



City Council Agenda

Minutes

Monday, December 6, 2021 at 7:30 pm

6550 N. High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085

Virtual Meeting Information

Link through: worthington.org

Our Government - Live Stream

1. Call to Order

Minutes:

Worthington City Council met remotely in Regular Session on Monday, December 6, 2021, via Microsoft Teams videoconference. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Minutes:

Members Present: Peter Bucher, Rachael Dorothy, Beth Kowalczyk, Scott Myers, David Robinson, Doug Smith and Bonnie Michael

Member(s) Absent: None

Also Present: City Manager Matt Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager Economic Development Director David McCorkle, Law Director 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 Police Robert Ware, Chief of Fire & EMS Mark Zambito, Management Assistant Ethan Barnhardt, Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Minutes:

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

4. Visitor Comments

Minutes:

There were no visitor comments.

Public Hearings on Legislation

5. Ordinance No. 53-2021 Operating Budget 2022

Providing for the Adoption of the Annual Budget for the Fiscal Year 2022 and Appropriating Sums for Current Operating Expenses.

Minutes:

The Foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

MOTION Mr. Bucher moved, seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk to amend Ordinance No. 53-2021 to the December 6th version.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Kowalczyk expressed how it is her understanding since she is a member of two non-profit boards that are getting funding, that she has been advised to abstain from the vote.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll of Ordinance No. 53-2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Vote Results: Ayes: 6 / Nays: 0 / Abstain: 1

6. Ordinance No. 54-2021 Compensation for Unclassified Employees

Establishing Compensation for Certain Unclassified Positions of the Municipal Service For the Period of January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022, and Adopting Class Specifications for Said Unclassified Positions.

Minutes:

The Foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

MOTION: Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Myers to amend Ordinance No. 54-2021 to the December 6th version

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll of Ordinance No. 54-2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Vote Results: Ayes: 7 / Nays: 0

7. Resolution No. 64-2021 Capital Improvements Program (2022-2026)

Approving the 2022-2026 Capital Improvements Program for the City of Worthington.

Minutes:

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy

MOTION: Mr. Robinson moved, seconded by Mr. Bucher to adopt Resolution No. 64-2021.

Ms. Dorothy asked if there was anything that changed since this was introduced, particularly since the Bike and Pedestrian Board asked for \$200,000 for sidewalk improvements. Mr. Greeson replied that those dollars were not included in this and the direction from Council was to work with them on some sidewalk policy issues. We did increase the overall funding for Bike and Pedestrian throughout the five-year plan in total, but not earmarked for sidewalks. Ms. Dorothy wanted to emphasize that the ask was above and beyond and she has been hearing for a number of years that the Bike and Ped Committee is needed and the community is in support of them. However, their ask for a long time has been more money and then their ask again was

additional funds for sidewalks.

There being no comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 64-2021 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Consent Agenda

Notice to the Public: There will be no separate discussion of Consent Agenda items as they are considered to be routine by the City Council and will be adopted by one motion. If a member of the City Council, staff, or public requests discussion on a particular item, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.

8. Ordinance No. 55-2021 Riverlea Police Protection Contract

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into a Contract with the Village of Riverlea for the Provision of Police Protection.

9. Ordinance No. 56-2021 Public Health Contract (Columbus Public Health)

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Contract Between the City of Columbus Board of Health and the City of Worthington for Health Services.

10. Ordinance No. 57-2021 Plumbing Inspection Services (Franklin County Board of Health)

Approving the City Manager's Appointment of the Franklin County District Board of Health as the Provider of Plumbing Inspection Services in the City of Worthington.

11. Ordinance No. 59-2021 CIP Appropriation - Indianola Park Playground Repairs

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2020 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Costs of the Indianola Park Playground Repairs and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 721-21)

12. Resolution No. 58-2021 Reappointment - Parks and Recreation Commission

Re-appointing Alan McKnight to the Parks and Recreation Commission.

13. Resolution No. 59-2021 Appointment of D. Schofield - Alternate Chief Building Official

Approving the City Manager's Appointment of Donald W. Schofield as Alternate Chief Building Official and Alternate Master Plans Examiner for the Division of Building Regulation.

14. Resolution No. 60-2021 Staffing Chart 2022

Amending the Staffing Chart of the City of Worthington to Reflect the Positions Authorized in the 2022 Operating Budget.

15. Resolution No. 61-2021 General Fund Transfer

Adjusting the Annual Budget by Providing for a Transfer of Previously Appropriated Funds.

16. Resolution No. 62-2021 2022 Emergency Medical Services Fees

Establishing Rates and Fees for Emergency Medical Transportation Services Provided by the City of Worthington.

17. Resolution No. 63-2021 Compensation for Classified Employees

Establishing the Compensation Plan, Assigning Compensation Levels for Positions in the Classified Service, Adopting Class Specifications, Providing for Normal Work Weeks, and Repealing Resolutions No. 57-2020, 16-2021, 32-2021, 41-2021, and 42-2021.

18. Resolution No. 65-2021 Adopting Position Descriptions for Assistant Fire Chief-EMS and Finance Specialist

Adopting a Job Description for Assistant Fire Chief-EMS and Community Risk Reduction and Adopting a Job Description for Finance Specialist.

19. Resolution No. 66-2021 Amending Position Title and Description for Assistant Fire Chief and Paralegal

Amending the Position Title and the Position Description for Assistant Fire Chief and Amending the Position Title and Position Description for Paralegal.

Minutes:

Consent Agenda introduced by Ms. Kowalczyk

MOTION: Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Myers to adopt the Consent Agenda

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Vote Results: Ayes: 7 / Nays: 0

Public Hearings on Legislation (continue)

20. Ordinance No. 36-2021 Rezoning - 127, 133, 139, and 145 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.

To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from R-10, Low Density Residential to WBC-2, Professional Office at 127, 133, 139 & 145 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Parcel Numbers: 100-002470, 100-002555, 100-2709 & 100-002473).

Minutes:

President Michael explained how for these rezoning applications, Council will consider each ordinance separately before moving on to the next one. We will begin with presentations from City Staff and the applicant, followed by Council questions. Next, there will be public comments before turning back to staff and the applicants for any additional information and final Council questions and comments before proceeding to a vote.

Mr. Greeson expressed how this is a unique situation where there are two City bodies that are split on their positions for this application. The Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) is the applicant and owner of the property and was created by the City with the mission of supporting economic development efforts and is made up of residents and business leaders in the community. It has an agency relationship with the City and by law has four city officials on its board, including himself. Likewise, the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) is made up of residents and appointed by City Council and has a Council liaison, and by Charter and ordinance is charged with making recommendations to the Council on long term plans and zoning requests. Staff that works for the City provide support to both the MPC and the CIC, working closely with both bodies. Both the MPC and staff come to Council with honestly arrived at recommendations on this application. Additionally, we have residents who will offer different perspectives tonight. He will be providing articulation of what the professional staff recommends, but he will first acknowledge and offer respect to board members and residents who may have a different opinion. It is the hope that the Council will have a full understanding of this application and will be able to make well-balanced, long-term decisions for our community.

He overviewed that the CIC properties begin at the corner of Westview and Wilson Bridge and include three abutting parcels to the east along East Wilson Bridge Road for a total of four parcels currently zoned R-10 for single-family residential. Currently, they have single-family homes on them with two owner-occupied and two rentals when purchased by the CIC. One is currently being rented and three are vacant. He overviewed the current zoning of the corridor. The parcels in question were platted in 1923 and were annexed into Worthington in 1956. By 1957, these lots were developed with some housing, and Wilson Bridge Road had a rural residential feel. By 1961, the interstate had been built and the modern planning debate about these lots had already begun. Currently, the area is no longer rural residential as they were

when the lots were originally platted. Today the lots are part of a dynamic mixed-use corridor and Wilson Bridge Road is a major thoroughfare in the City. These sites have been identified for re-development as they are well served by utilities, transportation infrastructure, and nearby retail and restaurant. The redevelopment of this area has been discussed in multiple planning documents, including comprehensive planning processes, an economic development plan, and a corridor-specific plan. The discussions are an outgrowth of several issues such as the fact we cannot grow outward through annexations, many of the lots in this area are larger in size and able to be developed differently than their current use, and that they about a thoroughfare and other uses that are not just residential. In 1968, the adopted future land use map recommended this area transition to "Medium Density Residential" which was viewed as 4-6 units per acre. In the 1988 Comprehensive Plan, the difficulty in assembling land was cited along with the concern about piecemeal development, and that yielded a recommendation that it remain single-family. In 2000, the Economic Development Plan and a lot was said about this area, noting the lack of sites as an impediment to economic development, and redevelopment should be a focus. This plan recommended the aggregation and assemblage of lots along this corridor and the development of policies to encourage this assemblage for either multi-family or small office development. The 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update also highlighted this area and rejects the perpetuation of rural residential since the commercial ground is so important to the City. If the commercial office cannot be accomplished, this plan recommended the creation of "Urban Village Residential". To bring focus to the recommendations of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study was completed in 2011, calling for professional offices to be allowed at the subject sites. Following best planning practices, we endeavored to adopt zoning categories that properties that could be rezoned to, to better meet the 2011 plan objectives with enhanced standards for the development of this area. In subsequent years, the City Council has placed Wilson Bridge road as a major priority at their retreats in 2014, 2016, 2019, and 2021. Council has tasked both Staff and the CIC with efforts to set the stage for the redevelopment of these parcels and the corridor as a whole. This has included funding the acquisition of the parcels by the CIC and last June, Council referred the rezoning of the parcels to the MPC for a recommendation on whether to rezone as proposed by the CIC. Staff held a meeting with residents about this in August and the MPC held two public hearings in September and October. Chapter 1181 is a specific section of the Planning and Zoning Code that addresses the Wilson Bridge Corridor, WBC categories, and standards for future redevelopment. These standards included in the WBC-2 category address site layout, right-of-way (ROW) dedication, equipment screening, design and materials, landscaping, lighting, signs, parking, and public space amenities. The staff memorandum goes into detail about the specific criteria. The WBC-2 zoning permitted uses are professional office, essential services, and accessory uses. Conditional uses are public uses and semi-public uses. Specific standards include maximum building heights of 3 stories, except for the south side of Wilson Bridge between Westview and McCord Park which should

be limited to 2.5 stories and 35 feet. He overviewed images of buildings in Worthington that represent different things that may fit in the WBC-2 category. The CIC and City Planning Staff both recommended approval for the rezoning applications. The MPC recommended denial of the rezoning applications.

Mr. Greeson explained how the staff has the obligation to review applications for consistency with existing policy documents. Our staff reviewed the application and at both public hearings held by the MPC, opined that the applications are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Wilson Bridge Road Plan. At the September hearing, Mr. McCorkle our Assistant City Manager and Economic Development Director, and Matt Gregory a commercial broker who is a CIC member, provided testimony expressing the need for office space in our community. Things discussed included the types of office products in Worthington, the need for more and different types of products, the connection of office to the City's financial well-being, the economic impact of office in this location, and what is being seen in the Worthington market. Their testimony was based on working daily in this City and submarket and interacting with businesses who want to consider and grow in Worthington. He explained how we have not really increased our net office square footage or diversity in our office stock in ways that are comparable to other communities. We need places to foster the growth of different types of business that promotes long-term stability. Responding to arguments that this site should remain single-family or some other form of housing, he explained that in the current Central Ohio market and in Worthington, there appears to be an insatiable demand for new housing. Multiple studies in the region support this and the acute need for affordable housing and senior housing and there is also a demand for single-family houses in Worthington. That need reinforces the logic behind the Wilson Bridge Road Plan's inclusion of medium family residential on half of the southside of East Wilson Bridge Road which will be heard later tonight. The word balance is important here and given how cities are funded in Ohio, residential produces fewer taxes than what it often costs to serve. We get over 70% of our budget from income taxes, including mostly commercial offices and industrial properties. About 50% of that comes from the larger Wilson Bridge Road corridor. Worthington provides a robust set of services for a community of our size and the demand for enhancement to those services rarely decreases. As noted earlier, the demand for more bike and pedestrian improvements is indicative of this. We are dependent on a strong income tax base to fund those services. In the current market, we could seemingly put apartment or senior housing on any piece of vacant land in Worthington, and doing so would address demand in the market and the needs of some of our community members as well as achieve some of our diversity and equity goals. However, it would be imbalanced if we did that and would not foster the long-term economic stability of the community while creating new service demands without the associated revenue growth necessary. We must strike a balance where we allow some new commercial economic growth with new housing. Both the Wilson Bridge Road Plan and Zoning Districts provide a regulatory structure for implementation of the plan, striking an additional balance with the needs for

economic growth with the impacts that growth may make on adjacent properties. The plan recommended and code changes created more stringent regulations specific to this corridor in excess of the zoning in other adjacent properties. In the WBC-2 category, put in place measures to balance the goals of economic growth with the interests of adjacent residents through reduced building heights, larger setbacks, enhanced site plan requirements, and requirements for the quality of signage and materials.

In addition to having good standards in place, the staff is confident in the process of moving forward. If approved, the CIC will have to develop a thoughtful process to solicit interest and partners in advancing professional office on the property, which will take time. If successful, it will require the approval of a development plan as well, which will need to be reviewed by the MPC and approved by the City Council. Lots of eyes will be on that, with many opportunities to be commented on by the MPC, Council, and the public. Staff believes that the CIC's zoning request helps achieve long-held community objectives to foster much-needed redevelopment in this corridor and the proposal is consistent with the City's plans. A strong zoning text is in place to balance interests, mitigate impacts, and achieve quality. The use being proposed is not only consistent with the plan but also needed in the community, contributing to our long-term vision and economic health. Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Brown explained how when this went before the MPC, the board had a lengthy debate and discussion on these applications. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the board are on the call tonight. The final vote for the CIC application came down to a 3-2 vote, with the two positive members feeling that the request met the outline in the plans that there needs to be office space in the corridor. The majority of the vote went with a recommendation for denial, with there being a sentiment that there should be more dense and urban-style development, not just office. Another board member felt like there was no real plan going forward with this. Another board member was concerned after putting themselves in the residents' shoes.

Mr. Robinson asked if the City has been thinking about this for so long and the plan was written ten years ago, the question is why this was not done previously when the dialogue was fresh and the engaged residents still lived there, and there were no additional facts on the ground. Specifically, why did we wait six years after the new single-family home was built next to Granby. Mr. Greeson responded that for this application, the parcels are already assembled and owned, but we have been working consistently on this subject all along. There has also been discussion at times about the proactive rezoning of these parcels. In hindsight, that would have been advisable, precluding the construction of two new single-family homes, making the achievement of the plan goals more difficult. In conversations with the City Council over time, more cautious strategic choices were made. He would challenge anyone who would say we have been inactive, because we have been making some proactive rezoning and acquisition of properties, and worked hard to create good standards. We heeded some of the feedback from residents during that process about non-conforming uses

so we took a more cautious approach and did not proactively rezone all of the corridors. In highlight that looks to be the wrong strategic choice. We are now coming back with a different set of circumstances with Granby Place being completed and the CIC owning multiple properties.

President Michael noted that there was a concern if the City went through and did a zoning overlay for the entire area, if anyone wanted to fix up their property while living there as a non-conforming use, it would be difficult for them to be able to do so. Since we did not own any of the property, there was concern about what we would be doing to the existing homeowners at that time.

Mr. Greeson explained how in all of these applications, these particular CIC parcels, while there is a consideration of adjacent uses, the consideration of non-conforming use is not germane to these parcels. The CIC already owns them and we are not talking about non-conforming use in this application. When we get to the following applications, the goal of proactive rezoning is aimed at preserving the broader community's ability to best achieve the long-term objectives it has. In this corridor, the objective is office or medium-density residential, and not allow the expansion of current uses that may negatively impact the broader community's interest in achieving redevelopment.

Mr. Robinson asked what is the rationale for the CIC to purchase the properties as opposed to even if we rezone it WBC-2, and then allow the market to respond and if it is attractive developers to let them come. He asked if one of the motivations is that it enables us to acquire property and not put them in a non-conforming position or are there other rationales. Mr. Greeson explained that redevelopment is challenging and sometimes cities need to intervene and help assemble properties to foster, control, and stimulate economic growth in particular areas where it has not occurred. Sometimes zoning by itself is not sufficient to cause that. There are countless examples of cities in Central Ohio that have bought land to achieve whatever their community's economic development goals are. CICs and other similar organizations are all vehicles for governments to help accomplish these types of community objectives.

Ms. Princehorn described how the plan as indicated by Mr. Greeson has been clearly stated for a decade or more and really gained steam in the past 5 years. The CIC views the next incremental step as the rezoning before Council this evening. The CIC is sympathetic to homeowners that may feel surprised by the zoning request, but the plans for this corridor were approved and made available for many years. She reminded Council that they unanimously funded the acquisition of these properties not long ago. This has been called different things, but she likes to think of it as a mixed-use corridor that is predominately office. When looking across the street to the north, that is what you see. On the southside, an excellent addition to the community would be the lower-scale office buildings as seen already in the community. A number of folks have commented on the need for this type of product and questions why we would not let the market decide. She responded to that by explaining how cities like Worthington that are landlocked, need to take extra steps to assemble parcels and

make a significant amount of acreage available for redevelopment. Rezoning is the next step in being able to approach the market at all. She has been on the CIC for a while now and one of the things they keep hearing is that we have office space that is not desirable in this pandemic era. We are trying to provide an opportunity for that office space to balance the competing interests in the community for services with the residents to the further south and east.

President Michael explained that the next part of this process is for public comment, with individuals limited to making comments of no longer than five minutes per ordinance.

Mr. Scott Green of 74 Glen Drive, shared that he is a member of the Worthington CIC and strongly endorses the recommendation for rezoning even though the MPC did not support the recommendation. This plan has been a strategic plan laid out by Council and the CIC for years and Worthington has limited abilities to generate new income taxes. This is space relatively low impact and is already used for offices in the corridor. He is concerned that denial of this request will have a long-term negative impact on the economic growth of our community and he wonders what type of message it will send if the CIC, which is an agent of the City, does not get this land rezoned.

Mr. Tom Barrett of 281 Halligan Avenue, stated that his family has resided here for 17 years and is soon to reside on 235 East Wilson Bridge Road. The rezoning as proposed will essentially wipe out millions of dollars of equity invested by families in their homes because it would make houses nonconforming and commercial development will have adverse impacts on neighbors. There is an opportunity here to build patio homes on the CIC properties to increase density at scale and retain the successful buffer homes have on the Wilson Bridge Road corridor. There are traffic safety and bike and pedestrian concerns with this rezoning as well. Traffic is already backing up and there is inadequate access on the street along with a dangerous line of sight that needs to be addressed before adding to this corridor. The proposed bikeway would be unsafe to families with the cars and trucks entering and leaving constantly. According to Loopnet, there is a surplus of Class B office space available at Cascade Two across the street on Wilson Bridge Road. High North will provide a large amount of new office space in the next couple of years. While the work from home trend increases, the state legislature wrote that Ohioans working from home will pay income taxes based on their office location. The Trillium property is also bringing 20,000 square feet of office space online in 2022. Commercial office demand has diminished since the rezoning was initiated and it is asked that Council support the MPC's vote to deny the rezoning and support the constituents desire that the corridor zoning be more inclusive to future and existing single-family uses.

Ms. Kristy Townsend of 7080 Westview Drive shared how she is speaking as a resident and homeowner of the Northhigh neighborhood and as a constituent and active voter. Her comments tonight reflect her opposition to all three applications for rezoning along the Wilson Bridge Road corridor. Two of these rezoning measures involved changes to existing residences and the MPC recommended denying based upon those

facts and the severe limitation places on homeowners if their homes are made a non-conforming use. Clearly, the City and CIC are going to continue to push to rezone these CIC properties to professional office space but she hopes that Council will also consider why the MPC recommended denial which includes maintaining flexible options for future use. The City should honor promises made when the Wilson Bridge Road plan was created and there has been little public input throughout this ten-year period which is likely why they have gained hundreds of names on petitions against this proposal. This is an issue of process, allowing developers to bring forward proposals for rezoning regardless of the proposed development type, which is directly against allowing residents due process to hear the specific development proposals and speak about them at that type. To preemptively rezone on the premises of a ten-year-old plan saying that office is the best use of this development, is premature and not founded on current data and is a sunk-cost fallacy. The Wilson Bridge Corridor plan was put together when the real estate market was expected to take a downward turn and office space seemed like a wise financial investment to bolster the City's tax base. Our community agrees the City needs to balance the needs for increasing residential space while also bolstering income tax. In 2021, the data shows office space needs are declining due to permanent shifts in people working remotely or from home and residential needs are increasing. She hopes that Council will revisit this written document, which they have done recently because there are numerous statements in the plan that support their stance. The plan states that it is intended to be flexible and fluid and updated and revised as appropriate. The plan also states that adjacent property owners should be included in the process and that urban village residential neighborhoods are a viable alternative to office development and given these trends in 2021, that seems like a viable option. They understand the City needs more Class A office space but that is not what this parcel would provide. Rejuvenating existing stock should be considered along with existing developments currently underway in the City.

Mr. John Gleason explained how he represents several homeowners in the area. He pointed out that Council should have received a letter that sets forth many of their arguments. What he sees in the staff memo is that it is acknowledged that the corridor study supports a mix of uses and livability in the area. The proposed zoning does not do either of those things. It limits use to professional office space and does not increase livability, causing the opposite. If office is added, without a traffic study, it could become very dangerous. The City has cited how the average age of office in the community is 47 years old, and there is not enough Class A office space. However, this rezoning does not remedy either of these things because there would not be Class A office space and does not get rid of the old product already here. He has heard that the offices already in the City are either obsolete or too expensive to remodel, and this rezoning does not change that fact. This rezoning gets rid of the homes of tax-paying residents, leaving those old offices there. At some point, something will need to be done with them, otherwise, they will continue to dilapidate. It was indicated that staff reviews based on the existing policy documents, but the

problem is that those documents are ten years old and things have changed. Also, it has been said that staff has been working with people, but if they are actually interested they can do what is normally done and file a rezoning application with a specific plan as opposed to just rezoning and figuring out what to do with it. We should let the regular development process work. He has heard the argument that the residents have been involved and known all about this, but the residents were told that the City would let the market dictate what would be done. There City is not allowing the market to dictate what is done. He asked if now is the time of COVID and with the shifts in how people work if this is the time to not be cautious and proactively rezone and knock out two major types of development.

Ms. Karin Demaree of 140 Northhigh Drive explained how she is adjacent to the properties in this current proposal and that she and her husband oppose this proposal along with the other two. She stated that they agree with all the opposing comments being made and want to make sure they are considered and recorded. They did not live at their property at the time of this plan and they were not notified. They bought their property at a Sheriff sale and did not have any notification. This would adversely affect the enjoyment of their property from noise, light, traffic, and potentially crime. Traffic has been specifically cited already and the area is already quite treacherous and there are many businesses already along these areas. A traffic study is needed. This proposal would adversely affect the property values of the entire community. She stated how before becoming a private practice attorney, she was general counsel for Nationwide, and worked on compliance issues with the Secretary of State's office. She reviewed the articles of incorporation from the Worthington CIC and she believes that as they were amended in 2009, the purpose statement is not in alignment with the purchase and proposed use of these properties as stated in the rezoning. As stated by Mr. Greeson, he talked about the long-term objectives of the City and the CIC vehicle to accomplish community objectives, these are not things that are within the definitions and purposes of the IRS code and any exemptions stated within that. She would like the City to consider that and these purchases were not made within the purposes of the CIC's articles of incorporation. She objects to all three of these proposals because the purchase was not in alignment with the law.

Mr. Christopher Hermann of 7035 Reiber Street explained how he was one of the authors working with the community on the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. He supports the rezoning of the CIC land for several reasons including that the proposal follows the guidance of thoughtful city-adopted plans. Secondly, the foundations and logic for the recommendations and logic for the plans have not changed. Third, the CIC was funded and empowered by the City to acquire this land, a task which many citizens and volunteers of the community followed through on faithfully as instructed by the City. Fourth, the CIC owns the ground, following the guidance of the Council and adopting plans in which the public participated. The request is following the future land use plan which serves as the guiding document for land use requests. This is the exact type of rezoning request that should be supported by the Council. Some have said that times have changed in the intervening decade since the plan was adopted.

Wilson Bridge Road is a major collector, connecting Worthington with areas outside of our City, and connects to 270 which is one of the region's most important transportation corridors. The City and MORPC are spending \$18 million on street improvements just up the street along this corridor for these reasons and the traffic levels that have occurred here and around us. Office uses are directly across the street and this is no longer a single-family rural-residential street and has outgrown that land use. Residents have discussed how traffic is not appropriate for these homes and are acknowledging that this street is not a residential street. This pushes us toward the conversation for office. Worthington is dependent on income taxes to provide for services, and in the past ten years, we have become more reliant on income taxes. Worthington has a lot of older office space already that is continuing to age, underscoring the need for newer office products. It is true that older offices need to be repurposed, but that does not change the need for more office space. This location is a desirable office available that is connected to our local transportation system and is walkable to the Worthington Community Center. Offices will still be in demand in our market, and conversations show that there will still be a strong demand for offices as we get better control of COVID. In this zoning process, there are buffers and other protections included to be sensitive to the adjacent parcels and will require a development plan to satisfy the MPC to receive approval.

Mr. Tom Burns of 1006 Kilbourne Drive expressed how he wanted to speak in favor of the rezoning and the CIC's plan. There was an earlier question about what took so long with the CIC, and he explained that the CIC exists to have a longer planning horizon. Individual homeowners may think only about what is best for them and their families and not necessarily what is best for the community at large. These entities are able to look at the greater community interest and that is what they do across the state. It should be noted that the CIC has accomplished something that many of the plans for the 1980s said would not be possible. He also heard some concerns about traffic and light pollution, there will be those issues but that is part of our process already that has worked successfully across the City. There will be more opportunities for residents to express their concerns and a traffic study should be done. He challenged Council about the notion of letting the market decide, and how the conversation would be different if we were talking about a specific business that has shown up with a plan to rezone. He thinks that the debate would not be significantly different and would be even more negative because there would be something to react to. He does not believe that some of these concerns are things that can necessarily be fixed due to residents living next to this property and that change is scary. When he looks at this, he is worried because the CIC is a public entity using public funds, and wants to rezone public property to achieve a public plan that was approved by the citizens of Worthington via the City Council. If we are in a position where any group of people can defeat the will of the City this easily, he would be concerned about how we could accomplish anything like the visions of Worthington that utilized the input of thousands. If it takes the slightest bit of pushback to defeat a plan that has been in place for decades, he does not see how we could accomplish

anything.

Mr. Larry Wendling of 7060 Rock Woods Place detailed how the actions taken tonight will have a long-term impact on the City and the neighborhood for many years. This piece of legislation is not supported by the neighborhood and they received 179 signatures from 125 households against the rezoning from both inside and outside of the immediate area. Citizens signed the petition because of the unknown and the end result and wanted to know why there was the need for more offices when so many offices are vacant across the City. The residents are also concerned about the impact of COVID and the future need for office due to the work from home trend becoming the new reality. There is also a question about whether this will actually produce or be a repeat of what happened when the last new professional development occurred on Proprietors Road when there was no real income tax gained. The next concern is about the traffic impact, a developer could develop approximately 48,000 square feet of office space, based on that there would be about 195 new cars for employees that would be added to Wilson Bridge Road. There is no design for a curb cut and people could start taking shortcuts through neighborhoods. This corridor is not being treated the same as the United Methodist property, where the City is allowing all the design issues to get ironed out before rezoning takes place, but here we are forcing the rezoning and saying to deal with it later.

Mr. Gary Rutledge of 195 Northhigh Drive explained how he was a member of the initial steering committee that looked at the redevelopment of the East Wilson Bridge Road corridor and has been involved with the process since 2010. The evolution of this has seen it go from a corridor that is vibrant with retail, office, and mixed-use housing. Time has changed and people's ownership has changed. The redevelopment was recommended not to be done piecemeal, the City has really allowed redevelopment to happen that way. Preventing us from getting a vibrant corridor as imagined. There was a memo sent out by the City to the neighborhood in 2016 that specifically said that the City is not rezoning the corridor, and if the property is redeveloped in the future each individual property owner should still be required to rezone their property to one of the proposed districts as part of any redevelopment project. If approved by Council, the new zoning district will become part of the City's zoning code. Creating the zoning districts and standards does not rezone the corridor and any future rezoning needs to be done by property owners and driven by developers. In September 2015, President Michael stopped by his house and they discussed the City issuing a development plan to developers for the six properties on East Wilson Bridge Road of which the City now owns four. There was an opportunity there that was missed for the City to have done something more comprehensive than what it is currently trying to do. As far as Granby Place, the residents never objected and thought it was a good piece of the corridor to be established along with other housing for a residential approach to the corridor. However, we have lost the opportunity to have a corridor feel here and because of that, residents feel that the residential aspect of this should be adhered to.

Lindsay Selinsky of 156 Northhigh Drive detailed how with a large number of signatures

in opposition to this rezoning, she urges the Council to consider that these are real families behind these signatures. Families that moved into a neighborhood community that is safe and their forever homes. Worthington sets itself apart with its beautiful historic charm and rejecting this proposal would show support for the families that have worked tirelessly and made their homes here. When they moved here six years ago, they saw children playing outside and in a beautiful community of neighbors. They love how close businesses are on High Street and the new development happening at the Worthington Gateway and Mall. They urge that the existing homes are here because that is what works and forcing a new commercial district feels awkward. If it was meant to be, other developers would have taken the opportunity if it made sense. Working from home has become the norm and it is important not to take our community's hard-earned tax dollars and waste them on unnecessary buildings. Driving down Wilson Bridge Road you see many signs that say "For Sale" or "For Lease" and there are many dated, unattractive buildings that need updating rather than just sitting there. It is important to focus attention on these existing offices and we do not want to see our community become overly crowded and overrun with traffic. She asked that Council not support projects that no one in the community wants.

Mr. Frederick Susor of 231 Highland Avenue stated that as a resident of Worthington Estates East for eight years, that he would like to support his friends and neighbors in opposition. He looks forward to a reasonable vote from the City Council.

Mr. Chris Costine of 7051 Rock Woods Place commented that in regard to people saying they are trying to slow down progress, he reminded that this is a ten-year-old study that is no longer relevant with COVID. He shared that where he lives, there are at least four houses where people are working remotely now and that is a permanent thing. Another question is what Council will do about the random, eyesore office space all around Worthington that is outdated and there has not been a good place for that outdated space, falling into greater disrepair. The neighborhood has talked about dividing the CIC properties for patio homes and getting immediate revenue from those homes in a market that is currently hot for real estate and does not have as much traffic problem as previously mentioned. There are tax abatements considered for new businesses, but why not do that for old properties like the Anthem building that takes up space in a prime location.

Mr. Craig Carmean of 7050 Rock Woods Place continued on the previous comment about why 179 residents signed this petition, it relates to the process. By rezoning, two of the development types are eliminated from the process. Residential is currently in high demand in Worthington. The need for end-of-life housing, single-story, and townhomes, are also eliminated from the process. To maximize the taxpayer's investment, the City should allow all development types to compete for the acreage. This process could not be any more different than what is going on at UMCH. Essentially, all of what we are seeing here is that we are taking away a lot of the taxpayer's rights here, people will be paying taxes to the City when working from home, and could be an incredible tax revenue that should be considered when looking

at this plan and changes the look of what we need for buildings along Wilson Bridge that is meant for office space specifically. Residents see that there is a demand for the income for the City from the growth there, they just want to avoid building structures that are an eyesore and decrease home values. Talking about the traffic along the corridor, if you've ever tried to leave the neighborhood, it is a dangerous turn, and any further growth there will be dangerous.

Ms. Rebecca Hermann explained that one of the things that came up was that we did not reinvest in our current infrastructure and she asked for Mr. McCorkle to address the Trivium investment in the Urology building where we gave some incentives. She would also like to hear how many of these signs say there are leases available and she recalled that there is turnover and we allow the signs to be up because we are at a significantly high amount of occupancy. Mr. McCorkle responded that the Trivium development at 350 West Wilson Bridge Road, we have reinvested back in that building which received funding from six or seven different buckets including Central Ohio CIC dollars for a demo, there was Tax Increment financing that supported interior renovations, and we also used something called Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) that allows building owners to add a tax to their own property tax bill and in return, they receive financing to invest into that property helping them save on their energy bills. The City has a program called the PACE Assistance Program where we encourage property owners to utilize that program by paying for the energy audit. The "For Lease" signs do not necessarily equate to vacancy. The majority of our buildings are multi-tenant, so if you see a sign that means that they have a space in that building. We allow our commercial brokers to have those signs because we do want to help them fill those buildings, but it may be for a space as small as 1,000 square feet for a 100,000 square foot building. Our vacancy on East Wilson Bridge Road and the comment that we have 80,000 square feet of vacant space at any one time may be accurate, but he pointed out that our current vacancy rate was that we had 70,000 square feet on East Wilson Bridge, but have over 700,000 square feet on East Wilson Bridge Road available, for a vacancy rate of 10%. Ms. Hermann asked about our vacancy rate for Worthington proper. Mr. McCorkle explained that the entire city is at 19%, but 10% of that is the Anthem building. He is hopeful that in the next few months we can reduce that number down to where it needs to be once Anthem is filled.

Ms. Princehorn expressed that this incremental approach toward the zoning application tonight, recall that City Council unanimously funded the purchase of these parcels and was not a flip decision on Council's behalf. That was part of this incremental approach to try to get a mixed-use corridor that was predominately office on Wilson Bridge Road. She responded to Ms. Demaree's comments that there are additional provisions to the article of incorporation of the CIC that indicate specifically that one of the objectives of the CIC was to revitalize property and the business of the City by advancing, encouraging, and promoting industrial, commercial, and civic development. It also cross-references the Ohio Revised Code with a long list of activities that a CIC can engage in, including to purchase or otherwise acquire, real

and personal property. That is within the scope of an organization of the CIC's type and does not affect their ability to function as a charitable organization under the Internal Revenue Code as is currently in effect. Their goal is to balance competing interests and they recognize that some homeowners have expressed concerns, but at the same time this is City-owned property and they are making a request to make it be rezoned.

Ms. Thress shared an email from a resident that reads,

"I'm speaking in opposition to the 3 rezoning proposals being considered. I have two points that I'd like to make tonight.

First I'd like to speak about the CIC owned properties. I believe that the Northhigh Acres community generally accepts that some type of development will happen on these properties. Our request is that the development be residential in use and that the City work with the community to find a mutually agreed upon plan for the development. The Northhigh Acres community feels like the City is dug in on this issue. Intent on pushing through these rezoning proposals, based on a 10 year old study that is significantly outdated. I believe a win-win solution is achievable if both parties work together on a compromise. We can increase density, we can increase tax revenue, and keep the Northhigh Acres neighborhood residential. At the same time we can help to meet the currently unmet and increasing demand for residential housing. I would much rather work with the city on solutions, then work against the city with petitions. Let's find a win-win solution.

Second, I'd like to speak about rezoning properties against the will of the homeowner. I understand that the City has the legal authority to do this and I'm sure there are situations that warrant using this authority. This is not one of those situations. Not even close. This type of rezoning and resulting non-conforming use will undeniably drive down the homeowner's property value. And the associated restrictions will deny the homeowner's full enjoyment of their property. I'm going to leave the commission with two questions tonight; first, would you pay fair market value for a property that had been rezoned in this fashion? Second, would you want your home to be rezoned in this fashion? I want those two questions to stick with you when you cast your votes tonight."

Mr. Sean Demaree pointed out that Ms. Princehorn is incorrect and is both citing articles that have been amended in 2009 and she is quoting the 2005 articles that are no longer in place.

Mr. Bucher asked for a point of clarity about the potential economic benefits and whether it was cited to be about \$300,000 per year on the upside. Mr. Greeson replied that it depends on the particular office type and users and some calculations based on their wages. It is believed that development at this site with the square footage that would be developed, could generate income taxes in the range of \$250,000 and \$400,000 per year. Mr. Bucher asked if the rezoning of the CIC lots were to be rejected, what would be the options at that point. Mr. Greeson responded that it would result in staff coming back to Council and asking what was meant by the vote and that decision. The option before the CIC would be to attempt to market the

site without it being rezoned and then if and when we found a developer, then go through the process described from some residents where the developer would seek the rezoning. He agreed with Ms. Princehorn that the logical next step is to rezone, the CIC is trying to get this site redevelopment ready and position it to attract quality users.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked about comments made at the MPC hearings that there were potential developers already interested in these properties and whether that was correct. Mr. McCorkle explained that is accurate and since our first acquisition in 2018, there were four real opportunities that have come forward.

Mr. Smith asked for clarity on the questions brought up about the CIC and their ability to engage in activities such as this. Mr. Lindsey explained how on the Secretary of State's website there are articles of incorporation first filed in 2005 and a subsequent amendment filed in 2009. The legal substance, however, he would need further review to comment, however, he does not believe that it would affect the CIC's ability to move forward on the zoning request.

Mr. Myers brought up how of the four properties the CIC owns, that four are currently vacant. Mr. Greeson said that was correct and the CIC rents one of the parcels out on a month-to-month basis.

Ms. Dorothy wondered about the need for office buildings in Worthington. She knows that the region is growing quickly and expects many more people to move here.

Worthington had its peak population in the 1970s, and now we have smaller household units and people are living alone. We are lucky to have the problem of being a growing region and she wondered if someone could speak to the need for office space and what the demand is. Mr. McCorkle explained how the vacancy rate along all of Wilson Bridge is about 11% and we have about 1.5 million square feet total on Wilson Bridge and 2 million as a City. A 10% vacancy rate is a pretty healthy and competitive rate for us. Our largest space on East Wilson Bridge Road is 6,200 square feet and that ties our hands-on retention and growth opportunities in Worthington. Recently, we have had several users that we have lost and left Worthington. We don't have the product for some of these businesses. We have a lot of smaller Class B and C spaces, and the average space on Wilson Bridge is 2,900 square feet. That is a healthy attorney or engineering office, but we do not have the product for our growing business and have as a result lost several businesses. This project would allow us to have spaces from 3,500 square feet to 40,000 square feet. It is possible this space would be Class A or Class B+ that would be very attractive to potential users. In respect to demand, he continues to hear the Worthington Gateway and High North sites referenced as office space coming online, but in respect to the High North project, that space is never going to be built and be empty. That project will not happen speculatively and the developers will not put shovels in the ground until leases are signed. The Trivium Project is already half leased out with Cleverly and Associates going in there. The demand is absolutely there. Ms. Dorothy expressed how she is not an advocate for our segregated use zoning, but we do need to do something to help out the rest of the region. We need to make sure we provide spaces

that we can grow into. It is unfortunate that much of our zoning is catered to cars and not human scale. We currently have many lots where when we did our zoning overlay in the 1970s, created non-conforming uses all over Worthington. She does believe this is where we need to go in this moment in time.

Mr. Robinson asked how many square feet is envisioned to be built at this location. Mr. McCorkle responded between 25,000 and 45,000. Mr. Robinson asked about the logic of us not having the product for certain businesses to grow in Worthington and how many square feet of office line the north side of East Wilson Bridge Road. Mr. McCorkle replied 700,000 square feet. Mr. Robinson clarified that if a business wants to grow, it cannot move into some of that space because it is already leased or not desirable for its needs. Mr. McCorkle explained that it is both of those things, but it is also that the largest available office space is 6,100 square feet on East Wilson Bridge Road. The average space in that section of the corridor is 3,100 square feet. When we have businesses that want to grow and are looking for between 7,500 square feet and 10,000 square feet, we simply do not have spaces for them and if we do, their options are significantly limited. Mr. Robinson posed that if this is developed and has 30-40,000 square feet, once it is filled, it is filled. It is not like it would be an ongoing available space, it would seem like it is a marginal addition to office space on East Wilson Bridge Road. Mr. McCorkle replied that 40,000 square feet of new space that is generating \$300-350,000 in income tax revenue to the City is certainly better than nothing and this is just one project and there will be additional opportunities to continue to add to that tax base. Mr. Robinson wanted to challenge the assumption that this would be a product for businesses to grow and develop, he would say this is a one-time opportunity for new businesses and would not be an ongoing resource for the City to be able to allow businesses to grow and move into. Mr. McCorkle explained how we have businesses that both grow and shrink, you may have a business that is 5,000 square feet now that would move into a larger space, and then five years from now, they may move into an even larger space. There are different needs for different businesses at different times, and this would fill the need for several businesses immediately and then as they grow, there are other places they can grow to continue to capture their growth, or we may need to look into an additional product that continues to capture them here. Mr. Robinson asked why we need to preemptively rezone and not allow these businesses to come before the City with their project and make a proposal. Mr. McCorkle explained how we are reactive, we are limiting our opportunities to what comes to us, rather than the City having control of the property. The vision of the CIC was to have these properties rezoned, issue an RFP with our own parameters for what we want to see as a City, and we would have the control to get the best project possible. If we are reactive, we are limiting ourselves to whatever is submitted to us and we are not controlling the process. Mr. Robinson asked if we could be explicit about what we are looking for without rezoning. Mr. McCorkle replied that this is one approach that could be taken to try to get a desirable outcome.

Ms. Thress commented that before a vote is considered, each of the three ordinances needs to be amended to the version that is in the packet.

MOTION: Ms. Dorothy moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson to amend Ordinance No. 36-2021 to reflect the materials that were submitted for the December 6th meeting

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

Mr. Smith commented as a representative of the CIC and explained how he has been involved in this process for many years now and has heard many different thoughts. What we are hearing tonight is an interesting take from multiple sides. He has thought about the best use for the property and years ago before the CIC purchased the properties, developers did try to come in and do a bigger piece of the pie with more properties on the corridor, but it did not work because there was not a good coordination effort. We reassessed realistically what could happen with those properties and have been pretty open with the residents that there was an open-door policy from the CIC expressing interest in purchasing properties, which has been a proactive step. Fortunately, in this case, several property owners took us up on that offer and we purchased those properties. Now we have contiguous land to do something with. If we have control of the process, we have control of the properties along with oversight of that, which will help us move forward with a project that makes sense for that area along with the neighbor's input. We could sell the properties to a developer, but we would end up with an aggressive developer coming in with a bad plan, which will be stuck in the conversation for ten years. We have thought this through from a CIC and staff level, talked with residents, and we are happy to continue to talk with residents, but he is in support of the CIC position.

Mr. Myers explained how Council unanimously voted to spend money to buy these properties and the reason that was given to spend the money was that we would be doing exactly what we are proposing to do now. To do otherwise, he would feel like his vote at the time was not genuine. He supports the zoning going forward.

Mr. Robinson weighed in, expressing this has been a challenging issue that is complex and he cannot claim to have the clarity of mind that he would like to have when casting a vote. He responded to the comment about previous unanimous votes, from his perspective when he supported the CIC acquisition of the properties, he admits that his understanding was general. He supports the idea of the City taking advantage of opportunities and pursuing economic development. His vote for the acquisition should not be understood as equating to supporting for proactively rezoning tonight. Additionally, the 2011 study is cited as a reason to justify what is being done, but he does not view that study as authoritative in itself, and the case needs to be made today for what is being proposed. The market analysis that informed the residential argument in the 2011 study was premised on the idea that Worthington's demographics are getting older and we are in a declining market and we need to attract younger people by way of constructing apartments. The real estate market has undermined that rationale that our housing stock is at risk of being devalued. He does not fault the writers of the study, but that is one reason why the study itself does not carry authority for him as a reason to do what we are doing tonight. Another reason why he hesitates to support this rezoning is what appears to be pretty overwhelming resident opposition in the proximity of the parcels. That is extremely

important to him and frankly, he would like more time to speak with the residents to better understand their objections. Gathering as my signatures as they have is a significant achievement. Most fundamentally, preemptive rezoning without a specific plan in hand is something he would only support under extreme circumstances. Going back to 2015, the basic premise of the Keep Worthington Beautiful Campaign which became Issue 38, is that the residents should have greater say in rezoning projects, and the only way that we can really see the reality of what is being proposed is when we see a specific project. While a development plan may be required, there are good reasons why residents would not see that as a safeguard to make sure their interests are protected. He cannot support a pre-emptive rezoning.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she has been on Council for the last ten years, and there have been discussions about pre-emptively rezoning or just creating the new zoning categories at that time. We ultimately moved forward with creating the categories and not rezoning the land. In hindsight, that was a mistake and there has been a lot of turnover with the properties and new homes being developed in an area we imagined having more significant developments. Historically, James Kilbourne wanted Worthington to be the capital of Ohio and wanted this region to grow and all boats to rise with it. Right now we have single-family homes in all of the regions that are becoming astronomically highly valued because there is a single home on a parcel of land when we have way more people who need places to live. We have priced out a lot of people from being able to live in the City of Worthington. Some people like to have the exclusivity of being able to use our zoning as a way to keep others out, but she would like to be more welcoming and raise all boats, providing more economic development and income taxes to provide more services. We can build things around humans, we do not need to build around cars which are scary and cause a lot of death and destruction. This is a move in the right direction and she was for this overlay when it happened and she supports rezoning it as being proposed now.

Mr. Bucher added his support for this ordinance and how this realizes the corridor plan, and this has been a priority in our retreats moving towards this consistently. This will ultimately allow us to keep control of the hypothetical development in contrast with other sites in the community, and he supports this ordinance.

Ms. Kowalczyk expressed her support for all of the reasons that have been stated. President Michael shared how she has been a part of this process from the get-go for 20 plus years and there has been a lot of discussions and public participation. She strongly believes whatever plan comes forward, there will be a development plan and lots of opportunities for citizen involvement on the actual project when there is one, there will be studies for traffic and water, and sewer, which are part of every development plan. This is going to be something that is going to help. We made a plan for the corridor and when people are talking about the patchwork redevelopment, she was one of the few people who thought we should have done more with a zoning overlay, but that was not what the Council wanted.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll of Ordinance No. 36-2021 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Vote Results: Ayes: 6 (Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Bucher, Kowalczyk, Michael) / Nays: 1 (Robinson)

21. Ordinance No. 34-2021 Rezoning 155, 163 and 173 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.

To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from R-10, Low Density Residential to WBC-2, Professional Office at 155, 163 & 173 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Parcel Numbers: 100-002474, 100-002475 & 100-002476).

Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Bucher moved, seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk to amend the ordinance to reflect the materials that were put out in the December 6, 2021 packet.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson overviewed how this application is to rezone 3.07 acres at 155, 163, and 173 East Wilson Bridge Road, which are the three parcels to the east of the CIC properties that were just voted upon. Like the previous application, this area has been addressed in the Comprehensive Plan and 2011 Wilson Bridge Road Plan. The current zoning is R-10 which is a low-density single-family. In a zoning context, there is C-3 to the north, R-10 to the south, and S-1 where McCord Park is along with City service facilities. The proposed rezoning is for WBC-2 which is for professional offices consistent with the CIC properties. He highlighted the parcels, showing the structures that are currently there including newer construction that has a rural-residential character, which is inconsistent with adopted City plans, not contributing to increased walk and bike-ability, or the economic vibrancy of the corridor beyond the single-family use. To the immediate east of the property, Granby Place has been built. Each of the properties is owner-occupied to the best of our knowledge and we respect the concerns that may be expressed by the owners. However, we are compelled to articulate the best planning strategies to achieve the community's long-term goals for creating a vibrant, competitive East Wilson Bridge Road. The goal of the application here is to help prevent new or expanded single-family homes from being constructed because in this unique area of Worthington, allowing further expansion of the current use impeded the likelihood of achieving the long-term use which in this location is a professional office.

There is a tension here between broader community interest and the individual property owner interest and the law allows a non-conforming use to be created to allow the non-conforming use to persist, but not be expanded significantly. A nonconforming use is the use of a property that was allowed at the time it was established and then a subsequent change in regulations no longer allowing the use to be permitted. Worthington's code allows the old non-conforming use to continue as long as there are no major changes to the non-conforming use. When the regulation changes, it signals that it is in the best interests of the community as a whole to have different uses of the property where the expansion of the old use is not allowed. The City's nonconforming use provision allows a period of transition, allowing property owners to maintain the old use include the size, scale, and quality that existed at the time of the regulation change, and allows for repair and maintenance to occur. However, the provisions do not allow for larger-scale investment, renovation, or

expansion unless specifically approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The City code limits the amount of work to be done on structures associated with nonconforming uses to no more than 10% of the current replacement cost of the structure in any 12 consecutive months and prohibits any cubic increase in the structure. Courts have approved the institution of this type of zoning provision, essentially allowing for the creation of nonconforming uses. The City's approach to nonconforming uses is pretty common in zoning practices, and the City has a number of nonconforming uses, and a number of them have eventually converted to the designated uses. Worthington's current land use mix that we enjoy today was created through this type of zoning action.

Our MPC recommended denial of the application. Staff continues to feel that there is a strong need for office as articulated previously and feels its duty is to review existing plans and believes they are as relevant today as when they were adopted. We have made many strides in this corridor to implement these plans over the years. There has been some discussion after new homes were built and how we prevent that from happening again, however it has now happened twice. The only real answer other than ownership in some instances is to zone them so they convert over time and preserve the likelihood that the area redevelops in the long term into something that better serves the interest of the larger residency. These proactive rezonings are aimed at preventing the limitation of future opportunities in good locations and preventing future leaders from being negatively impacted in their ability to foster economic vitality and redevelopment. The best way to do this is to rezone to the desired future land use.

Ms. Dorothy asked if someone wants to do something to their property and is nonconforming, what hurdles would they have to still be able to do improvements and what limitations would there be. Mr. Brown replied that there have been concerns about this, and the way the code is written, if someone wants to expand or make significant changes, they would have to go before the BZA for approval. With the East Wilson Bridge Corridor, we would use our existing policy documents as background, so when the BZA does review, they would look at what is being suggested along with recommended land-use policies going forward. The goal is balancing personal property right along with the overall policy goal along the corridor. There is a maintenance and repair section in the code, and the MPC cited concerns that there is a clause that repairs and maintenance could not exceed 10%. Other communities do not have that requirement or have higher percentages. That is one reason MPC gave for their recommendation for denial. Ms. Kowalczyk asked if we want to make a change as a form of mitigation for these property owners to do more, how would we do that. Mr. Brown replied that there could be a code change for staff to look at either increasing or eliminating the percentage, which would go to MPC for recommendation and then along to Council to have the final say in changing that section of the code. Mr. Greeson expressed that no matter what, Council may approve an additional motion that refers to the MPC a request to consider revision of the nonconforming use ordinance to increase or eliminate the amount of maintenance that is allowable. If the

rezoning request is passed and then the code is amended, the new nonconforming use section would be what we are administering.

Mr. Brown explained how the reasons MPC gave for denial of this application and the next one, one was the concerns of the maintenance and repair section of the code, the other was the possible sale and value of homes that are non-conforming use. Also mentioned was the possibility of changing to make the single-family residential a permitted use in the district and could co-exist together. Also cited were a mix of uses in the corridor.

Mr. Robinson asked if the MPC vote was unanimous. Mr. Brown replied that it was. Mr. Harold Karins of 173 East Wilson Bridge Road described how he is affected by this rezoning application. The MPC voted unanimously not to recommend this due to the restrictions, particularly if there is a near-catastrophic loss, they would not be able to rebuild their home. The staff mentioned coexisting R-10 within this corridor, but he recommends denial of this application at this time until there could be a solution that could alleviate any undue financial stress.

Mr. Larry Wendling of 7060 Rock Woods Place expressed that three property owners here have the ability to have full competition when they decided to sell their properties. They could sell to single-family residents or to a developer. Those three were the CIC-bought properties. Now the City wants to take action, stripping the other eleven property owners to have the same market conditions that the other three property owners had. You are limiting their options to sell to anyone other than a developer. Another striking thing is how this process is being treated so much differently than the UMCH property. Both have been in various stages of development and border residential neighborhoods, but that is where the similarities stop. For UMCH, the developer, City, and neighbors, have been given the chance to work together on addressing issues before rezoning is approved. The MPC and Mr. Coulter commented on how the best type of development is when all the factions are able to work together. If this rezoning is done, that means that the neighborhood is trumped out of any input and does not have the same leverage or rights. In this situation, the rezoning is already there and the developer knows that, and the single-family resident is restricted to selling only to a developer. You're also pigeonholing each property to a particular standard and not allowing the market to drive what is best to go there, instead of dictating based on a ten-year-old plan. The rezoning is moot because of Granby Place, where you allowed major variances to design standards, higher density, changes in setbacks, and trees to be cut down without the developers contributing financially.

Ms. Kristy Townsend of 7080 Westview Drive added that to residents who own these homes, it feels like taking due to the restrictions on being able to renovate a house, upgrade, or repair damage which is all severely limited. While that could be changed in the future, it does not exist today. As for property values, we have already had people in this area not be able to sell their homes and have been advised that people do not want to buy a house that is in a nonconforming use. So these people are stuck in homes that cannot be fixed up and you have blight in the neighborhood, which

does not fulfill the plan. Putting the homes in nonconforming use gets you no closer to fulfilling the corridor plan.

Mr. John Gleason expressed how the MPC denied the rezonings for quite a few reasons and thanked Mr. Brown for bringing that up. Based on the information provided by the City, a homeowner in this corridor could spend between \$5,860 and \$32,550 for repairs and maintenance in any twelve-month period. For some of these houses, you wouldn't be able to put a new roof on if needed. The fact is that you are basically prohibiting homeowners from maintaining or remaining in the City. He has a big problem with Council saying they will approve these applications tonight and then consider changes in the code in the future. The City already told residents once that they would not do this without letting the market decide. These citizens believe the City once, and he cannot believe that they will believe the City a second time based on their promise to make future code or zoning changes. The way the code is written, if someone wants to put a shed in their backyard, they arguably cannot do that because they are making an addition. These properties will now be nonconforming and will not be able to sell to another resident who wants to make Worthington their home, and can only sell to someone who wants to put in a professional office. There is a disagreement about the need for an office in the City, there is a lot of offices here already. There is a lot of space available already and flexibility to make space available. Someone could also be prohibited from being able to refinance as well because of the nonconforming use, further constraining residents. Future developers will only want to come in and want more variances. We shouldn't be rezoning first, and then figuring out what to do with it.

Mr. Tom Barrett of 381 Halligan Avenue detailed how they are moving to East Wilson Bridge Road with the goal of keeping their children in their current schools. They are looking for some flexibility in the zoning before this rezoning to allow it to be a little flexible for current residents. The corridor is mixed-use now with Granby Place apartments, industrial on one end, we have parkland and office across the street. Someone has to be the first house on the corner and on the edge of town. We are looking at the northern edge of a really nice neighborhood and are asking to use our tax money to be more creative in the properties around town that are already zoned commercial. We have planned offices at the Worthington Mall already. The demand is being met for multi-unit residential and new offices as it is. We want to retain R-10 zoning in the Northhigh neighborhood or as a conditional use under any future zoning.

Ms. Karin Demaree of 140 Northhigh Drive spoke about how these three applications are intertwined and this is their neighborhood. She voiced her opinion that she is disappointed about Council's first vote. They put a large number of assets into their house and the vote will significantly devalue their home in addition to devaluing their quiet enjoyment. With this proposal, she requests denial. The City is recognizing that the code needs to be looked at and possibly changed, and perhaps a better solution may be to consider a code change before revisiting rezonings of this nature. It is difficult to assure residents that a code change will occur if the rezoning comes first. She is concerned about whether we are letting things go vacant and what will happen

in the future with what might be along Wilson Bridge Road. It was promised that we would not rezone.

Mr. Jason Mann of 7021 Rock Woods Place, spoke in opposition to these applications and how he is disappointed in the yes vote for the first application. To make decisions based on a 2011 study seems really absurd. There was not any due diligence done in this current landscape to do data collection. It seems that the City staff is not bringing anything new to the table. With the nonconforming use, City staff will talk about the legality, but that does not mean it is ethical or just. To be able to force people out of their homes if they are nonconforming because they cannot repair their homes or sell to anyone other than a developer or the CIC. It seems like a way to devalue properties for the CIC to scoop up and sell to developers.

Mr. Craig Carmean of 7050 Rock Woods Place emphasized that his thoughts and opinions mirror Mr. Mann's comments and he is opposed to this rezoning.

President Michael explained that there are multiple ways to approach this vote tonight, either voting yes, voting no, or voting to table the legislation. If people feel it should be tabled for a period of time to amend the code relating to a nonconforming use, that may also be an option for Council to take.

Mr. Robinson asked if we could table and direct staff to rewrite or amend the WBC-1 code to allow for single-family residences as a conditional use. President Michael replied that is an option.

Ms. Dorothy mentioned all the properties that are currently nonconforming, such as the apartments and condos along with Selby, all of them have had significant improvements over the past ten years and probably over the 10% threshold. Mr. Brown responded that for example the duplex that was re-done on East Granville Road, with an addition to the rear, went before the BZA and ARB, with an expansion of the non-conforming use approved. Mr. Greenson added that while he appreciates the concern expressed by residents about the regulation of nonconforming use, there are not many nonconforming uses that we had vigorous enforcement or restriction using the code. While he cannot predict the future, in the past there has been a rather permissive administration of the code. Ms. Dorothy emphasized that all the apartments on Selby were built in the 1950s and then zoned R-10 in the 1970s, and have been ever since and they are still apartments and condos.

President Michael brought up a comment made earlier that the redevelopment should not be done as a piecemeal, patchwork quilt. Considering her history with this, we have looked on numerous occasions how to bring the plan forward with the business portion and multi-family along Wilson Bridge. Every time the nonconforming use conversation came up, we would say we do not want to do this to people, but how do we prevent new single-family homes from being built disrupting the corridor plan. The question is do we want to throw the plan out or have a method of revising the ordinance and move towards implementing the plan. If we do not do an overlay, we are in essence saying to let the plan go, which would be a Council choice.

Mr. Myers explained that if the main hold up here is the non-conforming use, that is a fairly fixable issue and is a code change. To his knowledge, we have never enforced

the 10% threshold. For the 12 years, he has been on City Council, every one of the twelve Council Retreats we have come out with Wilson Bridge Road commercial redevelopment near the top of the list. In 2011, we adopted the Corridor Study and in 2016 we adopted that study with the specific clauses as to exactly what we wanted to do. Since 2016 and the adoption of that plan, we have discussed the corridor at least 21 times at City Council meetings. It has been discussed exactly and explicitly with at least one of the property owners that are the subject of a potential rezoning. In that 12 years, we have invested millions in the Northeast Gateway, in 270/23, we have incentivized parts of Wilson Bridge Road, we have incentivized the mall and former Holiday Inn site, and spent over \$1 million on McCord Park, all in a way consistent with the implementation of the Wilson Bridge Corridor Study and all of this has been geared towards making that a commercial zone, as it should be and as it already feels like. It is ironic that we are hearing references to the UMCH debacle. An argument against the development of that property is that we should have rezoned it first so we knew exactly what was going to happen there and we should not develop it because we should be developing Wilson Bridge Road. Now we hear the same thing from Wilson Bridge Road that we should put it at the UMCH property instead. We tried it both ways and neither one seems to work. There may be some incentive to table this, but he would remind Council that this is why we are here tonight because we continue to kick the can down the road. This is not an easy decision, but this is why Councilmembers were elected, to make the difficult decisions. With the last application, that is our opportunity to put some multi-family homes in our inventory, it is something we desperately need, especially if they can be affordable. He is in favor of the rezoning of both of these and the adoption of the ordinances.

Ms. Kowalczyk agreed with Mr. Myers, while she is sympathetic to the property owners, but given the fact we have been so flexible with nonconforming uses, we have to make a decision on this. It has been discussed for over a decade and it is important to take that step forward. If we do not do it now, we may never take it. She asked that there be a consideration of an ordinance change, but she is not in support of tabling tonight, she supports proactively rezoning.

Mr. Smith stated that he is with the residents on this and it is troubling that we are promoting people breaking the laws by letting people disobey the code. We need to change the code. If we are going to allow something to happen, we need a code that gives the ability to allow that, not just look the other way. The last ordinance with the CIC is apples versus elephants compared to these other two proposals and he is not in favor of moving forward.

Mr. Bucher explained that it is important to move forward on the realization of this plan, but he would be open to considering ways to remedy some of the concerns that have been raised.

President Michael conveyed how she has been trying to push for a zoning overlay on Wilson Bridge Road for a number of years. She agrees that it is time and we can also very quickly ask staff to look at the revision of the nonconforming use maintenance and repair provisions.

Mr. Robinson explained he is not afraid of difficult decisions, he just does not want to make a bad decision. He believes for the reasons he spoke about earlier and the creating of nonconforming properties feels quite punitive and unnecessary particularly for the two new homes that have been built. They are not going anywhere and will be there for many decades. There is no positive upside for the City in making those new homes be nonconforming. For those reasons, he will stand with the residents and vote no.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll of Ordinance No. 34-2021 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Vote Results: Ayes: 5 (Myers, Bucher, Kowalczyk, Dorothy, Michael) / Nays: 2 (Smith, Robinson)

22. Ordinance No. 35-2021 Rezoning 199, 207, 217, 227, 235, 247 & 261 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.

To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from R-10, Low Density Residential to WBC-2, Professional Office at 199, 207, 217, 227, 235, 247 & 261 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Parcel Numbers: 100-002479, 100-002480, 100-002481, 100-002482, 100-002483, 100-002484 & 100-000977).

Minutes:

MOTION: Ms. Kowalczyk moved, seconded by Mr. Smith to amend the ordinance to reflect the copy of the ordinance in the packet for the December 6, 2021 meeting.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

Mr. Greeson overviewed the proposed Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Zoning and how this rezoning would be for the WBC-1 Medium Density Residential. It is currently zoned R-10 with single-family homes. Under the WBC-1 zoning, you can have multi-family dwellings, home occupations, public uses, essential services, and accessory uses would be permitted. There are similar restrictions in place with this zoning category, with height limitations and footage requirements. There is also a maximum number of dwelling units per acre of 14. The Corridor Study calls for medium density in this area, spelling out both the density recommendations as well as the thoughts that existed about the character, quality, and amenities of such residential investment. When we say medium density residential, it does not just mean owner-occupied condos or apartments, we find varying densities and ownership types and mixes thereof already in Worthington. The recommendation from City staff is for approval, however, the MPC recommended denial. He agreed with Mr. Robinson that some of the plan objectives from 2011 may have evolved. Now the housing conversation has evolved to include affordable, attainable, and inclusive housing which is an embedded part of our diversity and equity conversations.

Mr. Brown mentioned that the reasons the MPC gave before were maintaining property values, the nonconforming use question, and possible code changes, and the idea to add the single-family use as permissible or conditional. He added that many times we have heard reference to the medium density residential or multi-family, a lot of people have kept thinking apartments, but we have through the City many that are owner-occupied, so it is not just rentals. The MPC thoughts were overall consistent with the previous application.

Mr. Robinson asked how many of the homes are occupied right now. Mr. Brown replied that one is currently being constructed and the others are all occupied with a mix of owner-occupied and rentals.

Ms. Kristy Townsend expressed how this is really eye-opening tonight about how our City Council functions. She asked what is the purpose of the MPC if Council is not listening to their carefully weighed unanimous decision, and there is an option to table and come back with a thoughtful code change. It is baffling to her why our elected officials would not elect to take that route. She said that they will be telling their friends and neighbors and voting actively.

Mr. Larry Wendling shared how it is amazing that back when we went through the design standards and all of this stuff, there was a commitment to the neighborhood that the market would drive this, not the City. That is the farthest thing from what has happened tonight. Out of the seven properties, four have sold since 2017, and if there is a market for this type of development, a developer would have purchased one or two of those properties along the way, but they did not. Now the City is saying that their vision from 2016 is golden and the best thing ever, and no matter what the facts, they will ignore them and the neighborhood and do the right thing to table it or vote no and put the ordinances in place and allow that to happen. The neighborhood has heard this story in the past.

Mr. Tom Barrett emphasized how when they purchased their property, they were aware of the plans, specifically the 2011 one that referenced single-family homes off and on. They are open to mixed-use, which is smart, flexible development. They were not aware they would be restricted and lose their rights of ownership as far as making changes and upgrades, and being able to sell their property. They are open to having mixed-used residential near their home but they are not seeing flexibility on the public end to allow them to live here and be economically viable. When you take a walk down Wilson Bridge Road, they are patrons of these local businesses. People are not looking at the bigger picture that this is the edge of a neighborhood where families live. The examples of nonconforming uses shown tonight are not family homes. They are looking for the tabling of this and coming back with code change fixes and some R-10 zoning mixed in going forward. They should be a conditional use in any of these zoning categories.

Mr. Craig Carmean explained how this is more personal for them and affects the edge of their property line. They are frustrated and shocked that the voting went the way it did. They are trying to hold on to their rights here, which is not right. When Granby Place was put in, there were variances put in. Why would they trust when this is rezoned, they do not trust the City because if the price is right, Council would put a parking lot beside his house. They will be looking at the next steps here.

Mr. John Gleason brought up the comment that this would allow us to get multi-family along this road, but it is already there. That developer came to a homeowner, offered to buy their property, the developer came and went through the development process and they were approved for more than they should have been in his opinion. Council is negatively impacting these residents and the value of their homes because

residents will only be able to sell to a developer that wants to do multi-family, and will miss out on a hot market for single-family. He cannot let go of a comment made by Mr. Smith on the first vote that we need to pass this because otherwise, we do not have control of our property, but in all due respect, the CIC owned that property and had control of the property and did not need to do the rezoning to have control.

Ms. Karin Demaree conveyed how she has been here before and is a resident, and the impression from watching Council tonight is that their minds were already made up. Statements about how someone has waited years or this has been going on a long time, those statements prove the sunk cost fallacy. These are statements about your own personal interests, but you represent the residents. The majority of the people who have been here all evening to discuss this meeting are people who oppose these proposals and you are not listening. As far as affordable housing, Granby Place is \$1025 for 700 square feet, which is not affordable. She is quite disappointed in her City Council because she and her neighborhood does not feel heard. You talk about the community and the needs and wishes, but they pay taxes. Many of your statements have been of your mind is made up and this is the way it is going to be. She is saddened by the lack of care for community members. It was wrong of Mr. Lindsey to say he would not be able to make a legal recommendation, but then go ahead and make a legal recommendation anyways, but that will be addressed at a later time. People will hear about this.

Mr. Tyler Owens of 207 East Wilson Bridge Road echoed similar sentiments as the other speakers, and he lives in one of the properties affected by this. He is disappointed in the vote, but he would like to try to persuade Council to vote no on this. He has had his property appraised as both resident-owned and multi-family, and as a residential home, it is worth up to \$350,000 as multi-family that is only \$175-200,000. That is a huge difference in property values, and that means they cannot afford to move even if they wanted to because they could not get their investment back. This is strictly about what they can afford to do. The only difference between passing and voting no is that if you vote no, you're gonna have homeowners that want to invest in their properties and improve them. If you vote yes, the homes will continue in a dilapidated state because they cannot afford to do otherwise. There are also real concerns about the 10% threshold, constraining homeowners to be able to do repairs.

Ms. Dorothy emphasized how hearing these personal stories are hard to hear and understand, having this uncertainty which can fill someone with anxiety. It is not a good place to be in and is hard for everyone making these decisions. She does believe in general, as a region, we are growing and the single-family lots could house people. Going forward we have fewer people wanting large single-family homes. This is a huge change for everyone, but it is one that we need to make. Worthington needs to allow more people to be able to move into the neighborhood and be welcoming of all types of different people with different housing options. There are quite a number of properties that have been nonconforming for decades and have had significant renovations done to them and been bought and sold. Worthington tries to be as

welcoming as possible, but this is not a feel-good process even though it is the right process.

Mr. Smith expressed that property owners, whoever that may be, have certain rights for the property which is why in this proposal, he agrees with the resident and Mr. Gleason, and he is not in support of this proposal.

Mr. Robinson conveyed how the logic here is strange if not disturbing that we have seven inhabited households and this body is going to decide that them living in these homes is nonconforming, devaluing their homes. It is incredibly arrogant. He entered local politics when he and his neighbors felt disrespected and not listened to, and he felt the heavy hand of our local government which was disturbing and motivating. Through these actions tonight, we are creating many households in the area that will further distrust their local government. He is not happy about it and is voting no on this third ordinance.

Mr. Bucher reiterated that to realize the regional plans for the corridor, we have to take action. As soon as January, we need to address any changes that could alleviate concerns as soon as possible. He would appreciate some options for staff on how to go about that soon and not let it linger.

President Michael expressed she knows that this is not easy for the residents here to deal with, however, she is not sure when there has been a time where there has been retreat after retreat where all Councilmembers felt like this plan needed to be put forward. It has been more than one retreat where the redevelopment on the south side of East Wilson Bridge Road has been a priority of the Council. She agrees that staff needs to quickly look at options for changes to the repair and maintenance standards. She does not see how we achieve the plan without doing the overlay to avoid the development of more houses. We either need to choose to have the corridor plan put in place or let it develop in a piecemeal manner.

Mr. Gary Rutledge wanted to make the comment that there was a plan established and it had merit and Council failed to act on that when the time was appropriate to do so before people bought properties and built new houses. What we have now at best can be a hodgepodge of individual homes interspersed with multi-family housing and commercial. It is not the plan envisioned and it can never be the plan envisioned. It is inappropriate to try to keep referring to and trying to create something that no longer can be created.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll of Ordinance No. 35-2021 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Vote Results: Ayes: 5 (Myers, Bucher, Kowalczyk, Dorothy, Michael) / Nays: 2 (Robinson, Smith)

President Michael emphasized to staff how Council would like staff to work on the nonconforming use issue as quickly as possible. Mr. Greeson replied that he understood and felt that a referral to the MPC would be in order to set this in motion. Mr. Brown expressed that it is set up that City Council is to refer a code change to MPC for a discussion, in the past staff has worked on drafts that have then been brought to Council to be then referred to the MPC. Mr. Lindsey explained that absent

charter language, it is up to Council's prerogative to weigh provisions of its own code in terms of process. In general, there is value in having the MPC review prospective code because they have the most familiarity. He recommended against doing a referral tonight and to instead come back at the next meeting to do so. Mr. Myers conveyed that he would like the MPC to explore all options to decide what is the most efficient and in the best interest of the neighbors.

New Legislation to Be Introduced

23. Ordinance No. 60-2021 Appropriation for New and Replacement Equipment and Various Projects

Amending Ordinance No. 53-2021 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the 2022 New and Replacement Equipment Items and for Certain Projects as Identified in the 2022 Five-Year Capital Improvements Program and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Projects.

Minutes:

Introduced by Mr. Myers

24. Ordinance No. 61-2021 Amending Start Year for Community Reinvestment Agreement at 6700 N. High St.

An Ordinance Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Amended Community Reinvestment Area Agreement with Worthington 17, LLC, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, to Change the Starting Year of the Existing Abatement Period from Tax Year 2021 to Tax Year 2024.

Minutes:

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy

Both ordinance No. 60-2021 and 61-2021 are set for public hearing on December 13, 2021.

Reports of City Officials

25. Reports of City Officials

Minutes:

There were no reports from City Officials

Reports of Council Members

26. Reports of Council Members

Minutes:

There were no reports from Council Members

Other

Executive Session

Adjournment

27. Motion to Adjourn

Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Robinson moved, Mr. Bucher seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 12:28 a.m.

Contact: D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council (Kay.Thress@worthington.org (614) 436-3100) | Minutes published on 01/13/2022, adopted on 01/18/2022

 /s/ Ethan C. Barnhardt
Management Assistant

Attest

 /s/ David Robinson
President of Council