



Back

Search

Community Voice > Visioning UMCH > Scenario 5

Title Scenario 5

Feature

Description What do you like most about this scenario? What do you see that is missing? Additional thoughts?

Cancel

Tags Visioning UMCH

Votes

0 | 13

Idea Details

LAST MODIFIED by Worthington Ohio on 1/28/2014

ADDED by Worthington Ohio on 12/20/2013

ACTIVITY 13 votes 34 comments 105 views

Discussion



dgt107 2 points

All of these profiles have too much residential and mixed use space. There should be more green space and possibly park space. A venue for concerts and community use (shelter houses for example) should be available. We won't be able to utilize more office or retail space until we fill the areas still vacant (wilson br., high st, etc.)

Dec 23, 2013 2:26 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply

Flag as Inappropriate



Peter Macrae 10 points

This one is very prosaic...unimaginative 3) Additional thoughts...why show any large areas of surface parking...the site should required structured parking under the building and reserve the surface for streets with street parking, bicycle & pedestrian pathways and green space.

Dec 23, 2013 4:36 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



MATTHEW E BAKER 10 points

Not sure that so much office space makes sense. The parking garages would not be very attractive, would be better underground. Overall, I would prefer something less dense than scenario 1 with more green space and bike/pedestrian friendly pathways.

Dec 24, 2013 12:23 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



TSmith 25 points

I like the park area, but it is surrounded only by residential and office. So it's basically an office park with apartments overlooking it. Not that interesting. Also, the drive avoids the park somewhat, making it not visible from High Street. The park should be the heart and soul of the property, with visibility from High Street. I want families to want to walk there, have an ice cream cone, drink a soda, read a book, walk around some retail shops, etc. It's gotta be well rounded with some retail - preferably restaurants mostly.

Dec 24, 2013 1:57 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



Steve P 12 points

Much more office space here, with less residential. This scenario appears different from the other four in that regard. More office space would definitely mean more money for the city budget. The large parking lots have even less buffering from existing residential areas. Virtually no retail space for community amenities provides for little to no engagement that will draw in existing residents. I am extremely concerned that our Tucker Creek area is left completely blank. Does this mean that this scenario for the city plan would allow for eliminating this natural space to build more commercial? What a loss! In the WARD survey, residents were very clear that they were hoping that development would provide usable, active park space for the entire city. With hard divisions between residential and office, with no amenities such as a coffee shop or an ice cream place, there would be very little reason to engage in that small square green space afforded in this plan. No vertical multi-use?

Dec 24, 2013 7:37 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



Worthington Ohio 29 points

Sorry for the shading issue on Scenario #5, Tucker Creek and approximately 7-acres is intended to be preserved as part of this scenario.

Dec 24, 2013 8:07 AM | Flag as Inappropriate



Steve P 12 points

Thanks so much for providing clarity about this, and for your speed in providing it! :)

**CBFindlay** 10 points<http://www.mprnews.org/story/npr/251713829?from=social>

Dec 26, 2013 8:43 AM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Bill Whitlatch** 21 points

540,000 sq. ft of office will generate at least 2000 vehicles entering or leaving the area at peak hours of operation. How will all these additional cars fit on High Street and how will the residents of Worthington get around with all those additional cars on the road. Are we planning to widen High Street to three lanes in each direction?

While the office traffic is kept out of the residential area, the residential area would fail in the market place because of the dominance of the office buildings and the lack of spacial separation.

Dec 26, 2013 6:10 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**FH** 4 points

Lower density residential is likely a positive. Good point made with the anticipated increase in traffic flow into the area, but this is likely true for any of the scenarios presented. That major change will take some planning, and living just off of Worthington-Galena Road, will probably create a difficult traffic situation for many residents. Hopefully the access will be better than it is for the Worthington Square shopping area, where access appears to have been an afterthought, and is very poor.

Dec 27, 2013 10:49 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**FH** 4 points

In reviewing this scenario again, 500,000-plus square feet of office space is very significant. Hard to believe the site can support that much space, including the traffic load on High Street. This is in great contrast to the other scenarios, where the office space shown was less than 50% of this number.

Dec 27, 2013 10:58 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Ty Wait** 10 points

This scenario is an odd mix of pros and cons:

Pros:

- Housing density is so low that roads into Longfellow and Evening St. are not likely to cause high congestion
- High office space SF.
- Plentiful green space.

Cons:

- Tucker Creek Reserve is in comments, but barely implied in drawing. I'm trusting it is retained as in other scenarios.
- No bike/walking trail around south and western sides of development.
- Retail is small and tucked well away from High St.
- Housing density is so low that it will not provide much support for retail.
- Large parking lots, which appear to be surface lots and not multi-level garages

Expand to 15-20K SF the retail space utilizing first floor of office buildings along High St.

Reduce parking garage footprints by using multi-level.

Re-shape southern office building footprints. Rearrange with smaller parking garage footprint to provide expanded greenspace in southwest corner.

Add walk/bike path next to "main artery" from Evening St. to Longfellow.

Dec 29, 2013 6:39 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Beth Jewell** 19 points

All 5 scenarios have surprisingly little green space or community garden space. Given WARD's survey earlier this year, which indicated a strong preference for green space, I am hopeful that revisions will be prepared. I do not think it a good idea to add townhomes or apartments here. I may be wrong, but I do not believe sufficient demand exists for such housing types in Worthington. Plus, new apts are planned near the mall. Additionally, it is my understanding that the nearby elementary schools are at capacity. Has the school district been consulted about the proposed addition of more homes?

I suggest more green space for community recreation and enjoyment, along with a community garden where local foods can be grown. Given the crowds at the farmer's market, it is safe to assume this community supports local. Limiting green space to between 2 and 3.5 acres is a mistake, I believe, and counter to the desires of the community. Thank you for the opportunity to post.

Dec 29, 2013 10:08 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Andy Minard** 25 points

I like this scenario more than the other ones but I still don't like it. I would prefer more retail space, scale back the office space somewhat, significantly reduce the zero-lot density and increase the single family homes. I think the City needs a better understanding of what residents are looking for. From the comments so far, it seems that no one really likes the scenarios.

Jan 2, 2014 10:41 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Joe Decker** 4 points



When the parking lots are clicked on, a two story structure is shown. How accurate is that? Seeing movement away from open asphalt is tremendous.

Jan 5, 2014 8:39 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

0

Worthington [Help](#)

This site is powered by [CivicPlus](#) Rev: 4.0.33423 | For assistance, please [visit our support site](#) | Learn more about the [CivicPlus Service](#)



Worthington Ohio 29 points

It is accurate. Parking decks are proposed in all of the scenarios.

Jan 6, 2014 11:43 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)



JAS 16 points

Unlike many others, I don't mind this option. From a tax perspective, having professional oriented office coupled with mid to high end, lower density housing would present an attractive mix. This is not my favorite, but an acceptable concept. However, the concept does not promote a community gathering character - mainly work and housing. I prefer mixed use where the entire community can rally around and enjoy the development.

Jan 9, 2014 2:31 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Sarah Johnston 39 points

This might be the worst of the five. There is way too much ugly, lumpish office space that has no character. Little or nothing to bring the community together--little green space, few retail or restaurant sites where people might gather. I agree with Andy Minard's comment, above, that these scenarios don't really respond to what the community was trying to tell you we want. And let me say one more time: GROCERY STORE, such as a Weilands or a small local chain such as Fresh Market. Please, grocery store!

Jan 10, 2014 8:54 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Joe Sherman 10 points

In all scenarios we need to realize and respect the traffic impact for existing residents on Larrimer, Longfellow and Evening. To that end, ingress/egress via High Street only is a must have. Least acceptable in my opinion due to the Office Space focus. Not what Worthington needs or should be promoting. As stated in my comments in Option 1, Tucker Creek Reserve in-conjunction with enhanced Green Space needs to be 'active' and serve as a destination park space. Not in favor of additional office space, but rather a focus on a limited retail, walkable block of restaurants to include a Trader Joe's/small grocery. This 'Main Street' would be on the East facing High Street to include underground parking concept tied in with single family homes for the 40 and under demographic along with condos/townhomes but no apartments.

Jan 15, 2014 1:02 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



KeySterling 12 points

I understand there needs to be a residential component to the development. The business component doesn't need to be visible if there are destination type retail establishments. The flow from high should be a loop road.

Traffic in all of the scenarios are going to impact the neighborhoods to the west and east. Why not create another greenbrier from evening to Longfellow. Buffer with green space parks flowing east with business and second floor apartments facing high street.

Again, all of the green space is not a destination. Someone above mentioned an amphitheater. This would be great. It could be the head of the parade down high street. This could be where all of the free concerts are held.

The village green space could be developed as true mixed use with a corner park. I'm sure this is sacrilege. There is more interest in these two crossroads with people traveling by everyday. It would fortify the business in old Worthington. I don't have enough space to continue.

Jan 18, 2014 9:45 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



MMR456 21 points

JAS above makes a good point about this design: professional oriented office space, coupled with mid to high end, lower density housing is a good thing. But that begs the question: who exactly would be occupying this space? Is this a "build it and they will come" kind of vision?

Jan 19, 2014 11:23 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



JULIE LOVEGROVE 7 points

I agree with most comments here, I like the lower number of rental homes, but will we really be able to fill this much office space? And again, the parking garages are going to be an eyesore, particularly bc they will be better seen from High Street than the park space, to residents who are used to seeing a lot of green space and beautiful trees on this property. I think overall residents want a walk-able, bikeable, mixed use space of retail/restaurants on the first floor that is family friendly, below office space/small amount of rental units, with single family homes at the rear of the property near Tucker Creek.

Jan 19, 2014 4:09 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Mike 15 points

Too much office space and not enough green area. Although there is a argument for the commercial revenue base this plan would be short sided as we see numerous commercial offices empty on Wilson Bridge as they are no unique and there are many other newer development options. More green space, although not immediately revenue generating, create a more unique experience, thus demand and then more long term viability. As the developments age, owners with a unique offering can continue to invest in upkeep due to demand, thus tax bases are still relatively strong in the long term. As far as retail, I live behind the proposed area and I have more gas stations, restaurants, etc. within 2 miles than I did when I lived down town. The reason I moved to Worthington is for the schools and the unique downtown feel so commercializing the area will not aid in the feel that makes Worthington desirable.

**smagill15** 31 points

Since the Worthington area is already having trouble filling office spaces on both the east and west sides of Wilson Bridge, this seems the worst plan. Now, taking High Street instead of 315-S to get to work each day is a time-saver; the increased congestion at High Street/Worthington-Galena would make this area a gridlock at 8 am and 5 pm each day. Worthington still inhibits some of that small-town charm, but adding these office buildings would ruin that. Also, would be a shame if the offices ended up empty.

Jan 22, 2014 12:18 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Ward Planning** 10 points

The Planning Group of the Worthington Alliance for Responsible Development appreciates the efforts made by the City staff and their consultant to provide development scenarios for the United Methodist Children's Home property. After careful review and discussion, however, WARD finds serious flaws in each of the five scenarios, to the point where we feel that we cannot support any of them at this time. The designs do not address the results of WARD's survey of 758 residents, nor do they reflect some of the significant concerns raised by WARD in numerous meetings with City staff and the consultant. WARD will release its official response by Mon., Feb. 3, on our website. <http://www.wardworthington.org>

Jan 23, 2014 6:51 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**smagill15** 31 points

Just another observance- drove down High Street and almost every office building has a "space for lease" sign. What is the justification of ANY more office space on High Street? I previously thought there were only empty spaces on Wilson Bridge Rd. but after driving on High, I can't see the need for more offices. We don't need more empty space in Worthington.

Jan 24, 2014 3:35 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Jim Rush** 31 points

I am definitely disappointed with the proposed traffic flow. The traffic from the residences will be onto Hayhurst and Evening Streets disrupting the existing neighborhoods. The increase of vehicular traffic onto Larrimer Avenue will increase the rush hour congestion that currently exists.

A single access point onto High Street (Similar to Josephium) at Worthington Galena where a traffic light is already in existence or the center of the development would protect the existing neighborhoods from cross traffic, increased flow and short cutting. Evening Street and Larrimer were not designed to have the numbers of cars, trucks and buses that would be reflected in the additional residential and office units.

As the home owner on the corner of Larrimer and Hayhurst, I have been unable to exit my driveway during rush hours and school let out. Facing increased traffic and a parking garage or office building looking into my living room is not appealing.

Jan 25, 2014 4:14 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Kathleen Hall** 2 points

I chose this option because it contains the most green space. I DO NOT LIKE the 49 small homes clustered together in this option. This density could cause future problems. The office buildings on High Street are ridiculous. We already have ENOUGH empty office space--why build potential "white elephants". Worthington has never received tax dollars from the UMCH, and we are fine. Why is there such a push for high density building to receive a high volume of tax dollars now?

Jan 25, 2014 11:15 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**bcm** 25 points

To me all of the scenarios are too dense with either residential, office, or parking garages. I don't believe we need to pack the property with so many buildings. Do we really need more offices? Why not update the empty offices that already exist and get new revenue from Class A offices in locations other than UMCH instead of building more? We need quality residential for seniors who want to sell their homes but stay in Worthington. As a senior, I don't want to be packed into a townhouse, sharing walls, and having stairs. I'd rather have a one story with patio overlooking open green space. There should plenty of open green space on UMCH with a destination item, such as splash park, for all to enjoy. All 5 scenarios lead to more traffic on our residential streets which already have plenty of traffic. There should be only one road into the UMCH property and that should be off High Street. The character/heritage of Worthington will be affected by whatever is built. These downgrade WOR.

Jan 26, 2014 1:30 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Dorothy David** 28 points

Wa-a-a-a-y too dense commercial development. Traffic nightmare. No breathing room. No appropriate space/units for seniors; the retail space (?) is so hidden; it would only serve the tenants and minimal outside retail customers. Two plusses: 1) the great entrance; 2) more financial benefits to the City of Worthington (fewer demands on services; better tax base). My last choice.

Jan 26, 2014 6:50 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Pamela Fair** 10 points

Who is going to lease all this office space? And, what is the effect of its construction on the existing glut of vacant office space that needs to be remodeled to attract new tenants looking for Class A office space? Shouldn't the City be leading the charge to reuse what we already have in office space as we seek to more "green"? The dominant features on this plan are behemoth parking decks, including a 4 story one that backs to Tucker Creek. Surely there is a better use for such space offering pretty views?!

Jan 27, 2014 9:39 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)



My Favorites

Pages

Modules

0



Worthington

Help



Anne Fouss 20 points

Least appealing look - is not engaging

Jan 27, 2014 5:29 PM



[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Chris Highley 2 points

I don't like any of the 5. Please plant trees and let's have parkland, community garden, and arboretum. We don't need any more apartments, now that the new ones are being built at the Mall. I don't want congestion on High St around Old Worthington like the traffic we've had for years north of the 270. But that's what will happen if these houses and apartments are built. Why risk changing Worthington from a relatively quiet, stress-free community?

Jan 27, 2014 8:28 PM



[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Anne Fouss 20 points

Thinking of this concept more - I agree with a lot of what JAS says, "From a tax perspective, having professional oriented office coupled with mid to high end, lower density housing would present an attractive mix. This is not my favorite, but an acceptable concept. However, the concept does not promote a community gathering character - mainly work and housing. I prefer mixed use where the entire community can rally around and enjoy the development."

I envision a branch campus of a university with some retail, residential and integrated with interactive green space - benches, picnic tables, hiking/bike path (Tucker Creek area). That way community could enjoy, plus, benefit by being able to participate in continuing education classes. Again, the aesthetics would need to be engaging.

Jan 28, 2014 6:26 AM



[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Worthington Ohio 29 points

You have 1000 characters left.

[Add Comment](#)

[Spell Check](#)