Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 21, 2014 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

City Council

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

D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, April 21, 2014, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of City Hall, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 P.M.

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

Member(s) Absent: Robert F. Chosy

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

There were twenty one visitors present.

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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Good Neighbor Award

Ms. Michael announced that she would have council members adopt both Good Neighbor Award resolutions before turning the meeting over for the actual presentations.

Resolution No. 09-2014 To Congratulate Deanna Mears on Her Recognition as a Recipient of the 2013 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

MOTION Mr. Smith moved to adopt Resolution No. 09-2014. Mr. Myers seconded the motion.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 09-2014 carried unanimously.

Resolution No. 10-2014 To Congratulate Lisa Abrams and Luke Neiger on Their Recognition as Recipients of the 2013 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

MOTION Mr. Troper moved to adopt Resolution No. 10-2014. Mr. Norstrom seconded the motion.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 10-2014 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson shared that each year council and the Community Relations Commission have the opportunity to issue a Good Neighbor Award for people who are great neighbors within this great community. He introduced Mikel Coulter, Chair of the Community Relations Commission who will share about this year's award winners.

Mr. Coulter provided a brief history of this award and the process for selecting the winner(s) before inviting Deanna Mears forward to be recognized. He also invited Susi Soler, the resident who nominated Deanna to join them at the podium. Mr. Coulter shared that it is not very often that they receive a hand written nomination so when they do it makes it extra special because to them it means that somebody put a little bit of extra time and effort into it. There were several things to note about this particular nomination. Deanna took care of Susi's dog, which may not seem out of the ordinary except that this particular animal had been abused in a prior life. So when it came over and there were a couple of overnight stays, it was a little bit unusual. Deanna also provides a safe harbor for the neighborhood kids, which is kind of a special thing particularly in today's time. She will drive neighbors around to places such as CVS or the grocery store or things like this. That is just not something that everybody is willing to take the time out of their busy schedule to do.

Mr. Coulter read the resolution in its entirety and presented Ms. Mears with a certified copy.

Ms. Mears thanked council for the recognition. She shared that she moved to Worthington in 1977 and remains in that same location today, on the corner of Eastfield and Pittsfield. She had a great landlady who didn't increase her rent so she decided to stay here because she could afford it when she retires. Unfortunately she has a new landlord and her rent has been raised considerably. She reported seeing many changes in that neighborhood over the years. She has noticed that crimes are no longer an issue and she thinks it is due to getting some of the scoundrels off of the streets. She thanked council again for the recognition. She is very proud to be in Worthington. She added that she would now like to get more involved in the senior center. She would like to get involved with any type of artsy crafty group.

Ms. Michael thanked her for her involvement and her willingness to give to the community. She encouraged her to get involved at the senior center as she believes she will find many opportunities there.

Mr. Norstrom thanked Ms. Mears because she is the kind of person that makes Worthington the special place that it is. Ms. Mears agreed that it is very special. She particularly likes our police force.

Council congratulated Ms. Mears on her award.

Mr. Coulter commented that the second award is a bit unusual because he thinks it includes the youngest recipient we have ever had. He invited Lisa Abrams and her son Luke to the front.

Mr. Coulter shared that from time to time there are properties in Worthington that need a little bit of help from neighbors to care for them. It is probably a little unusual that some people go to the extent that Lisa and Luke have gone to. When he read through the nomination and saw what they went through, it was pretty amazing. The amount of time that they put in and the effort is kind of special especially since no one asked them to and nobody paid them. This was just something that they did because they needed something to do. He read Resolution No. 10-2014 in its entirety and presented the two with a certified copy of said resolution.

Ms. Abrams thanked council and said that they were honored to receive this recognition. They love living in Worthington.

When Luke told Ms. Michael that he was in second grade at Evening Street Elementary, she shared that next year he will probably attend the Live Government class that she provides to many third graders. She added that she will be looking for him.

Ms. Michael thanked the two for all that they have done because it really makes a difference in our community to have neighbors that are willing to reach out and help.

Ms. Dorothy shared that what she loves about that award is that people don't go out of their way for the recognition but rather share good deeds for the love of their community. It is special that we have this award to grant this recognition to the unsung heroes of our community and she thanked them for their deeds.

Discussion – "Hi Neighbor" Booklet

Mr. Coulter that he hopes everyone received the "Hi Neighbor Booklet" in their packet this week. He shared that a number of years ago the Community Relations Commission (CRC) undertook a project of "Hi Neighbor". Members may recall that the former president of the CRC, Courtney Chapman started this event. Initially it was one day a year. After several years it was expanded to an entire month and then ultimately expanded to "Hi Neighbor" all year round. It was an effort to get people off of their front porch or at least get the chairs out front and visit with others. One of the things that the Commission wanted to do, and it ties back to the "Good Neighbor Award" is we wanted to make people aware of who all lives in Worthington and what Worthington is about. We've collected a number of stories and board member, Aaron Domini really led this effort on behalf of the members of the Community Relations Commission. We all had some input from time to time but it was Aaron through the last year that has really spent his time and effort to put this document together.

Mr. Coulter said he wanted to share a few items regarding the CRC before passing things over to Mr. Domini.

- Sean Hamzee, a member of CRC returned from a year's reserve duty in Afghanistan about two months ago. We are proud of him and very pleased with his safe return.
- Thanked council for their effort in getting three new members to serve on the CRC. The new members include: Angela Mahaffey, Jack Miner, and Joe Decker. Those additions bring the Commission once again to the full complement.
- This is the second year for the CRC to offer a free Legal Clinic. First year it was held at the Griswold Center and was attended by thirteen individuals from Stafford Village. This year's clinic will be an all day session for six groups in the morning and six in the afternoon through the Food Pantry. It is free to those who qualify. The attorneys and paralegals will focus on and offer the following documents:
    - Simple Will
    - Financial Power of Attorney
    - Living Will
    - Health Care Power of Attorney
    - Donor Registry Enrollment Form
    - Declaration of Funeral Arrangement
- The CRC will once again be matching in the Memorial Day Parade

Mr. Coulter turned the meeting over to Aaron Domini who shared with members the details of the Hi Neighbor Booklet as well as the intentions of the Commission after Council has an opportunity to comment.

<u>Hi Neighbor Booklet</u>

Mr. Domini commented that this booklet kind of spawned out of the testimonies that members heard tonight. They worked with Mr. Chapman on the question of "What is the future of Hi Neighbor?" The result was really celebrating the stories of Worthington. One of the things that the CRC is charged with is being an ambassador for this community. They thought there is no better way to be an ambassador than to share the stories of this community because in their opinion that is what makes this place special. It is what makes us unique and sets us apart in the marketplace. Members heard two of those stories tonight. Every year we give these awards but there are a number of stories left over. They are filed away and nothing is done with them. The idea of this project, which has been more than a year in the making was to kind of memorialize all of those stories and create a living booklet of what makes this place great, which are the stories of the people who live here. That is what this project was about. This is going to be a living and breathing document so every year new stories will be created as part of this booklet.

Mr. Domini shared that in addition to the stories there will also be other content. We also wanted to provide information about the Commission beyond just what is available

on the website. That section will be updated annually. We also plan to profile a place and a program every year. This year we've profiled the Worthington Community Garden and the Farmer's Market. It is a way to get out in the community and let people know what is unique about this place if they haven't already discovered it. The last piece of the document is a tool box. We want to give people some tools to continue to be good neighbors and help grow Worthington. This year we talked about the Block Watch. The last piece includes a contact list and Volunteering and Community groups. We wanted to provide people with a link to almost every group that is within this community.

Mr. Domini commented that the evolution of the project went beyond the booklet. We have a full booklet that members have today. We are proposing a condensed street ready version for higher quantity distribution. We also have post cards. If there is a special event people can use a post card that includes a link to the full version of the booklet. Each post card also includes a story on the back. These are things that we would like to use, and working with the City to have a higher quantity of distribution to continue to promote Worthington and promote the things that make Worthington special.

Mr. Domini stated the question is, how do we use this booklet? CRC members have discussed a number of ways to use it as a Commission; from the city website to distribution to local realtors and community promoters. We want to keep an annual copy at the library. The post cards can be included in new resident welcome packets. We hope to have the smaller version in coffee houses, restaurants, etc. Again, the idea is to promote the community to the people who live here, to visitors and to businesses that may want to locate here. There are a number of things this community already does in this respect such as the calendar and things on the website. We wanted to create one more piece that compliments all of that good work that the city is already doing. The thing that sets us apart a little bit is that it is really about the people who live here and the promotion of those people is one of the Commission's missions.

Comments

Ms. Michael, Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Myers commented that the project was well done and very nice.

Ms. Michael asked about the funding for the booklets. Mr. Coulter reported that the project grew from something they thought would be much shorter to something that is forty pages. Ms. Trego began gathering costs for printing and the Commission decided against mass printing because of the expense. That was when they came up with the two shorter versions: the smaller booklet and the post card. They are more to the point and more cost effective to mass produce. The booklets will be left in places like real estate offices. We are hoping to build excitement in Worthington about the people, the places, the things to do and about the families that live here. The Commission plans to pay for the post cards out of their budget.

Once the full version of the booklets is ready to hit the street, they will be placed in places like the Griswold, the Community Center, and the Library. It will also be

available on the website. They also will look to see how much short of the second version would be and what the printing costs for that would be. They talked about seeing if they could solicit some of the business community to help pay for that since it is going to be in their real estate offices or wherever and they could benefit from this. They could use this as a very good sales tool.

Ms. Michael suggested that council members get specific questions to Lori Trego.

Mr. Smith commented that he really likes the post card idea. He added that his family has been looking for Worthington post card for some time.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom about whether the commission has looked at advertising, Mr. Coulter replied no. It is probably something that is not out of consideration but they didn't know if that was a road they wanted to go down. Sponsors might be a possibility. He wouldn't want to say no.

Mr. Norstrom added that Anne Brown has a large mailing list of organizations. Mr. Coulter mentioned several organizations that they plan to contact including: Sustainable Worthington, a group in Worthington Estates, the Olde Worthington Business Association, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Historical Society just to name a few.

Mr. Norstrom said so when it comes to advertising maybe it would just be to put some inserts in a business. Mr. Coulter agreed.

Ms. Michael noted there being no contact information listed. She thinks it might be nice to include someone from the city that they could contact since some may not want to use a computer. She thanked the Commission and everyone that worked on this to put it together. They did a wonderful job.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

Ordinance No. 08-2014 An Ordinance to Revise the Codified Ordinances by Adopting Current Replacement Pages.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson agreed with Ms. Michael that this is routine legislation.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 08-2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	**6**	Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, and Michael
No	**0**	

Ordinance No. 08-2014 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 09-2014 To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain

Land from C-1, Neighborhood Commercial to C-2, Community Shopping Center (2299 West Dublin-Granville Road)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson reported that this item is a rezoning in the Dublin-Granville/Linworth Road area of town. He asked Mr. Brown to overview the application.

Mr. Brown shared that this is a rezoning request for the property at 2299 West Dublin-Granville Road. It will change the zoning from C-1 to C-2 Community Shopping Center. There is another item later on the agenda for the subdivision combining parcels for this intersection. The request is to rezone 1.56 acres to the C-2 district. The applicant has anticipated a future shopping center type development for the site however no application has been made at this time. This site is in the Architectural Review District and is subject to development plan approval so any change/modification to this site will be required to go through Municipal Planning Commission, Architectural Review Board and City Council for approval.

Mr. Brown reported that the surrounding zoning in the area at the intersection of Linworth and Dublin-Granville Rd. is commercial. The northeast corner of the intersection is in Columbus and zoned C-4, Regional Scale Commercial District. To the east of the property is a parcel recently annexed from Perry Township to the City of Worthington and is located in the Community Shopping Center District. To the south is Linworth Park which is zoned S-1. Further to the west is CS (Community Service) and LI (Limited Industrial District) of Perry Township. The request is in conformance with the Worthington Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in 2005. It recommends the intersection to be a commercial node for the community. He added that the parcels are all owned by the applicant.

Mr. Brown stated that staff recommends approval of this proposed re-zoning. It went before MPC on March 27th. MPC did review and recommended approval to City Council to rezone to the C-2 district. He would be glad to answer any questions that member may have.
Mr. Myers commented that the property to the east is already C-2 or the portion that council will combine tonight is already C-2 so this just brings the other C-1 up to the same zoning classification. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Brown agreed with Mr. Myers comments.

A member of the audience was sworn in by Mrs. Fox.

<u>Stan Apseloff, 2740 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. Columbus, OH</u>
Mr. Apseloff mentioned that he is sure this mall will be an important addition to the community. It is on a road that will either be widened or it will be augmented with a shared use path. He wants to make sure that everyone is aware that the road is going to be improved. He thinks a little bit of prior planning to make sure that there is some

right-of-way for the road expansion plus sidewalks or a shared use path to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles as part of this equation. He thinks this will be extremely helpful since there is also an apartment complex being built nearby and those people will enjoy going to this mall. Just a little bit of planning will be a wonderful thing.

Ms. Michael thanked Mr. Apseloff for his comments. She share that the City of Worthington, Perry Township, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, Ohio State University and ODOT are all working together to determine the best design for that entire area. Mr. Greeson suggested that staff comment on the particular issue that Mr. Apseloff raised. Mr. Brown shared that in the accompanying legislation to this item, which is two agenda items down for the subdivision of the property, we asked for additional right-of-way dedication along Dublin-Granville Road. As part of the development process they will be required to put in sidewalks along Linworth and StRt-161.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 09-2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Ordinance No. 09-2014 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 12-2014 Amending Ordinance No. 36-2013 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the Wilson Bridge/Huntley/WG Intersection Design and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 602-14)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Ms. Michael commented that two amendments are needed for this ordinance.

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 12-2014 in Section 1. to insert the amount of $247,203 and in Section 2. to insert the firm of EMH&T. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

There being no discussion on the amendments, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Greeson shared that a year and a half ago the city applied for Federal Attributable Funding dollars through the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission. These funds come from federal gas tax dollars that are then passed down to the region for significant infrastructure improvements. Staff was successful in obtaining approximately $7M in

federal funds for the improvement of this important intersection. Council included funds for a variety of things related to the local share in the Five Year CIP, the first of which were funds to study the intersection and develop an approach for the design of it. Council then authorized staff to issue a Request For Proposal (RFP) and in accordance with our Administrative Regulations staff created a committee to review proposals. Mr. Watterson, Mr. Brown, Ms. Stewart, and a representative from MORPC all served on that committee. He asked Mr. Watterson to further overview the proposal tonight.

Mr. Watterson commented that in response to the RFP, the city received six proposals from firms to provide the consulting services for the project. The interview committee shortlisted to three firms and interviewed those firms on Thursday, April 10th. As a result of those interviews and the proposals, the committee is recommending that the firm of EMH&T Incorporated be selected as the consultant for the project. At this point, staff is recommending that city council contract for two phases of the work. The first is the study and preliminary engineering work which will result in the selection of a preferred alternative for the intersection. They will be looking at both a roundabout and conventional signalized intersection configurations. An additional phase for identifying and pursuing alternative funding for the project to meet the difference between the anticipated costs and the amount of the MORPC Attributable Funds is also recommended. The first phase is $184,230 and the second phase is $39,500. Staff is recommending an appropriation to fund both of those phases and a 10% contingency for any unseen occurrences so the recommended appropriation is $247,203.

Ms. Michael identified the intersection being discussed for the benefit of those in attendance.

Mr. Myers commented that this is our money and not subject for reimbursement. Mr. Greeson agreed. Mr. Watterson stated that an estimated cost for the intersection at this time is around $11M and the MORPC funding is about $8M. Those are very preliminary numbers because we don't know what right-of-way is going to be necessary or what utility relocations are going to be necessary or what the ultimate configuration will be. Mr. Myers stated that we will have a much better idea after this money is spent. Mr. Watterson agreed.

Mr. Greeson pointed out that later in the agenda is a bond anticipated note that would allow us to reimburse costs associated with this and other aspects of this project through bond proceeds.

Mr. Norstrom asked for additional information about the $39,000 to pursue alternative sources of funding. Mr. Watterson commented that it will primarily be for preparing grant applications and doing the necessary work to meet the requirements of the specific grants. No particular funding opportunities have been identified to date. Staff anticipates that OPWC funding may be a possibility and other transportation funding that may become available in the next three to five years.

Mr. Norstrom asked if this is really something that we would want a consultant to do because $39,000 could get us a great deal of staff time. Mr. Watterson responded that staff's recommendation is for a consultant. We have used the same consultant for pursuing grant opportunities in the past and they have demonstrated the ability to prepare the applications, follow up on the requirements that are necessary and ultimately receive the funds. Mr. Greeson added that we do not have a regular track record of applying for grants like this so they are not in the category of things that we are touching everyday and have developed consistent staff experience with.

Mr. Norstrom asked how often we touch these kinds of projects. Mr. Greeson thinks this is the first MORPC Federal Attributable Funding project that we have ever done so we do not frequently have federal funds involved in our project. Mr. Norstrom thanked staff.

Ms. Dorothy stated that she had a question about our selection process for the three short list companies. She asked what qualities or attributes were identified in EMH&T to have them rise to the top. Mr. Watterson shared that all three firms were very impressive and had good proposals. He thinks that any one of the three could have done the work. In keeping with a positive light, he thinks the things that EMH&T demonstrated that were very important were:

1) Their approach to the project included identifying the location of all utilities early on in the process so the design and selection of the preferred alternative could be based on the presence of those utilities and reduces the amount of relocation and time it would take to do that. That was not the case with several of the other firms.
2) In a previous roundabout project, EMH&T provided a program to educate motorists as to how to use them. As this could potentially be the first roundabout in the city of Worthington, we thought that was an important element that could be included.
3) EMH&T has assisted us in the past, specifically with the earmarked funding for the sewer projects. It ended up being a very involved process and their grant staff did a very good job of getting those questions answered in a long process to be able to eventually get those funds.

Ms. Dorothy thanked him for his reply.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 12-2014 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 12-2014 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 13-2014 Approving the Subdivision of Property at 130 West Clearview Avenue, Authorizing Variances and Approving a Subdivider's Agreement. (Dennis M. Hamilton)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson stated that this is a division of property at the Clearview/Evening Street intersection as is depicted on the screen. He asked Mr. Brown to overview the application.

Mr. Brown agreed that the property in question is located at the northeast corner of Clearview Avenue and Evening Street. The request is to divide the one parcel back into two parcels. As originally platted in 1928 as part of the Clearview Addition, it was platted with 50' wide lots along Clearview and North Street to Oxford and Evening. The house was constructed in approximately 1939 on one of the lots. Part of lot #18 to the east of the existing house was combined to add on to the frontage and the lot size of the 50' lot. Sometime in 2004 the applicant had two separate lots of record and went down to the Franklin County Auditor's office and combined them to create one tax parcel. What staff understands as the goal was to go from two taxing bill to one taxing bill. To recreate what existing in 2004 requires the owner to meet current standards and go through this process.

Mr. Brown reported that the parcel is located in the R-10 zoning district. In order to recreate what previously existed and meet the current standards will require the approval of variances. The variances requested for lot #20, which is located on the corner of Evening and Clearview, include lot width, lot area, minimum width for the west side yard, and the sum of side yards. The variances requested for lot #19, which is where the existing house is located and half of lot #18 include lot width, rear setback for detached structures, and minimum width for the west side yard.

Mr. Brown stated that these parcels in the Clearview Addition were originally three separate lots of record (50' wide) when it was originally platted. The properties are located in the Architectural Review District so any changes to the property will require approval from the Architectural Review Board. There are examples in the packet of houses that could fit on the parcel. We are not saying that those designs would be the ones built but rather they were just to show an example of that if the lot was split back to the 50' wide lot that a house could fit on the parcel.

Mr. Brown reported there being a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees on the property. No change to the trees is proposed with this request. The effect to the existing facilities and sewerage is minimal. As part of this, Section 1101.06(e) and Section 1173.08(a) as it relates to Public Area Payment, requires $500.00 per each new lot created and an additional $250 per new residential unit at the time of construction. Section 1103.10 also requires sidewalks as part of the Subdivision process. The map before members actually shows the sidewalks in the area in gray. There is about a 640'

section along the eastern portion of Evening St. that is missing sidewalks near the Evening Street Elementary School. So as part of this process the applicant would be required to install sidewalks along his portion of Evening Street and along Clearview Ave.

Mr. Brown commented that in looking at the Worthington Design Guidelines, infill sites are recommended to be developed as they are complimentary to the surrounding neighbors. The Worthington Comprehensive Plan promotes increased residential densities around Old Worthington provided the development meets the Worthington Design standards.

Mr. Brown stated that the proposal went before the Municipal Planning Commission on March 13th and they unanimously recommended approval. Staff also recommends approval. He stated that he would be happy to answer any questions. Mr. Brown added that the applicant is in the audience.

Ms. Michael asked if there were any council comments prior to taking public comments.

Mr. Norstrom suggested that the pictures of homes that show garage doors opening on the street be removed. Even though Clearview has several of those that lot will be a prime example and he doesn't think that look is appropriate for Old Worthington.

Mrs. Fox swore in four members of the audience who wished to testify this evening.

Sheila Sinno, 130 W. Clearview Ave.
Ms. Sinno shared that she actually resides in the house at 130 W. Clearview Ave. She along with Mr. Hamilton jointly own the property. She favors the subdivision split even though she lives there and would probably be the most impacted by any construction. She believes that it is very suitable for an additional house to be built there. She moved to Worthington last summer and she thinks that another family should have an opportunity to build a house in that neighborhood and on that street. It is a beautiful street and right next to the elementary school. Her daughter attends the high school. Yes it might have some impact on the neighborhood in terms of construction but it would really enhance the neighborhood especially having a new house on that street. In terms of the lot sizes, she has heard some comments that there is a precedent for larger lots on corners. She doesn't think that is the case in this area. If you look around there are many 50' wide lots on the corners. She believes it is a good thing and hopes that council approves it.

Dennis Hamilton, 25 Fox Lane
Mr. Hamilton shared that the lot was already split before and out of convenience it was combined into one tax bill. Some of the home options that he proposed were just to provide an idea with what could be put there to fit within the parameters of such things as setbacks. He thinks anything could be put there. There are proposals with the garage coming in off of Evening St. They might put another front low garage like the one way down Clearview. Several people have shown interest in the lot. They are local builders

that already work with the city and could do something that would look very nice and bring another family into Worthington. Mr. Hamilton added that he is friends with the neighbor across the street and she is very much for the proposal. She has also spoken before in favor of it.

Peggy Barnum, 120 W. Clearview Ave.
Ms. Barnum shared that she lives on the property immediately to the east of the property in question. She has a petition (copy attached) to present to council for consideration to oppose the lot split.

Ms. Barnum shared the following statement:

> In 1928 the Clearview Addition was platted with all lots, even corner lots 50' wide. Mrs. Ingram bought the lot #20 on the corner and added #19 to the east in 1945. In 1949 she added the west half of lot #18 to 130 W. Clearview and from 1949 until now those 2 ½ lots were bought, maintained, and sold as a beautiful setback corner and home package. There are 50' lots developed in our Clearview Addition but the corner lots tend to be multiple lots with homes setback from neighboring streets. That is the character of our neighborhood. Combining lots, which her former neighbors, the Sheban's did in 2004 requires signing a combination request of tax parcels which states at the bottom, "Once combination form has been filed, you must seek Planning Commission approval to split the property." It might simplify taxes but combination means something. Zillow reported the Sheban's house went on the market with Marlo Capuano at $529,000 on 4/15/13 and dropped to $513,900 and then down to $499,000 by 5/24/13. Not until then was a lot split contemplated.
>
> She likes her neighbors and their home as it is. She has lived at 120 W. Clearview for twenty three years and has learned that as a favor to a potential but unnamed buyer that they were going to ask for a lot split to accommodate her circumstances of a divorce but still reaching to own this beautiful Worthington home near the high school. She opposed the split on 6/27/13. The application was tabled because the Sheban's didn't have dimensions to conceptualize splitting the lot. Knowing that she and a least one other neighbor opposed the lot split, the buyer nevertheless bought the lot, not in their own name but as a Limit Liability Corporation (LLC) formed on 7/5/13. The deed was dated 7/9/13. One of the LLC members and her daughter moved in by school start time last summer and just prior to Christmas the survey stakes were driven into the 130 W. Clearview lot. By 1/27/14 a second investor owner revealed himself and she doesn't know who else might be involved in the LLC. This investor explained in his written application that he has a pending divorce and his financial circumstances forced his hand to liquidate any assets he has. His "hold to retirement and build a small home" plans are apparently kaput due to these extenuating circumstances. No elaboration on this excuse to split the lot was offered until 3/13/14 when the MPC hearing occurred. What court requires liquidation? Will his residence and other properties he and his soon to be ex-wife share be offered up for sale? Doesn't that

mean that the entire 130 W. Clearview lot should get sold if he is liquidating? Can't he just sell his LLC share? I don't understand. Why is construction contemplated in the face of a liquidation emergency? Maybe city council likes investors coming into a neighborhood, imposing their will and leaving it to endure the consequences. That would not constitute good representation of its constituents as a group over one individual.

She believes the approval of the lot split is a slippery slope to construction. Obviously he has plans to construct. The hallmark of an LLC is limited liability. Council should favor a typical owner occupant taking a deed in his own name who accepts the responsibility so if improvements are not done according to plans someone is held accountable. Hopefully council won't impose more building on this lot to collect more tax dollars than an R-10 zoned district should be supplying. Why tear up and generate even more traffic on an already busy Evening Street right by an elementary school as the city plans to funnel even more traffic down Evening Street with development of the former Methodist Children's Home property.

Here are a few specifics. Going back to a 50' lot the Sheban's spoke of the LLC investor, what they want is not the real issue. Somebody might want a 50' corner lot but it is a brand new lot split that has to meet today's rules. Section 1102.02 says no sub-dividing unless the requirements are complied with. Section 1101.05 says excessive depth in relation to width shall be avoided. Depths in excess of twice the lot width are not recommended. The way it would divide out is that it would be a 50' front by 159' depth which means the depth is over three times, not just two times. Section 1129.05 may be worth quoting even though it is not within the zoning board. It states: what practical difficulty exists when the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restrictions. The LLC members walked into this situation with eyes wide open.

The current applicant has the support of the Municipal Planning Commission and the Planning staff that the Sheban's didn't have. Drawings were provided of potential houses that might fit on a thin lot hanging on the edge of Evening Street which Myers surveyed for Buck Equipment Inc. Some house might fit there but the houses aren't supposed to be part of the lot split issue and trees don't fall with lot splits.
Worthington's Comprehensive Plan tells us that there is an over abundance of single family houses in Worthington. Why build one with all of the variance complications that might be involved? Once the sidewalk gets built and 35 Howard Ave. new homes gets built tells us a sidewalk, even to nowhere, is needed with a new build so we will have two sidewalks to nowhere. If the house is built on the east edge of Evening Street the streetscape will look like a wall on Clearview Avenue because the property that just expanded (the Holland property) is a solid wall and this will be yet another solid wall. At least the Holland's live where they made the changes. The original house was already close to Evening Street when they did their improvements. The house at 130 has been mentioned

as an excuse to allow the lot split but did the R-10 and lot limits exist when that house was built years ago? I don't think they existed and that was in 1958. People come to the city for minor adjustments for like air conditioner condensers, fences, generally non-substantial changes that they are going to live with and they are respectful of their neighbors and the city's rules. Mr. Kenimer down in Medick Estates was complimented for talking to his neighbors. The perspective buyer was available when a McBurney Place zoning hearing was held. The Howard Ave. property was split into two 72' wide lots less than the 80' requirement but not by much. The SWOP on 2/10 at the McBurney Place and the Linworth Lakeside SWOP 03/10 stayed well within the R-10 and R-16 lot zoning requirements. The 1 to 3 width depth requirement next door to her is way over what is recommended and the square footage minimum recommendation is 10,400 square feet. The proposal as is would give 7,950 square feet and that is a substantial difference. Also the house proposal would be roughly five feet from the current home instead of the eight feet that is recommended.

In summary, the neighborhood doesn't need another 849 Oxford St. set of problems with trees, tree losses, driveways and neighbor dissatisfaction. Thank you for listening.

Ms. Michael asked Ms. Sinno if this is a single or multi-person LLC. Ms. Sinno replied that it is she and Mr. Hamilton. They are the only two investors in the LLC. Ms. Michael stated that it is common for LLCs to own pieces of property. She asked if that was correct. Ms. Sinno replied yes. This LLC was formed specifically to buy this property.

Mr. Norstrom commented that in listening to Ms. Barnum's testimony, he is trying to understand what she is objecting to. He stated that if this was someone buying this property and building a house on it, you would have no objection. Ms. Barnum replied that she would have an objection.

Mr. Norstrom stated that she was talking about a LLC like it is a third party. He is trying to understand why that makes a difference and it doesn't. It sounds like she is just opposed to a house on this property. Ms. Barnum agreed. She is just saying the LLC is protected.

Mr. Norstrom said that doesn't matter. Your bottom line is that you are opposed to a house being built on this property. It is 50' wide lot, which is common throughout Old Worthington. Ms. Barnum disagreed. She stated that it is not typical on a corner lot. Mr. Norstrom disagreed. It stated that it is common throughout Old Worthington including corner lots. He asked if she looked at all of the corners throughout Old Worthington. Ms. Barnum replied that she did. It is very common not only in Worthington but also in the Northmore section of Clintonville and Arlington.

Mr. Norstrom asked why she is against another house being built. Ms. Barnum replied that it will increase population density. Mr. Norstrom stated one house? Ms. Barnum replied yes. Mr. Norstrom stated that the traffic that will be generated by that one house

will have minuscule impact. Ms. Barnum replied that she has enjoyed it for twenty three years.

Mr. Norstrom asked if she wants to buy the property and not develop it. Ms. Barnum replied that had she known what was going to happen she would have considered it.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the other thing that she seems to be ignoring is that we have lots of controls about what happens in Old Worthington. This house cannot just be built. It has to go through a fairly comprehensive approval process and inspections will it is being built. He thinks that she kind of disregarded that fact. Ms. Barnum disagreed. She is talking about the great variances that are required to allow the build to meet the requirements. Mr. Norstrom stated that variances like that are common throughout Old Worthington. That is why they are variances. Ms. Barnum replied that the variances are typically not that large. Mr. Norstrom disagreed.

Ms. Michael asked Mr. Coulter about this application. Mr. Coulter shared that when the Commission looked at this particular property, one of the first thing that they looked is the lots, not only in the immediate vicinity but throughout Old Worthington that had a 55' width. The property immediately behind it is one of those properties and it is in fact a corner property. It is also a 50' wide lot. There are other lots throughout Old Worthington that are 50' wide as Mr. Norstrom pointed out. In fact, there are several right down the street on both sides of Clearview Ave. One of the things that he advised the folks that are selling the property is whoever they talk to, make sure that they understand that if the buyer is smart he is going to get his permits and his zoning in place before they close on the property because as Mr. Norstrom pointed out, it is not going to be an easy thing to do. He also appreciates the comment about no garage doors on the front of the house for all of the same reasons. It is going to be a narrow lot. It is going to be a narrow house and yes the entrance to the garage will probably be along Evening St. Is it going to dramatically impact Evening St.? He doesn't think so. It is one car and one family. The house is only going to be of limited size even if it is a two story home. Did the Commission consider it? Yes. Most certainly they took a hard serious look at it. He believes if council looks back through the record, the ARB and MPC passed this unanimously when they forwarded their recommendation on to City Council that they go ahead and approve this lot split.

<u>Christy Caine, 123 W. Clearview Ave.</u>
Ms. Caine commented that her statement is more to express a concern about the issue of sidewalks. She wanted to bring up the point that Clearview itself is one of the rare streets that doesn't have sidewalks on either side of it. She is wondering how, with this zoning issue and requirements, how that will impact the rest of Clearview since there aren't sidewalks there already. Her concern would be based on where the street tree and the large tree placement are now. Would the city expect sidewalks to be constructed on Clearview because of this property and how that would impact the full growth of old trees on that street.

Mr. Greeson replied that the city code requires sidewalks to be added when doing subdivisions. He thinks that is done because our planning documents and our long term goals for the city in general promote the creation of walkable neighborhoods and fostering connections amongst the sidewalk system. If you don't do it at subdivision then it often becomes much more difficult for at least one of the reasons Ms. Caine outlined in trees. There is a procedure in the codified ordinances related to how sidewalks can get created in neighborhoods that don't already have them. There are a variety of ways to accomplish that. Council can do that and assess property owners. Property owners can petition, in which the city would pay a portion of the costs. A third way would be if the city received grant funds to add sidewalks. So it is not a forgone conclusion that we would extend those but there is procedures by which they could be extended in the future. He added that related to the trees, it is really site specific. There is any number of sidewalks that we have built in Worthington where we've had to navigate around that issue.

Mr. Watterson reported that the code requires that a sidewalk be placed a minimum of 5' behind the curb but in the past council has granted variances to that in order to avoid impact to trees or other physical features. He added that any homeowner can apply for a permit to construct a sidewalk in front of their house to city standards so it doesn't necessarily require a petition process if an individual homeowner wants to construct one.

Mr. Norstrom commented that as an individual homeowner, he thinks they can rest assured this council and prior councils have been very wary of trying to force sidewalks in a neighborhood. As Mr. Greeson indicated, we do want to do it whenever the opportunity is there because over the next hundred years there will be plenty of opportunities to complete that sidewalk as property changes and things happen but there are no plans at this point in time to come in and require it all the way up to Oxford Street.

Ms. Caine commented for the record that at this point in time she is not in favor of sidewalks on her street. She does have small children who ride their bikes in the street and it is a quiet enough street that she is not concerned about that. She thanked them for letting her know how that process works.

Mr. Myers asked if she is for or opposed to sidewalks on this property. Ms. Caine replied that she thinks it will end up looking odd for a sidewalk to be there when there is no other sidewalk that it is connecting to. Therefore she is opposed to it. Mr. Myers thought that might be her response because as Mr. Norstrom said, whenever we get the opportunity to put a sidewalk in with someone else's money, we do that. That way we don't have to use your money or his money to put one in and we have an opportunity here to use somebody else money. We have not taken the approach of forcing people to spend money on the sidewalks but it is a long range plan and a requirement of the city to put the sidewalks in. Because of that residents can drive all over Worthington and see sidewalks to nowhere. They do look odd but you have to start somewhere. Mr. Norstrom defined those sidewalks as sidewalks to somewhere yet to be determined.

Ms. Barnum interjected that once green space is gone, it is gone forever. She added that on Oxford Street they weren't supposed to damage the trees. They dug the foundation and all of the mature trees are gone now. Mr. Holland took out about four or five very large, very beautiful trees. But at least he lives there and deals with the circumstances and she doesn't think they will have the same situation in this case.

Mr. Myers reported that when this application was heard by the Municipal Planning Commission he thinks that one of the strongest arguments was that all this is doing is turning back the clock to what it was before. This was originally platted as a 50' lot. It was combined for reasons that had nothing to do with the platting. Then when we looked at the rest of the neighborhood, including the house immediately to the north, they were all 50' lots. He thinks that carried a great weight with MPC.

Mr. Myers shared that he looked at his neighborhood while the presentation was going on. He has one of the largest lots in his neighborhood at 61'. The people next to him are 55' so it is a pattern that is repeated all over Worthington. Mr. Norstrom pointed out that Mr. Myers owns a corner lot. Mr. Myers agreed. He added that they have no sidewalks on the side street or curbs. That is what he thinks MPC reasoned.

Mr. Norstrom commented that he thoroughly thinks that the house on Oxford St. was a disaster, not only in the approval of it but also in the construction of it. It is a very poor example to be using to be arguing against this application. The urban forest is very good within this community. Unfortunately we recently had to cut down many trees along Wilson Bridge for the future and those things happen. Trees do come back. Old growth trees take a long time to come back. Even when trees have to come down he is not as concerned about it because it does not leave just vacant space.

Mr. Myers said to keep in mind a point that has also been made is that whatever goes in here is going to be the subject of scrutiny, further public testimony, and will have to be a quality built that fits with the character of the neighborhood and the lot. There will also have to be a landscape plan when that comes in so it will be further regulated and scrutinized.

Ms. Caine asked if once a permit is issued, is there is a timeframe for finishing? For instance, our neighbor's house next door continues to sit without a driveway finished at this time. Is there a timeframe under which construction has to be completed once an approval is made? Mrs. Fox reported that completion needs to be completed within eighteen months from the time the permit is issued. Mr. Myers stated that right now nothing can be built on that property. They would have to go through a permitting process and an architectural review process. After that is completed then it would be eighteen months.

Ms. Dorothy stated that currently this is R-10 zoning. She asked what the zoning is just to the west of this property. Mr. Brown replied that Medick Way is R-16. Ms. Dorothy stated that R-16 requires larger lots so those corner lots are required to have larger lots

as opposed to this R-10 that isn't required to have the larger lot. Mr. Brown clarified that the lot size is not because of it being a corner lot but rather by the zoning district.

Ms. Dorothy commented that this property is located in the R-10 district and it was originally platted with the 50' wide lots. Then we are not trying to change from R-10 to something else. Anything that got built here would be a single family home and that would be under the ARB guidelines. Mr. Brown agreed.

Mr. Smith asked the original date for the lot being platted. Mr. Brown replied 1928.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 13-2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 13-2014 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 14-2014 Approving the Subdivision of Property at 2233-2299 West Dublin-Granville Road, 6113 Linworth Road and Authorizing Variances (Gary Gitlitz/Segna Investments Inc.)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson commented that this legislation is the subdivision that was discussed when we dealt with the rezoning earlier in the meeting. He asked Mr. Brown to overview this request.

Mr. Brown reiterated that this is a subdivision of properties along West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road. It is currently seven separate parcels of record with the ultimate goal to combine them to create two separate parcels of record. The reason for going from seven to two is that when the parcels were annexed from Perry Township to the city of Worthington, the taxing district had to remain different with Perry Township remaining underneath. What will ultimately happen is that we will have lot #1 that is approximately 2.73 acres on the corner of Linworth and Dublin-Granville. Then lot #2 will be approximately 1.729 acres. The parcel was recently rezoned from C-1 to the C-2 district so it will all be under the Community Shopping Center district. As part of this approval process with the strange configuration of the property line running right down the middle of the parcel, we are asking for a side yard setback variance to be granted. This site is located in the Architectural Review District and is subject to Development Plan approval so any development on the site will be required to go to MPC, ARB and City Council. The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan does recommend the creation of a commercial node for the community in this area.

Mr. Brown provided the following details:

1) The applicant has met all requirements of the Preliminary Plat and Final Plat as outlined in the Codified Ordinances.
2) The proposed subdivision will allow for the further redevelopment of the parcel.
3) Access to the site will be limited to two access points in the future. There will be one full access point to Linworth Road towards the southern boundary towards Linworth Park and limited access point to West Dublin-Granville Road that will be controlled by ODOT.
4) The applicant will be dedicating ten feet of additional right-of-way along West Dublin-Granville Road to meet the future right-of-way needs.
5) Ultimately the lots created will exceed the minimum lot size and frontage requirements for the districts.
6) Requesting side yard setback variances to be included for the internal property line.
7) There is a fifteen foot sanitary sewer easement along the southern and western property lines to allow for sanitary connection at the parcel to the northwest should it ever annex, along the railroad tracks and StRt-161.
8) The applicant has proposed to demolish all structures on this site.
9) The site is subject to ARB, Development Plan approval from the ARB, MPC and City Council.

Mr. Brown reported that staff is recommending approval. This application did go before MPC on March 27th and they did unanimously recommend approval to City Council.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 14-2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 14-2014 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 11-2014 Authorizing the Use of a Portion of the Proceeds of Bonds or Bond Anticipation Notes of the City, in the Principal Amount of Not to Exceed $3,500,000 to be Issued for the Purpose of Financing the 2014 and 2015 Capital Improvement Program Projects Including Street and Utility System Improvements as Identified as Bonded Projects in the 2014-2018 Capital Improvement Program, to Reimburse the

City's Capital Improvement Fund for Moneys Previously Advanced for Such Purpose.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy moved to adopt Resolution No. 11-2014. Mr. Myers seconded the motion.

Mr. Greeson commented that we have done this before but in order to reimburse ourselves ultimately from a bond issue that we may or may not do in the future, we have to do one of these bond anticipation notes. The note allows us to go ahead and proceed with the work that we need to do on the projects that members adopted in the Five Year CIP and in which you are anticipating using bond proceeds for those projects. Projects include: Northbrook Sewer, Central District Sewer, Kenyonbrook Sewer, Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena intersection design and enhancements to the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Myers stated that at the time staff comes back to discuss the issuance of the bonds, council will still be able to debate whether we want this sum of money included in that bond or not. This is just anticipation of this being included in that bond and allowing us to seek reimbursement at a later date. Mr. Greeson and Mrs. Roberts agreed.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2014 passed unanimously by a voice vote and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Mr. Myers commented that he was just standing up for Dr. Chosy's debt adverse nature. He just wants to preserve his right to argue about it later.

Resolution No. 12-2014 Adopting the Job Description for the Position of Part-Time Code Enforcement Officer and Amending the Staffing Chart and Pay Resolution to Accommodate Said Position.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom moved to adopt Resolution No. 12-2014. Mr. Troper seconded the motion.

Mr. Greeson shared that this part-time position was justified and agreed to in the 2014 budget discussion.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2014 passed unanimously by a voice vote and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Resolution No. 13-2014 Amending the Personnel Rules and Regulations of the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

MOTION Mr. Myers moved to adopt Resolution No. 13-2014. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Mr. Greeson shared that periodically staff updates the Personnel Rules and Regulations for a variety of reasons. There are a number of amendments being presented tonight with most being fairly straight forward. If members have questions that deal with how some of these changes may relate to Collective Bargaining, then that would be an appropriate topic for executive session should you so desire. Otherwise, he and Ms. Trego are prepared to answer any questions members may have.

Mr. Myers wanted to reiterate his gratitude to recognize Veterans Day. He appreciates that.

Mr. Smith asked what is the time of paid leave for paternity leave. Ms. Trego replied that employees can take up to six weeks of sick leave.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2014 passed unanimously by a voice vote and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 15-2014 Amending Ordinance No. 36-2013 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Additional Costs of City Improvements to the Interchange at IR 270 and US 23 and all Related Expenses. (Project No. 564-10)

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

The Clerk was instructed to give notice of a public hearing on said ordinances in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

Request to Bid: 2014 Street Improvement Program

Mr. Greeson asked Mr. Watterson to overview the request to bid the 2014 Street Improvement Program.

Mr. Watterson reported that last Friday afternoon the annual driving tour of the street improvement program was held. There was one recommended addition to the project that came from staff. During construction of the West Wilson Bridge Road bike path staff became aware of a conflict between the former bus stop and the path. We removed a portion of the bus stop curb to allow the path construction to continue but we are recommending that the remainder of the bus stop be removed and that will provide additional separation between the bike path, the street curb, and also provide an opportunity for more green space in that area. So that addition is estimated to cost $20,181. With that, the revised Engineer's estimate is still under the $600,000 budget and is at $585,356.40. Staff is requesting an approval to advertise for bids and planning to open bids on May 9, 2014.

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to authorize staff to bid the 2014 Street Improvement Program. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Smith shared that pre-cycling is this Saturday.

Mr. Norstrom commented that he is still looking forward to when staff eliminates paper.

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

_____
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 19th day of May, 2014.

_____
President of Council

RECEIVED
APR 21 2014
By K Jness

LOT SPLIT/DEVELOPMENT OF NE CORNER EVENING STREET & CLEARVIEW AVENUE

I oppose splitting the lot and/or any building of an additional residence on the above corner. The property is zoned R-10 and I would not like to see City Council approve zoning variances and/or a subdivider's agreement. I appreciate trees, greenspace and the appearance of Worthington's corner lots, where homes are set back from the streets.

City Council don't approve ordinance 13-2014. Don't cut corners.

Name		Address
Peggy Barnum	Peggy Barnum	120 W Clearview 43085
Todd Hitt	Todd Hitt	880 Oxford St 43085
Tim Stanton	TIM STANTON	129 W. NORTH ST
Paul Hier's		900 Evening St
Lori C. Reeder	Lori C. Reeder	126 W. Stafford Ave.
Eliza Burston	Eliza Burston	111 W. Stafford Ave.
WALTRAUT BUTLER	Waltraut Butler	110 W. Stafford Ave.
MIKE SCHOLL	J. Michael Scholl	41 W. NORTH ST.

LOT SPLIT/DEVELOPMENT OF NE CORNER EVENING STREET & CLEARVIEW AVENUE

I oppose splitting the lot and/or any building of an additional residence on the above corner. The property is zoned R-10 and I would not like to see City Council approve zoning variances and/or a subdivider's agreement. I appreciate trees, greenspace and the appearance of Worthington's corner lots, where homes are set back from the streets.

City Council don't approve ordinance 13- 2014. Don't cut corners.

Name		Address
[illegible]	Anne Grunow	907 Oxford St.
[illegible]	CHRISTINE FRAKE	158 MEDICK WAY
[illegible]		930 Evening St.
[illegible]	Thomas Crane	92 West North St.
[illegible]	BARBARA CRANE	92 WEST NORTH St.
[illegible]	ANNIE JORDAN	40 W. NORTH ST.
[illegible]	Jeremy Yohe	20 W. North St.
[illegible]	Kevin Masterson	31 W. North St

LOT SPLIT/DEVELOPMENT OF NE CORNER EVENING STREET & CLEARVIEW AVENUE

I oppose splitting the lot and/or any building of an additional residence on the above corner. The property is zoned R-10 and I would not like to see City Council approve zoning variances and/or a subdivider's agreement. I appreciate trees, greenspace and the appearance of Worthington's corner lots, where homes are set back from the streets.

City Council don't approve ordinance 13- 2014. Don't cut corners.

Name	Address
Kristina Sessa	817 Oxford St. Worthington 43085
Chris Otter	817 Oxford St Worthington 43085
Chasity Kilburn	787 Oxford St Worthington OH 43085
Wilma Wabnitz	784 Oxford St. Worthington 43085
Anne Riley	784 Oxford St. Worthington OH 43085
Lou Flocken	810 Oxford St. 43085
Sarah Logroteria	850 Oxford St

Sarah Logroteria

LOT SPLIT/DEVELOPMENT OF NE CORNER EVENING STREET & CLEARVIEW AVENUE

I oppose splitting the lot and/or any building of an additional residence on the above corner. The property is zoned R-10 and I would not like to see City Council approve zoning variances and/or a subdivider's agreement. I appreciate trees, greenspace and the appearance of Worthington's corner lots, where homes are set back from the streets.

City Council don't approve ordinance 13- 2014. Don't cut corners.

Name	Address
Michael Paoletti	690 Evening St.
Mary Mirick MARY MIRICK	700 EVENING ST.
Kathy Berkhart	664 Evening St.