



Back

My Favorites Pages Modules

Worthington Community Voice

Search

Community Voice > Visioning UMCH > Scenario 1

Title Scenario 1

Feature

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

Cancel

Tags Visioning UMCH

Votes

13 12

Idea Details

LAST MODIFIED by Worthington Ohio on 1/27/2014

ADDED by Worthington Ohio on 12/20/2013

ACTIVITY 25 votes 67 comments 295 views

Discussion



Peter Macrae 10 points

- 1) Like most...the various proposed uses
2) Missing...Vertical mix of uses...uses are shown segregated in plan like traditional zoning
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 4:24 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply

Flag as Inappropriate



Fred Yaeger 32 points

I agree with Peter Macrae's comment about parking - it should be underground. Doing so leaves more land for green space or buildings. But underground parking is MUCH more expensive than surface or multi-level above-ground parking.

Jan 27, 2014 12:58 PM | Flag as Inappropriate



MATTHEW E BAKER 10 points

This scenario is pretty dense development, I would prefer something less dense with more green space, especially bike friendly.

Dec 24, 2013 12:16 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



TSmith 25 points

- 1) The common area park is a nice core feature, but why the over-emphasis on residential surrounding uses?
2) A retail street or square area surrounding the park would be nice and reinforce activity, esp. pedestrian.
3) I'd like to see more office uses deeper on the property, but still with residential buffering edges.
4) I like the townhome style residential you suggested.
5) I'd also like a small grocery of some kind for quick runs, not another pharmacy, but a real grocery store.
6) And some restaurants.
7) And maybe physician offices or a small hospital.
8) I like Peter's suggestion above about hiding the parking if cost effective.
9) I'm okay with 3-4 stories as long as not adjacent to residential houses that already exist. It's okay if they're adjacent to new housing.
10) I like the green space ideas and bike path connection suggestion. Not sure how it would work.

Dec 24, 2013 1:50 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



Steve P 12 points

I like the mixed use approach, but density seems very high. I like that we have some green space and that the plan provides some buffering between parking lots and residential spaces, but I suggest parking below the office space. I am hoping that the red retail area signals restaurant use, but please, fast food would ruin the development!

Dec 24, 2013 6:48 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



CBFindlay 10 points

http://www.mprnews.org/story/npr/251713829?from=social

Dec 26, 2013 8:42 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply

**MMR456** 21 points

Like several commenters have suggested, this scenario seems very housing dense. Like Steve above, I think the potential for negative impact on Evening St. seems high. The total amount of green space seems small given the parcel size.

Dec 26, 2013 6:28 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Bill Whitlatch** 21 points

Interesting Plan If we are going to have offices in the development, this is the way to go. The plan places the office buildings away from the residential areas. The formal entrance to the office area is directly across from City Hall and would create an attractive "civic" space.

I am not convinced that there is a market for "new urbanism" row housing in the area, or that developing housing with back alleys is what the Worthington housing market is looking for.

I think the "flats" make sense in the location proposed, however there should be an attempt to relate the form of the new buildings to the existing buildings. Assisted Living and Senior Housing would work.

Finally, consideration should be given to extending Wesley Blvd into the new residential area. While it shouldn't go directly into Evening Street, it should become the main southern access to the new residential area with a minor connection to Evening Street

Dec 26, 2013 6:38 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Ty Wait** 10 points

I have a few thoughts.

Extending Hayhurst south into development looks good. Let Longfellow t-bone into it. Narrow the east-most Single Family (SF) lot, slide the eight lots east, and add an ingress (one-way, south) on west side of west-most SF lot. Make road into development from Evening St. near Greenbriar Ct. a one-way ingress. Shrink parking footprint (see below) and rearrange retail and office space to provide three or four access roads to High St. for residents, office workers, retail workers, and shoppers. Shrink office space footprint but build 2 or 3 story buildings toward 150K SF.

Extend tree buffer north along west side of western Zero Lot Line (ZLL) units (like Scenario 3). Instead of flats and townhomes, build higher density apartment (condo quality) units (like Scenario 4). More density will help support retail.

Build 3 or 4 level garages, with 1 or 2 of the levels underground (like Easton).

Very glad to see Tucker Reserve kept on southern end.

Dec 29, 2013 6:26 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Jim Rush** 31 points

Ty, how close do you live to the proposed development? The residents on Longfellow do not wish a t bone across from their properties. Traffic flow along Longfellow would increase by approximately three hundred percent.

Jan 25, 2014 4:40 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)**Beth Jewell** 19 points

I have an amazing idea, in my humble opinion. Take scenario 1,2, 3, or 4, but not five. Keep the east side retail/office/ etc elements that face High St., but then use the ENTIRE western portion NOT for town homes & houses, but rather for green space, in the form of an amphitheater, recreational space such as soccer field &/ or baseball diamond, community garden, wildlife refuge, and/or nature preserve with pond, with multiuse trail throughout. A restaurant (not fast-food) would have a back patio overlooking this beautiful space. Community events, sporting events, small music and other festivals would take place here along with peaceful walks. Parking would be available in the underground garages and/ or parking decks in the eastern portion. People would access this parking primarily evenings/weekends while office workers would use it weekdays. Kind of a version of Creekside in Gahanna.

Dec 30, 2013 9:36 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Thomas Hamer** 2 points

My comments apply to scenarios 1-4. I like the buffering effect of single family residential along Longfellow and Evening. I like the provision for green space, but believe there should be a large "community" (read destination) green space central to the property in addition to Tucker Cr. Besides esthetically pleasing, it would be a magnet for retail users. Concerns re traffic: a) commercial - all proposals show access to Larrimer, which in time will produce flow onto Longfellow and Evening as drivers seek 161. Congestion at Larrimer and High bad enough in a.m. as is. b) residential - curb cuts onto Longfellow and/or Evening will flow traffic along them to 161; congestion especially in a.m. because of necessary stop sign at Evening and Tucker, plus parents dropping off students, plus buses and children walking to school. Effect will increase as density grows. Solution - ingress/egress to High only. Precedent: Josephinum, Crosswoods (not ideal) and res..dev. on 23 near Flint

Jan 2, 2014 1:38 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Andy Minard** 25 points

These scenario have lots of condos and zero lot properties as if that is something that we actually want. It's not. This is not what I think Worthington needs at all. I would prefer to see moderate offices and retail near High street and single family homes through the back. The more dense our housing is the less desirable we are. Densely populated areas become problem areas.

Jan 2, 2014 10:20 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)



My Favorites Pages Modules

0 Worthington Help



**Todd Boucher** 4 points

I completely agree. I don't like any of the scenarios for this reason. I think that this space should look more like "Old Worthington North". Make it a natural extension of Old Worthington, with the look feel and density of Old Worthington. People love Old Worthington and it is a major draw to our area. Why can't we have something similar (maybe with higher office space - I understand economics) in this area?

We have an area that could be a beautiful crescent. Detached housing in the nature proposed is terrible. If high density housing is to be used it should be attached and beautiful, a la a modern version of:

[http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Royal\\_Crescent\\_in\\_Bath,\\_England\\_-\\_July\\_2006.jpg](http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Royal_Crescent_in_Bath,_England_-_July_2006.jpg)

Anyway, I do not like any of the options, 1 through 5. They seem very "today" and not organic or long term. I'm sure that the office buildings behind Worthington Square were thought to be cool in their day too. The thinking needs to be 200 years from now, will this look good.

Jan 27, 2014 9:26 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

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



**Susie Kneedler** 9 points

I agree, too, for we need something like this park--which is also actually close to the Royal Crescent in Bath--: <http://visitbath.co.uk/things-to-do/royal-victoria-park-p25701>.

Jan 27, 2014 9:10 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)



**JAS** 16 points

This an attractive option. The green space in front is inviting while the space in the midst of the housing breaks the density and provides an emotional respite. I wouldn't mind more retail and a restaurant, for example, something like Hill's or Weiland's specialty market plus lure Cameron's American Bistro to this sight. I do prefer office over box retail, so read the retail comment as a small marginal increase, not a majority.

Jan 9, 2014 2:17 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Sarah Johnston** 39 points

There are way too many residences and not enough retail to bring pedestrian traffic to this part of the city. In particular, I would like a grocery store of some kind--either a local concern such as Hills or Weilands or a small chain store such as Trader Joe's or Fresh Market. I'd love small restaurants that offer something other than pizza and the blended-out food that places such as Jason's serve. I don't think we need more office space--we just need to upgrade/renovate the office space that already exists abundantly in Worthington.

Jan 10, 2014 8:40 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Keith Thompson** 7 points

I favor this one because of the maximum green space among the proposals. I disagree with all proposals in the closeness to the street. That section of High Street has all of its buildings set back and positioning two or four buildings close to the street as is prescribed in the current city plan creates a funnel effect as you come down high street entering Worthington. Keeping the setback similar to nearby structures would create a more pleasing entrance to the city and not give the funnel effect that would be encountered if the few buildings on that property are set forward to the street.

Jan 10, 2014 11:22 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Sarah Johnston** 39 points

As a comment in response to all of the scenarios: one thing I really like about some of the recent redevelopments of Bexley, Grandview and the Short North are the way that buildings contain shops and restaurants on the ground floors and apartments or condos on upper floors. This really gives a nice feeling of being in a real community where people come together to live, not just to sleep in their own spaces and then leave in the morning.

Jan 10, 2014 11:27 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Dee** 2 points

I suggest housing for active, independent 55+ residents. I hope the plan includes at least one condo apartment building for independent seniors. I like the idea of restaurants and shops on the first floor with apartments above. I have no problem with high-rises, but they may prefer a mid-rise. Parking out of the elements would be helpful in such a building. A recent Dispatch article detailed the success of the new Westminster Thurber building for active adults, indicating the response was so successful that a second new building is being planned. I can see such a development going over very well in Worthington. Long-term 55+ Worthington residents want to stay here. An attractive senior residence or 55+ only condos would enable them to turn over their homes to young families who want to move here. Green space and access to a specialty grocery and healthy non-chain restaurants would be a plus.

Jan 11, 2014 9:01 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Taylor Lies** 2 points

The pros for me are that the buildings are set back off high street and that the overall height in proportion to the neighborhood (no "high rises"). I'm not sure that the commercial space is needed or likely to succeed; with the Shops at Worthington and downtown Worthington I don't know that we need a 3rd commercial area (especially with downtown having empty storefronts). It's not my first choice, but it is at least inoffensive.

Jan 12, 2014 5:53 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



My Favorites

Pages

Modules

0

Worthington

Help

**Keith Thompson**<sup>7</sup> points

If I read the drawings correctly, the small buildings against the long ones facing the street, are closer on this drawing than the others. If they follow the current city plan, they will all be close to the street, similar to the CVS building. This will create a funnel effect as you drive down High Street because all the other buildings are set back considerably further than those in the drawing.

Jan 12, 2014 10:38 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)**Bill Whitlatch**<sup>21</sup> points

Dot has the right idea. Worthington needs something like Westminster Thurber for its more well off seniors. My wife and I would love to live the rest of our lives in Worthington, but just can't find any housing that meets our needs. We know a number of seniors who have recently moved from Worthington to other communities in order to find appropriate housing and we are starting to look elsewhere to find it. We have visited Westminster Thurber and while the facilities are just what we need, we don't want to leave Worthington.

Jan 13, 2014 9:55 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Sarah Johnston**<sup>39</sup> points

To keep Worthington's economy vital, we also need to bring in younger people, whose spending habits round out the economy. We can't focus on one age-group alone. Moreover, keeping Worthington's housing market attractive means keeping the school system excellent, which means we cannot focus too closely on groups who are past the child-rearing stage. Balance amongst age-groups and their needs is key to making this work.

Jan 13, 2014 9:58 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Joe Sherman**<sup>10</sup> points

In all 5 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. 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 12:51 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Tiffany**<sup>5</sup> points

I like the division of space, amounts of housing versus retail and the amount of park and green space.

Jan 17, 2014 4:59 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**christie thomas**<sup>5</sup> points

I like this one out of the 5 because it had the most amount of green space. It also has a smaller amount of office space (why does Worthington need more office space?)

The retail is more than the others, but that is only good if it is retail we need. Some good options: small healthy grocery, unique (not chain) shops, places to eat (not more pizza). Some bad options: More Real Estate places, pizza, junky stores, hardware stores.

I have to say, selfishly, as I live right there, the street heading to Evening is not thrilling. Hopefully there will be a 3 way stop. The curve already has a blind spot and people speed around that curve up to Tucker.

One big question: Where do all the kids go to school that might be living there? Proximity seems like Evening Street would be the elementary, but they are filled to the brim already.

It would be nice if the whole area could be as "green" as possible. Meaning alternative energy sources and building materials. Forward thinking please!

Jan 17, 2014 5:45 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**ann**<sup>8</sup> points

Agree that Evening Street is going to be a problem with traffic. It is a narrow road and can not handle the bikes, walkers, and cars that travel it now to school, pool, etc. The curve is a hazard. I feel sorry for those at the High Street end of Larrimer. You can already see traffic on High Street looking east from Guyer/Worthingway. Hope there are attempts to use trees so in 30 years it is a bit more attractive. There will be a long line of cars waiting for that light! Not enough consideration given to Pedestrian/Bikeways. Never enough green space

Jan 17, 2014 6:24 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Dr. Kathleen Knight**<sup>4</sup> points

I like scenario 1 best - it looks the least dense with the most green space. I really don't know what Worthington's needs are with regard to retail vs. office vs. different types of residential space vs. parking. I guess with any of the scenarios, I would like to see thought given to green space, bike/pedestrian friendly paths, use of low-maintenance native plants in landscaping, keeping as many already-existing large trees as possible, planting many trees with a diverse species mix (if they're all the same genus, they could all get wiped out by a bug like emerald ash borer), use of eco-friendly landscaping techniques like rain gardens, bioswales, and cisterns to capture rainwater, considering permeable pavement for parking lots, etc. It seems like a great opportunity to showcase eco-friendly and sustainable construction and landscaping, setting an example for others in Worthington and elsewhere to visit and emulate. Maybe opportunities to partner with Wild Ones or others.

Jan 17, 2014 9:32 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)

**Dr. Kathleen Knight** 4 points

My wish list for retail includes a healthy grocery with many organic/local options (a mini Whole Foods or Trader Joes), kid-friendly but nice buffet restaurants, and a bike shop.

Jan 17, 2014 9:39 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**70 USA** 4 points

One of the questions about each Scenario is "What is the impact of this Scenario?"

=====

1) Too much office space in an already city with high amount of vacant office space.  
 2) Too much "open space" and "preserve" (10.5 acres) in a city with already 18 parks. Too much open space will attract more predatory animals (deer, coyotes) to an already existing problem with destruction of landscapes in residential areas. That creek is a known "travel corridor" for the deer herds. The abundance of deer in Worthington then travel to other existing residential areas from from the UCMH site. 3) A 'speciality' grocery (like a Cargagna's or Weinland's) is needed and few sites remain in Worthington for such opportunities.

Jan 18, 2014 3:23 AM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**KeySterling** 12 points

The housing being proposed is too dense. The greenspace buffering seems good.

The traffic connections on the this scenario create a great cut through from sr 161 to high street. This should be avoided. The connection to evening or Longfellow should be change on only one roadway. The other connection should be pedestrian only.

Other communities are proposing centralized spaces for gathering. The green spaces should be developed with art, features, or something of interest.

Jan 18, 2014 8:04 AM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Maryellen McLaughlin** 6 points

I like that this option has the most park acreage and green space. I think there needs to be a tree line between the new houses and those on Evening Street. I agree that we need a healthy organic focused grocery, bike shop, coffee shop, interesting, casual restaurant options OTHER THAN PIZZA!

Jan 18, 2014 2:52 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**JULIE LOVEGROVE** 7 points

I have concerns with this much rental housing, and this much more traffic on Evening St., and Larrimer into Worthington Estates from High Street (already a slow light that can backed up at certain times of day.) I'd like to see more single family homes.

Jan 19, 2014 4:03 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**70 USA** 4 points

We do not need more pizza places nor more bars! I like them both, but enough is enough. We do not need more "open space" because we have 18 parks, and more than enough travel lanes and habitat for the already too many destructive deer herds, coyotes, foxes and other predatory animals that are already present. We need quality senior residences like the one on south High Street.

Jan 19, 2014 4:19 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Cathe Moog** 5 points

What do you like most about this scenario? The mixed use, the various housing types and the emphasis on green space. This scenario feels less fabricated than the others. The green space and features seem more aesthetically pleasing. I think the retail on High Street is essential to carry the flow from I-270 to downtown Worthington (and vice versa).

What do you see that is missing? n/a

Additional thoughts? I defer to the experts to gauge the demand on the amount and specific types of housing, as well as the office space (and class), and to balance this demand with the new inventory being developed on Wilson Bridge Rd. Thank you for the opportunity for community dialog.

Jan 20, 2014 9:08 AM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**ann** 8 points

on all plans would like to see a bus "cut out" in front for the current bus stop with a bike rack and shelter included. The current stop creates a road block on Larrimer and High when a right turn is made. Also wider sidewalks in front of the area to allow for better pedestrian traffic. Again green it up and the surrounding streets (Hayhurst, Larrimer, Longfellow, Evening) with more street trees. Just a warning - there is tons of work that goes on routinely with underground lines at the Larrimer and High- creates another traffic pain.

Jan 20, 2014 2:28 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Mike** 15 points

I prefer scenario 1 as it is a compromise for several needs and positions. It allows for residential use but does not have an excess of units. Keep in mind that within 2-3 miles of this plan are numerous aging apartment complexes with cookie cutter designs that have had there prices driven down due to the number of units available. If you have a large green area and feel like this, you are near Old Worthington, then you can keep pricing up for the long term which means the unit owners can continue to invest in up fitting units as they age. When apartments are overly abundant and all look the same people often just move to the next new complex and prices drive down. Green space does not allow for as much immediate development



potential but does allow for long term demand and thus economic viability. Schiller park, Goodale and other newer downtown initiatives are proof of the impact on property values. This model also allows for some office use which does offer a revenue base.

0

Worthington

Help

Jan 21, 2014 11:11 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**smagill15** 31 points

This seems the best option. I understand that Worthington has no where to grow, and this space is an opportunity for growth, so there's going to be an addition in housing/offices/shops, and we have to figure out the best option because it's going to happen anyway. The amount of green space in this option is nice. Townhomes are a nice option for both families just starting out and older adults looking to downsize, but who want to stay in the Worthington area. I wish the office space was removed as Wilson Bridge Rd. has multiple empty spaces already. A small, specialty grocery store and other shops/restaurants instead of the office spaces would be much better than the office spaces. I know more houses would cause more traffic, but in general Worthington seems to have no problem filling houses- we have problems filling office space (Wilson Bridge Rd) and shops (Worthington Hall, sometimes downtown). I think more single family homes would be nice in this space.

Jan 22, 2014 12:36 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 6:48 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**ann** 8 points

I also noticed in the plan the two residences on Larrimer (between Longfellow and High) have disappeared as well as the street trees planted there. I hope the home owner across the street on Larrimer will also be offered a buy out.... they will not be able to get out of their driveway and will be facing an office building. Hope the city transplants or replaces those street trees on Larrimer. The street really needs them! Also a straight T bone down Hayhurst may create a runway effect. I know neighbors with kids were wanting speed bumps on that street in the past- can't imagine what it would be like with added cut through from high density housing etc.

Jan 24, 2014 3:07 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Aura Whittaker** 21 points

I like this scenario the best; has the most green space and least amount of parking. I would like less residential (too dense) and more green space.

Jan 24, 2014 6:06 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Glenn Tucker** 18 points

Does not address the traffic issues along Evening St., also does not address flooding that would be cured due to change of surface change. Asphalt does not absorb any rain fall.

Jan 24, 2014 7:35 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**resident** 2 points

I like none of the plans, too dense with housing, what are these to be rental properties, condos, what about single family homes as current to the neighborhood? Why this plan for high density when the surrounding area is not? What sort of retail is envisioned for this area, will it take away from the downtown which already has vacancies? Just another attempt to add high density units where they are not needed or wanted.

Jan 24, 2014 11:43 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**MMM** 5 points

I would prefer an option with more single family homes and less apartments. Option five has the most but lacks a buffer between Longfellow and the new development.

I'm concerned with the limited amount of green space and feel that a playground and children's area would be beneficial to encourage families to settle here and in keeping with the surrounding area. I would like to see some small restaurants, shops, and possibly a grocery or small market.

Jan 25, 2014 8:19 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**ann kipp** 2 points

Of the choices offered, #1 is my preferred choice because it has less office space and lower residential density. However the townhomes are not that attractive. I would like to see the number cut in half with the gained square footage used to turn them into one-story units that could be used by seniors or any age group.

As mentioned by someone else, an open, destination area, esp. if planned near the front or on the south side, could be used for small festivals or as an add-on/overflow for events held in downtown Worthington. A big concern is the amount of traffic flowing into the development from Worthington-Galena Rd. and back out into what is effectively a five-way intersection (Crandall into Worth.-Galena, High St. both directions and the existing street into the development). At certain times of day, it is difficult and dangerous to access Worth.-Galena from Crandall. To send more traffic into that intersection would be unwise.

Jan 25, 2014 12:04 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)



[Jim Rush](#)<sup>31 points</sup> My Favorites Pages Modules

0 Worthington Help

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 3:56 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[Jim Rush](#)<sup>31 points</sup>

The more I review the proposals the more problems I see. Speaking selfishly, in all five scenarios, the only thing between my home of almost twenty years and the parking garage on Larrimer is at most one tree and about five to twenty feet of lawn. The parking garage empties onto Larrimer almost across from my driveway and the parking garage driveway would be blocked by traffic for significant parts of the day due to the light. Traffic from the school would block both ingress and egress due to the proximity of the driveway to the light. During rush hour the garage would be inaccessible from Larrimer.

People talk about how this scenario has the most green space. Most of the green space is just buffer and would not contribute to bike paths or walking areas. The green spaces would be used by high density unit owners as personal pet waste areas. The green space would be of minimal value to the community.

Jan 25, 2014 4:27 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[cardinal](#)<sup>5 points</sup>

Comment for 1-4. Way too much residential density. Traffic concerns with cut throughs into existing neighborhoods. Not nearly enough green space, none allocated for active, community use. Very disappointed that the city is not authentically looking into creative funding and development ideas. These designs are merely variations on a theme, boilerplates that are not consistent with the character, charm and needs of the residents. Many many people have been inquiring about the possibility of the public/city purchasing at least part of the property to serve the GREATEST GOOD of Worthington, for now and the future. Why has there been such resistance to this, without, apparently, the first step in looking into it? These designs may address the financial needs of many parties, but not the long-term needs of the residents, who pay taxes. By taking the short-sighted view, we risk compromising our beloved town.

Jan 26, 2014 8:26 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[Blair Fujii](#)<sup>2 points</sup>

The things that drew me to Worthington include the quality of the school system, integrated green spaces such as the bike path and village green, unique shops and restaurants, vibrant community events including the farmers market and art festivals, lots of people out for walks or running or shopping, and the "look and feel" that came from thoughtful planning and high community standards.

There isn't much that would make Worthington a more appealing place to me other than I do still miss "The Jube" and would love to see a small grocery nearby. While I understand the relationship of office space and density to increasing the tax base, more of either would not have attracted me to Worthington as a place to live. If these things are necessary for the health of Worthington then less is more in my opinion. As many others have already commented - housing density, resulting impact on traffic, and even more empty office space are also my key concerns.

Jan 26, 2014 8:41 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[ann](#)<sup>8 points</sup>

More thoughts on greenspace. The city could purchase part of this property for greenspace/park even for passive use early on and changed in the future. People mentioned Schiller and Goodale, but even in Worthington there is Selby and Pingree. Not that the focus would be the same, but the space is there. I would NOT count school property as green space. As anyone knows who has served on a PTA or sports team, the schools are using their space, they struggle to maintain it, and with security issues it is less usable on a routine basis- most certainly not when children are in attendance! So with all these plans a designated community held green space is missing . Also consider this property (and the whole Wo Estates neighborhood) was once part of a Childrens Home, I see nothing that is intentionally honoring children or the heritage of the property. Look at Dublins model to see how art, neighborhood greenspace/parks, and multiuse trails are used to build neighborhoods etc.

Jan 26, 2014 1:22 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[bcm](#)<sup>25 points</sup>

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 1:26 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[SJ](#)<sup>3 points</sup>



This applies to scenarios 1-4; these seem extremely dense for the area. This will cause a real traffic nightmare in the surrounding neighborhoods. Scenario five seems somewhat better. I am concerned about additional office space as we can't seem to fill what we have around Worthington now. And please, please no high rises. We can move downtown (or to worthington mall) if we want that, don't block out our sky!!! After viewing all of these scenarios, I hope the children's home will just stay there. Sometimes you really don't know what you have until it's gone.

Jan 26, 2014 5:05 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Dorothy David** 28 points

High St. frontage for commercial space; property not over-developed; nice green buffer between commercial & residential; focus primarily on residential vs. commercial; appropriate space & # of units (flats) for senior living, great entrance, retail space accessible to all customers not just tenants and residents, best green space, limited access to development. My first choice.

Jan 26, 2014 6:29 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Pamela Fair** 10 points

All of the scenarios suffer from the same fatal flaws. First and foremost, a lack of meaningful green space that benefits the entire community, not just a bit of lawn and a token tree for the new residents crammed into too dense housing to walk their dogs. We lack any "Class A" unique park space. I want to see something special on the site, which is completely lacking in all the scenarios. For example, an outdoor ice skating rink that doubles as a splash pad or roller rink in the warmer months, a fishing pond, a gathering place with shelter & bathrooms, and ball fields with a goal post. Second, the housing density is ridiculous and not in keeping with Worthington's character. 1-4 range from 135 to 465 new housing units: very concerned re the effect on Eve St school that already is crowded & flood of increased traffic on existing residential streets. Third, the look of housing & parking garages as shown look like a typical apartment complex that will become an eyesore in 20 years.

Jan 27, 2014 8:59 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Todd Boucher** 4 points

I couldn't agree more!

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



**Fred Yaeger** 32 points

Main part of the green spaces shown in scenarios 1-5 is totally surrounded by residential or office. This would effectively prevent that space from being used by Worthington residents except those living in the immediately adjacent buildings. A large green space in the UMCH site should be designed so that it is usable by any resident of the city and is visually welcoming to them. One way to achieve this might be to locate it connected to the Tucker Preserve. Of course, any dense residential areas should have "some" passive green space, but it should be minimal compared to a community-wide area.

Jan 27, 2014 11:52 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Fred Yaeger** 32 points

Continuing my comment above,...

Except for the Tucker Ravine/Preserve area and some small token areas like mentioned above, all other green space in the UMCH site should be contiguous and designed for "active uses" - that is, designed for more than sitting on a bench and enjoying the tree/grass view. This large active green area should be adjacent to Tucker Preserve. Worthington already has many passive park/green spaces, such as the Village Green and Olentangy Parklands non-trail parts, East Granville Park, Moses Wright Nature Area. The green space should be a "destination", different than the existing plentiful passive park spaces elsewhere in the city. Of course, a small fraction of UMCH green space could be passive, but only a small fraction, sprinkled in dense residential, retail and commercial area.

Jan 27, 2014 11:53 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Fred Yaeger** 32 points

Final segment of my comments above....

The large active green space should be designed to be different than the types of green space that Worthington already has. It should add another dimension to our system of parks. Examples of active uses include (no particular order) splash pad (bigger than at the Worthington Pools, but smaller than at Dublin's Ballantrae Park) a winter ice rink (Obetz's splash pad doubles as winter rink!), open performance space (for outdoor plays, summer movies, productions by the McConnell Arts Center, mid-size festivals or privately reserved (rented) activities such as company picnics, weddings/receptions, reception building or shelter house (see picture for Scenario #4's green area), sledding hill along the natural downslope area ending near Tucker Creek, fishing pond.

Jan 27, 2014 11:54 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Christopher Jolley** 2 points

Several of the intersections would create problems for motorists. There are too many roadways coming together at a single point in a few locations and the circulation feels a little chaotic. It seems that too much traffic is being diverted towards the existing residential streets and ignoring the lighted intersection with Worthington-Galena. I would like to see less emphasis on surface parking lots, maybe more structure and street parking. I like seeing the retail along High street and residential towards the back of the lot.

Jan 27, 2014 12:44 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



**Fred Yaeger** 32 points

C Jolley makes a great point. Fewer surface parking lots. See my comments about parking in Scenario 2's comments

Maybe we should consider making the part of High St in front of UMCH similar to what's in Old Downtown



Wor? IE make the curb lane a parking lane, one side being 24/7 parking the other side no parking during rush hour: That would increase parking without creating more water runoff.

0

Worthington Help

Jan 27, 2014 2:29 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**AVPL8** 8 points

Like Scenario #1 as it provides good mix of patio, townhouse and flats, although a few more flats would be better (but not as much as Scenario #3) to provide what I would assume to be more economical housing (to allow full range of housing prices). Such flats should be condo units for retirees and young professionals, not rental apartments. Limit to 3 story height, best if 2-story to match Old Worthington. Prefer 80% housing on use of space. Low key signage, mix of materials, more traditional than modern in appearance. Like entry across from Worthington's administrative buildings for cohesive look. No large green spaces, so large to turn into sports field by default.

Jan 27, 2014 3:30 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Fred Yaeger** 32 points

Many residents don't want to live in multi-story apartments condos or flats that are 3-4-stories tall, or in zero-lot-line two-story houses or 2-story row houses. But some people do like that. If such buildings can be designed, built and managed in a high-quality way, they'd be an asset to Wor. Other high-quality smaller cities or large neighborhoods have done this. Right after college, I lived in a 4-unit 2-story townhouse (rowhouse style) in Clintonville for 6 years before I saved enough to buy a home. The quality of that old building was great and all residents and the owner maintained them well. All the neighbors were great. I could see new graduates renting a similar place in Wor, if it existed. Some of the new buildings should be single level patio homes which a lot of current residents want. No reason UMCH cannot have both.

Jan 27, 2014 5:04 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Anne Fouss** 20 points

Like: provides good mix of patio, townhouse, flats and family homes. Entrance and office space. Missing: questioning in scenarios 1-4 if it is too dense - residentially. Additional thoughts: exploration area along Tucker Creek, Family friendly, hiking trail, bike path, amphitheater for summer theater and music, landscaped gardens, possibly a small pond. Attractions that will integrate this space into the community - engaging. Help create more of a connection between Old Worthington and the Shops at Worthington Place. Not just somewhere you drive by.

Jan 27, 2014 5:12 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Anne Fouss** 20 points

Some how my sentence got cut off - Where I said "Entrance and office space." Meant to say would like if entrance gives cohesive look with civic buildings across High Street. Also, like the brownstone styled residence but would want to be sure there were offerings that had no stairs to climb or an entry at parking level.

Over all - this is very cool to have this technology for everyone to contribute ideas. Thanks all that made it possible!

Jan 27, 2014 5:47 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Susie Kneeder** 9 points

I agree with all who say that ?all ?the plans are ?bad, because they: 1. would destroy the charm of Worthington's relaxing way of life; ???. would inject too much traffic on the already-congested Evening and Larimer Streets?; and 3. ?LACK ENOUGH GREEN SPACE. ?Worthington needs many more usable tree-lined parks, gardens, an arboretum, with paths for running, walking, and playing. (Our Olentangy bike path's nothing but a freeway for two-wheelers, where runners, walkers, and people pushing strollers can be mowed down. The path's isolation also makes many ??feel unsafe ?being there ???alone??.)

Jan 27, 2014 8:48 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Susie Kneeder** 9 points

Sorry, somehow question marks were added to my Comment. I meant to write:

I agree with all who say that all the plans are bad, because they: 1. would destroy the charm of Worthington's relaxing way of life; 2. would throw too much traffic on the already-congested Evening and Larimer Streets; and 3. LACK ENOUGH GREEN SPACE. Worthington needs many more usable tree-lined parks, gardens, an arboretum, with paths for running, walking, and playing. (Our Olentangy bike path's nothing but a freeway for bikes, where runners, walkers, and people pushing strollers can be mowed down. The trail's isolation also makes many feel unsafe being there alone.)

In sum, we need beautiful, tree-filled community areas, where the people of Worthington and our visitors can enjoy coming together.

Jan 27, 2014 9:20 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Worthington Ohio** 29 points

You have 1000 characters left.

[Add Comment](#) [Spell Check](#)