



Back

Search

Community Voice > Visioning UMCH > Scenario 2

Title Scenario 2

Feature

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

Cancel

Tags Visioning UMCH

Votes

3 | 11

Idea Details

LAST MODIFIED by Worthington Ohio on 1/27/2014

ADDED by Worthington Ohio on 12/20/2013

ACTIVITY 14 votes 29 comments 102 views

Discussion



Peter Macrae 10 points

1) Like most...the hierarchy of green space 2) Missing...not enough commercial...too much residential 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 4:30 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply

Flag as Inappropriate



Quentin Jung 2 points

I had always pictured the south side of Longfellow to be filled in entirely with single family residential, without a curb cut, matching the north side. Being a resident on the north side of Longfellow, I would definitely prefer access to the site via an extension of Hayhurst.

Dec 23, 2013 5:03 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



MATTHEW E BAKER 10 points

I would prefer something less dense than scenario 1 with more green space and bike/pedestrian friendly pathways.

Dec 24, 2013 12:19 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



TSmith 25 points

Way too much residential, not enough retail or office or whatever else. We don't really need more residential much, other than as a buffer for our existing homes nearby. Also, no connection to existing neighborhood to west? I know roads are controversial but wouldn't it be more natural?

Dec 24, 2013 1:52 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



Steve P 12 points

Scenario two does not seem to have many significant differences from scenario one. There is even less usable green space, although it is nice to see what appears to be some performance space in some of the dark green areas. While it's nice that this scenario provides comparably perhaps less density in terms of residential housing, it also raises the question: Do we have more than enough traditional single-family homes in Worthington? What is the advantage of building up traffic congestion through the back development with this high level of density? Why not route most of the traffic up to High Street where it can be absorbed most easily? If the plan is to increase interaction with new residential and old, why not have something like a "destination park" in the new development to draw existing residential occupants into the new development? If there is no real interactional "draw" for the existing residential occupants, why connect these two spaces?

Dec 24, 2013 7:04 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

Less green space than #1! And with more housing! And egress should be out onto High St., not Longfellow or Evening.

Dec 26, 2013 6:37 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply

**Ty Wait** 10 points

I have few thoughts.

Extend Hayhurst south into development and let Longfellow t-bone into it. Move the four west-most Single Family (SF) lots east, and move the depicted road to west of the west-most SF lot. Make it an ingress (one-way, south). Make road into development from Evening St. a one-way ingress. Shrink parking footprint (see below), rearrange retail (expand it closer to 20K SF) 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 multi-story buildings toward 150K SF.

Extend tree buffer north along west side of Zero Lot Line (ZLL) units (like Scenario 3). Instead of flats and townhomes, build higher density apartment (condo quality) units (like Scenario 4). Replace southern row of ZLLs with green space.

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

Very glad to see buffers and Tucker Reserve kept on southern end.

Dec 29, 2013 6:28 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Beth Jewell** 19 points

Please see my post under scenario 1. Also, I would like to the comments of MMR456, CBFindlay, TSmith, Matthew Baker & Steven P, above.

Dec 30, 2013 9:55 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Andy Minard** 25 points

The housing is way too dense. There should be more single-family home and significantly less zero lot and condo/apartment like housing.

Jan 2, 2014 10:23 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Joe Decker** 4 points

Scenario 1 is my favorite. I like that the Tucker Creek preserve is a constant throughout. The verticality near High St. is an intelligent move and one that fits well in that section of High St. I agree with the others that the garages should be built up, not out.

Jan 5, 2014 8:51 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**JAS** 16 points

The style of town homes in this scenario are attractive. I definitely prefer this style in the final project. However, I agree with others that the density is too high. I would consolidate the structures (eliminate at least one block of town homes) and increase green space. I also think egress to High St., perhaps through the circle exit in front of Sunrise, would improve traffic flow. Personally I also prefer a bit more retail - restaurant, pub-cafe, grocery.

On all the scenarios, my opinion is that the zero lot line SFH is unattractive. The concept is OK, just the architectural detail is unenthusiastic.

Jan 9, 2014 2:41 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Sarah Johnston** 39 points

Way too much residential crammed in together, with ugly parking garages, and there's no real retail to draw our community together. I don't see anything I like in this plan.

Jan 10, 2014 8:43 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. Less Green Space with a reduced retail component with the 700+ parking space allotment is less favorable than Option 1. 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 12:52 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**EricE** 7 points

Nice for older citizens of Worthington who want to downsize with a one story plan.

Jan 17, 2014 3:56 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**KeySterling** 12 points

Housing is too dense.

Are there going to be garages to the towns homes and the flats? Is there a vision to serve the area with transit?

The Longfellow homes are the only residential piece which make sense. The connection to Longfellow is poorly thought connections. Headlights in the existing home which didn't have them.

Jan 18, 2014 8:19 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)



My Favorites Pages Modules



Worthington Help



Cathie Dotzauer 5 points

There should be a parking garage with half the parking underground. I like the green space plan. Traffic flow will have to be carefully thought out since, at certain times of day, school traffic already congests the Larrimer - High St. intersection.

Jan 18, 2014 3:33 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



smagill15 31 points

I don't like the idea of the development connecting to Longfellow. I think it would increase traffic in the Worthington Estates/Olentangy Hills area, as the new residents might take neighborhood roads like Rieber to get to the Worthington Mall, Wilson Bridge, etc.

Jan 22, 2014 12:22 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 6:49 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 4:09 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Sarah Johnston 39 points

When I commented on the scenarios a couple of weeks ago, I didn't realize what several residents are now mentioning: that the traffic flow will be dreadful for people who live in the area (I live in another part of Worthington). Having looked at the five scenarios more closely now, I see that they are right. All of these lay-outs would be disasters for anyone living in the newly developed area or the nice older neighborhoods nearby. I don't want to see that happen.

Jan 25, 2014 4:18 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Jim Rush 31 points

Thank you Sarah, we need more speaking out against the traffic patterns that will disrupt the existing neighborhoods.

Jan 25, 2014 4:36 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Glenn Tucker 18 points

go ahead and put apartments next to my house then my property value will go into the dump i will get a huge tax break

Jan 25, 2014 8:34 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 1:28 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Dorothy David 28 points

Acceptable alternative to #1.

Jan 26, 2014 6:55 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Pamela Fair 10 points



The proposed road at the curve on Evening Street is very problematic. The street already bears heavy traffic, and it passes by Eve St Elementary where we have young kids walking to/from school. Likewise, the increased traffic onto Longfellow & Larrimer is unacceptable. Existing homeowners are expected to contend with significantly increased traffic, yet the proposed scenarios give them no benefit. As a landowner on Greenbrier Ct. that backs up to UMCH, I bought my house relying on the existing zoning, never expecting that apartments & a new maze of streets dumping hundreds of cars out onto Evening St into my neighborhood would be something that the City would propose. Very disappointed this is what the City proposed. Any traffic generated by development on the site should be handled only by roads from High Street. Further, this scenario shows 120,000 sq ft office space. Refurbish the glut of existing vacant office space to be Class A office space & use this land for something better.

0

Worthington Help

Jan 27, 2014 9:14 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

Vehicle traffic into/out of UMCH will be considerable with *ALL* 5 scenarios shown, some scenarios certainly more than others. Evening St and Longfellow & Larrimer Aves should not bear more traffic. Larrimer is already too heavy; ditto traffic on Evening between Highgate and Rt 161. All vehicle traffic in UMCH should enter/exit at High St. Traffic engineers can decide how many in/out streets are needed and which should be signalized. Traffic can be simultaneously calmed and made to flow faster by replacing the signal at Worthington-Galena Rd/Wesley Dr with a roundabout. Hilliard and Dublin have roundabouts. Many people hate roundabouts because they have no or very little experience with them. After you use them a while, they are easy, and they have been proven safer and higher traffic flow. We need to stay open to new stuff,...when it's better.

Jan 27, 2014 12:19 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

Concluding my comment above.....
 Car parking for green space activities for Worthington residents living outside of walking/biking distance should include same parking space allocated/designed for commercial and retail buildings with the condition that such green space parkers can only use the spaces when commercial & retail businesses are closed/do not need them - several places in town already do this. Additional parking on the city-owned properties across High St should be permitted and parking along Evening where it touches UMCH property. That part of Evening is a speed zone; allowing parking there (maybe even move the sidewalk back 5-6 feet to allow parallel parking) would help slow speeding cars. Additional public parking could be installed on the northeast corner of the intersection of Worthington-Galena Road and High Street, immediately south of the Fire/EMS building, without disturbing its trees that border High Street.

Jan 27, 2014 12:21 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

OOPS - in my comment above, I meant to say diagonal, pull-in parking, not parallel. More parking slots would be created that way.

Jan 27, 2014 3:00 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Worthington Ohio 29 points

You have 1000 characters left.

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