

Lifestyle Communities Development Application for the UMCH Site

Questions from City Council Members

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

City staff responses are in italics.

Construction Oversight

3. How will construction practices vs. design documents be verified throughout the project?
 - a. *City staff would continue to follow current practices in comparing what has been submitted for compliance. Regular inspections would be scheduled throughout the construction process.*
 - b. *Construction plans related to on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements would continue to be reviewed and monitored by the Service & Engineering Dept.*
4. How will independent construction oversight be funded throughout the project?
 - a. *This would be a fiscal cost to the City; however, we have in the past used consultants to assist various City departments throughout construction. This is something that would likely be needed on this site and would require additional funding to be allocated.*
5. What will happen if a discrepancy between design and construction is found?
 - a. *If the discrepancy is caught early enough, correction will be required by staff. It may require additional review by City departments and/or the City's consultants. If significant progress has been made before the discrepancy is identified, the issue may be presented to the Municipal Planning Commission/Architectural Review Board and/or City Council to determine whether approval of the revised work is acceptable.*

Impact on Schools, City Services & Neighborhoods

18. What is the estimated impact of this development, as proposed, on the city budget, including estimated tax revenues and cost-to-serve expenses?
 - a. *Given the sensitivity of this site and the heightened level of scrutiny it receives, staff suggests a consultant is needed to adequately answer this question. Such consultant would have experience in conducting sophisticated analyses of this type and would be able to provide the best answer to this question.*
24. What will be the impact to the city budget if this proposal were to pass? Needs to be reviewed and discussed.
 - a. *As noted above staff recommends the City hire a consultant that has experience in reviewing these types of questions if an answer is desired.*
27. How does the proposed development conform or relate to the criteria of existing zoning (S-1, C-2 and C-3)? Yes, I know that LC is seeking a PUD rezoning, but as a starting reference

point, how does their plan compare in terms of uses, densities, setbacks, heights, etc.? Relatedly, what is the zoning of surrounding properties (in terms of uses, densities, setbacks, heights, etc.)?

a. Please see chart below for detailed information related to current zoning:

Zoning	Minimum Lot Width	Minimum Lot Area	Front Setback	Rear Setback	Side Setback	Max Height of Building Stories	Max Height
S-1	250-feet	3-acres	60-feet	60-feet	50-feet	4-stories	45-feet
C-2	150-feet	1-acre	50-feet	30-feet	20-feet	3-stories	45-feet
C-3	100-feet	20,000 sq. ft.	50-feet	30-feet	15-feet	3-stories	45-feet
R-10	80-feet	10,400 sq. ft./4.2 DU/acre	30-feet	30-feet	8-feet	2 ½-stories	30-feet
Section 1149.07 – 100’ front setback along this area of High Street							

- b. *The S-1 portion of the site would not permit residential uses; however, it does permit a building of 4-stories in height that could be located 50-60 feet from the front and side property lines in this portion of the site. This district permits 20% of the lot to be covered by building, this does not include other impervious areas. Parking lots could also be located within 12.5-feet of the side and rear property lines with solid screening.*
- c. *The C-2 portion of the site would permit residential uses as a Conditional Use in that district at 3-stories and does not have a residential density associated with that district, however the C-2 is very small in size and is the only portion that would permit retail uses on the site. This district permits 25% of the lot to be covered by structure, this does not include other impervious areas.*
- d. *The C-3 portion of the site would permit office and institutional development at 3-stories in height; however, it would not permit residential uses and retail along the High St. frontage. This district permits 35% of the lot to be covered by structure, this does not include other impervious areas. This area currently requires a setback of 100-feet along the High St. frontage.*
- e. *The R-10 portion of the site appears to fall in the area that has been identified as the open space area along Larrimer Ave. and Longfellow. This district does not have a structure/building coverage requirement for single-family homes. Access to Larrimer Ave. would not be permitted since the two parcels with the Larrimer frontage are zoned for residential uses.*
- f. *The only portion of the proposed project that would be able to be constructed under current zoning would be the office and some limited retail in the area that is currently zoned C-2 and C-3 along High St. The S-1 district would also permit the construction of park space. The other proposed uses would not be permitted under existing zoning.*

Planning & Architectural Review

35. Speaking of the Architectural District, in order for the LC project to proceed a Certificate of Appropriateness would need to be approved by the Architectural Review Board. The Board is to decide whether to issue the certificate by determining whether the proposal “promotes, preserves and enhances the distinctive historical village character of the community and would not be at variance with existing structures within that portion of the district in which the structure is or is proposed to be located as to be detrimental to the interests of the Districts as set forth in Section 1177.01” (1177.05 [a]). How could a high-density, modern, apartment-heavy project conform to these standards? Asked differently, what criteria would you use to assess whether to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness?

- a. *The [Worthington Design Guidelines](#) address new commercial/institutional sites for areas outside of Old Worthington and contain criteria to be considered. These are summarized below. The full text regarding these items is available in the Guidelines.*
 - i. *Commercial/Institutional Guidelines are discussed starting on page #25 of the Commercial/Institutional section of the Worthington Design Guidelines.*
 - ii. *New Development Sites*
 1. *Planning for the development of a new site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape.*
 2. *Connecting new development with what has come before is an important consideration.*
 3. *New development should build upon and extend the pedestrian scale and walkability of the city’s commercial heart. Efforts to establish this connection can include multiple pathways to existing streets, following traditional grid street patterns in commercial developments, and extending amenities such as sidewalks, lawns and shade trees into new developments.*
 4. *Scale, Form & Massing*
 - a. *Scale – references a difference between Old Worthington & areas outside of Old Worthington. Setbacks, materials and forms tend to be consistent with historic patterns of development and continue traditional patterns into a new development along High St.*
 - b. *Form & Massing – are different in Old Worthington & areas outside of Old Worthington and are discussed in greater detail in the Design Guidelines.*
 5. *The Worthington Design Guidelines offer a variety of recommendations related to setbacks, roof shape, materials, windows, entries ornamentation, color and signage.*

- b. The Comprehensive Plan Update and 2005 Strategic Plan – UMCH Focus Area adopted in 2014 also references additional commercial and residential guidelines building upon the Worthington Design Guidelines. The Plan also makes additional recommendations related to the High Street Frontage concerning height, setbacks, parking, activating street fronts and landscaping features to just name a few.*
36. How will the MPC take into account, when assessing the current proposal (\approx 730 units), the fact that City Council issued a statement in 2015, regarding a less dense LC proposal (\approx 570 units), that Council “has never supported nor does it support the plan presented by UMCH and the developer [LC].” If Council at that time rejected less dense, why and how would you now consider more dense?
- a. Board & Commission members are aware of the history of this site and consider all letters, emails and other information provided to them as part of their discussion.*
- b. The letter dated [July 15, 2020](#) was previously distributed to the Board & Commission members. A copy will be provided again as part of the packet materials distributed to the Board and Commission members.*
- c. Board & Commission members are required to articulate their vote and reference to the relationship their decision or recommendation has to the overall comprehensive planning goals of the City, which are found in the Master Plan, the zoning map, a course of zoning or subdivision practices by the City, or any other acknowledged comprehensive strategy or goals previously established at the time of the decision or recommendation as referenced in [Section 6.03](#) of the Worthington City Charter.*
37. Does the MPC take into account, and give any relevance to, the public surveys conducted by WARD, and the 1,000+ petitions gathered by PCPW? Or are these public expressions regarding uses and outcomes at UMCH considered outside your purview?
- a. The Board & Commission listen and evaluate all testimony provided as part of the overall record.*
38. In 2015, after the last proposal from LC, Council stated it did not support that amount of density (\sim 570 units). Now that this proposal has been submitted with even more units proposed for the same location how will MPC and staff take that into consideration during deliberations?
- a. City staff, Board & Commission members all received the July 15, 2015 letter and all the other letters and emails received from the community. The proposal will be reviewed based on adopted policy documents, while considering the additional information that has been provided.*
- b. There is now less acreage and less High St. frontage available and the current unit count is much higher than previously discussed. There was never a formal application for the City to review or make comment on at the time.*

QUESTIONS FOR LC, THEN STAFF/CONSULTANTS

City staff is waiting for a response from the applicant for the questions below.

Connection to Overall City/Community Goals

1. How will the project contribute to the city's goals of sustainability and connectivity?
LC then staff

Energy Provision & Use

11. What is a typical energy performance of an office/commercial building built in the 1970s or 1980s (EUI)? What is your source for this information?

Impact on Schools, City Services & Neighborhoods

14. What has been the impact of similar projects upon the school districts in terms of students added and tax dollars generated? Please note any specific projects used to consider the impact. (Note: Involve Schools in review)
15. What are the estimated number of school aged children who will live in this new housing vs the overall anticipated property tax generated for the school district? Children/school tax revenue of site. (Note: Involve Schools in review)
16. What has been the impact of similar projects on local resources such as fire, EMS and police and tax dollars generated for those entities? Please note any specific projects used to consider the impact.
17. What has been the impact of similar projects on the real estate value of neighboring properties? Please note any specific projects used to consider the impact.
19. How would traffic throughout the city, but particularly on Evening Street, be impacted? What assumptions are being made in terms of vehicle count, etc.? What is an acceptable level of degradation, if any? Details please.
20. How many school-age children are estimated to live in the development? Based on what assumptions? And, if claiming that existing residents will inhabit the new units, then what are the secondary impacts? Which schools would the children attend in this new development? How would this likely impact redistricting? (Note: Involve Schools in review)
21. The UMCH property is in the Architectural District. Our City Code (1177.01) states that a primary purpose of the District is "... to promote the stability of property values and to protect real estate from impairment or destruction of value for the general community welfare..." How would a high-density development impact property values, both adjacent and throughout the city? I realize that studies exist that tout the benefits of high-density mixed-use developments on nearby property values, but as far as I know these are based on revitalization projects in distressed areas, and thus not applicable. Are there any comparable contexts we can cite? Also, let's speak with residential real estate agents, etc., and get their assessments.
22. What will be the traffic impacts in the city under the current proposal?
23. What impacts will the current proposal cause to the school district with more families potentially moving into this area? (Note: Involve Schools in review)

Land Use

26. What percentage of commercial vs retail space is being proposed? **Staff:** Does this match the guidelines outlined in the comprehensive plan?

Multi-Modal Transportation & Traffic

28. Will there be incentives for people to travel by public transportation? **Staff:** Can we incentivize car-free living? Trade parking space requirements for bus pass and or covered/indoor bike parking? <https://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/business/biz-columns-blogs/development/article246561293.html>
33. How will multimodal travel be incentivized throughout the development?

Preservation of Trees, Greenspace & Public Areas

44. Loss of trees. Let's see a concise listing (not just the map) of type and size. **Staff:** There is a veritable arboretum on the property, particularly on the south end, that ought to be accounted for. What would be the total fee for developer were their identified trees cut down? Would MPC even consider waiving the fee, or can it be stated upfront that the fee would be collected in full?

Sound Transmission

45. Will the sound transmission loss between living spaces be better than current minimum design requirements? What will be the design STC value and how will this be verified during construction? <https://www.ecohome.net/guides/2278/understanding-sound-transmission-in-buildings/>

Storm Drainage – Water Quality & Quantity

46. How will the site storm water be designed to stay on the property? What 'green' principals are employed for achieving this storm water plan?
47. What is the projected impact on water runoff, in terms of both volume and quality? Effects for both traditional, annual precipitation patterns, as well as extreme events (e.g., 100 year)? How are the calculations being made?
48. What water quality impacts will occur for Tucker Creek during construction and after completion of the current proposal?