their first entry into central Ohio and they couldn’t be more pleased. This is an important project for them so they plan to develop here and in Dublin over the next two years. Then they will see where they go from there.

Ms. Kowalczyk went back to her earlier question about this location being near a railroad track and a busy street. She asked him to elaborate on the security of the property for the residents. Mr. Cini replied that next to providing the best quality of life while those residents are under their care, safety and security is number one. Each of those pods are 24/7 lock down. They are staffed one to six ratio (one staff member to six residents) and have 24 hour surveillance. He has been involved in several hundred memory care facility across the country and this is a typical type of environment because you want it very accessible to family in that area so these are the common challenges you have in a property. Everything is locked down and residents can’t get out of their units. The only space they have access to is that central courtyard. The only time a resident will be out there is either with staff or with a family member. For them, that is quasi-public space too. They want to be friendly to Worthington and would love for families to come and picnic there and the clock be the Worthington clock in a photo shoot opportunity. Everything outside of the pod is really public space and it needs to be friendly and open to community use.

Ms. Michael asked if the railroad wall goes all the way down through there. Mr. Cini agreed that it did. He added that Kemper’s have an impeccable non-elopement record over thirty years so that sort of speaks for itself. Mrs. Kemper and her team know exactly what they are doing and this is their model. This is exactly what they built in Strongsville in 1999 and two years ago in Highland Heights. They are taking all of the same precautions but be a little more tech savvy in how they monitor and track residents. Residents will have WanderGuard on them, which is a device that actually tracks them within their community. If they stand near an exit door for too long it will indicate that to staff and they will go and guide them to another location. He is confident in the location as far as safety and security.

Ms. Kowalczyk expressed concern about the railroad track and the noise considering that residents suffer from cognitive impairments. She understands that noise can be a trigger for them. She asked what they are doing to deal with that situation. Mr. Cini reported that they will insulate really well and/or double wall the back of the buildings. They will work with their contractor to determine how best to insulate that.

Mr. Hodge reported that early on they had conversations with Silcott, who has their facility to the east. They also went to the Railway Museum as they have an interest in the easement so they have to agree to the release and relocation to the north. The other reason they went to see them was because in his initial phone conversations with them they were interested in having them come to the site while they had a train operational so that they could hear both the train and also understand that they do blow their whistle when they cross the easement. They operate on Sundays and occasionally on
Wednesdays. On Sundays they blow it on the hour and they sat and listened to the horn. There are different levels. They don’t blow the highest level of horn that they can but rather an intermediate level. The other thing that they did was talk to both homeowners and some residents of the multi-family on the west side of Proprietors to gather from them some information about whether or not the railroad noise has an impact on them. One of the comments was that they never heard it and didn’t even know that it was going on over there. So they feel comfortable that it will not be a negative impact on residents. As Mr. Cini mentioned, they looked at and will continue to look at the façade treatments along there for insulation and further noise mitigation above and beyond the sound wall that is already there.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked if they have had people with experience in dealing with Alzheimer patients listen to the sound and provide their opinion because residents that don’t suffer from cognizant impairments are not the same as someone who has those issues. Mr. Cini replied that Mrs. Kemper approved everything about this site so they rest on what she said. She is 100% behind this project.

Ms. Kowalczyk then asked about potential increase in EMS visits. She asked if they had statistics from the other sites about how often that occurs. Mr. Cini replied that it is typically not an issue. The have few runs because it is such a controlled environment. They bring in hospice to end of life so it is all a preplanned thing. The only time there would be an emergency run is if somebody got injured onsite. So most of the time it is very much planned. In fact, Mrs. Kemper said that if anybody wanted to call the mayor of Strongsville and speak to them about that, he would vouch for that.

Mr. Hodge thanked Council for moving this item down on the agenda as he had another professional obligation in Gahanna this evening. He shared that he has been a zoning and land use lawyer for some sixteen or seventeen year. Zoning and land use is all he does. He has worked with Mr. Brown the entire time in different roles and in different places. He knows that there is a concern about a PUD, what it is and what it means. In his practice and in his professional opinion, a PUD is absolutely the mechanism to have a developer show precisely what they intend to do. Then that developer must deliver upon that promise to this community and your legal counsel and others have the right to tell them to comply with what was approved under the zoning. It has more teeth in it than any other zoning mechanism that there is. He just wanted to go on record in addition to what Mr. Brown shared and say that. They have really attempted to work diligently with Mr. Brown and Ms. Bitar and staff. They have had separate meetings with members of this Council, some of your colleagues and members of your MPC and ARB to make this a project of collaboration with the city of Worthington. We have worked on the plan, on the tree preservation, the architecture, landscaping, aesthetic along Dublin-Granville Rd. and we really do believe that we are here this evening with a project that is really an asset and an attribute to the city of Worthington in terms of the use itself, the folks that are running it, and the aesthetics that is going to be created here in terms of both landscaping and architecture. So, we will do our best to field any additional questions that the Council has but we would very much love an approval so that we can go on and work on our architecture and our final plan and wait through the referendum period.
Don Kenney Jr. shared that he is a life-long Columbus resident. He grew up in Beechwold and attended Bishop Watterson High School. He is very familiar with Worthington and has had many friends here. It was very easy to design this building because he feels like this was his quasi-backyard even though he lived near Graceland growing up. He thanked Mr. Brown for all of his help. It is his first development opportunity in Worthington and he looks forward to doing more. Mr. Myers has been very tough with them but very fair, which he appreciates. Hopefully they brought a plan that is acceptable and will add value to the City.

Mr. Foust thanked them for the terrific amount of thought and consideration that has obviously gone into getting to this stage.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 02-2018. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes  7  Kowalczyk, Foust, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Robinson, and Michael

No  0

Ordinance No. 02-2018 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

Mr. Greeson shared the following items:

1) MORPC has a City Forum coming up and the topic is Trust (Information at your places). There is a survey that was conducted about the subject and will be part of the presentation.
2) Westerville is hosting the Ohio Ethics Commission on January 23rd (an e-mail about that subject is at your places). They have extra space in their Council chambers so they have invited neighboring municipalities to participate.

Mr. Greeson commented that if any members are interested in either of those forums please let staff know and we will RSVP on your behalf.

When asked by Ms. Michael if we will be hosting an ethics event of our own, Mr. Greeson agreed that we were but this is an early opportunity. It is probably a general catch all presentation.

3) He offered his thanks to all who worked on the Martin Luther King Day celebration. He found the history portion particularly fascinating as he is somebody who loves that stuff.
4) He requests an Executive Session to discuss pending litigation, appointment of City Official, and a complaint involving a public employee.

5) A Notice of Hearing has been received on the renewal of the liquor permit for the Monkey Bar. Our hearing will be on February 12th. We will be presenting before the Division of Liquor Control at that time.

REPORT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Ms. Michael echoed how great the Martin Luther King Day program was. Although it went a little long, it was very well done.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Robinson made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss pending litigation and appointment of City official and a complaint involving a public employee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes 7 Robinson, Foust, Smith, Myers, Kowalczyk, Dorothy, and Michael

No 0

Council recessed at 9:40 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion to return to open session at 10:10 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

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

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 5th day of February, 2018.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President