



Main



My Favorites

Pages

Modules



View Site



Worthington



Help

Community Voice

[Back](#)

Search

Community Voice ► [Visioning UMCH](#) ► [Scenario 3](#)Title [Feature](#)Description [Cancel](#)Tags

Votes

1

15

Idea Details

LAST MODIFIED
by Worthington Ohio
on 1/27/2014ADDED
by Worthington Ohio
on 12/20/2013ACTIVITY
16 votes
28 comments
92 views [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

Discussion

**superteampalmer** 5 points

I'm against more apartment-style housing in Worthington. I understand it's profitable for the developer, but it's not necessarily beneficial for the community. In general, apartments and town homes do not attract people who seek to commit to the community for long periods of time. I would favor any development that creates single family homes and a local grocery store (ie style of the old Jubilee or Trader Joes). While I'm not a huge fan of more large office buildings, I would much rather have those than the plethora of rentals suggested in this particular plan.

Dec 23, 2013 2:32 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Peter Macrae** 10 points

1) Like most...the apparent increased density...the center area is suited to vertically integrated mixed-use
2) Missing...increased commercial development...too much housing
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 4:33 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**MATTHEW E BAKER** 10 points

Far too dense. 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

Too much residential. Way too much. And no sense of community gathering spot, no open land, no park, no retail. It looks like all office and apartments.

Dec 24, 2013 1:53 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)[Reply](#)**Steve P** 12 points

I have no doubt that 400 flats would sell in Worthington. This style of empty-nester housing seems to be in high demand among the many people with whom I have spoken in the city. How tall would these four buildings need to be to each accommodate 100 units? Our WARD survey of over 700 residents clearly indicated that residents of Worthington do not want high-rise apartments in our city. I do like that you have included residential units shielding the eyesore of parking decks, but they would require more than a single line of trees to buffer the sides.

Dec 24, 2013 7:12 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](#)**Ty Wait** 10 points

This is my favorite of the five scenarios presented for the UMCH space. High density residential, with buffers and walk/bike paths from High St. to Longfellow. Multi-level parking and green space along High St.

I like extending Hayhurst south into the development. To aid traffic flow, shift all Single Family (SF) lots east (narrowing the north end of tree island just east of east-most SF lot), and add an ingress (one-way, south) between tree buffer and west-most SF lot. Make the road into development from Evening St. a one-way ingress. Build 2 or 3 story office buildings toward 150K SF. Add road between parking structures to allow traffic flow to High St. for residents.



My Favorites Pages Modules

0

Worthington Help

Replace southern row of Zero Lot Line units with green space.

Very glad Tucker Reserve kept on southern end.

Dec 29, 2013 6:32 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

Beth Jewell 19 points

Please see my posts under scenarios 1& 2. Need much, much more community green space.

Dec 30, 2013 9:57 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

Andy Minard 25 points

Worthington does not need to double-down on apartments. We have a ton of apartments coming in at the mall site. I would wonder what impact the apartment complexes will have on our schools and crime rates. It is not a good idea to have a lot of people living in a small area like this. All of the scenarios seem to miss what makes Worthington what it is. I don't think any of these scenarios are what I would like to see.

Jan 2, 2014 10:28 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

JAS 16 points

With some adjustments this concept has some merit. I would increase the green space in the middle by eliminating two of the four apartment complexes. Some the housing could be recouped by building 1-2 stories on top of the parking garage, or better, excavate and put the parking under the buildings. A bit more retail (restaurant, pub cafe, specialty grocery) would position the property to fulfill many of the residential and social needs of the residents, including those of us who live in Worthington Estates.

Jan 9, 2014 2:26 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

Sarah Johnston 39 points

Way too much residential, especially apartments (we will have enough apartments at the mall site). Way too little green space (put the ugly parking underground) and not enough retail/restaurant space. We should be thinking along the lines of what Grandview or the Short North looks like--interesting but functional shops and gathering places than draw a community together, not imprison each of us in his or her own pod-like home.

Jan 10, 2014 8:50 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

Philip Green 2 points

Why doesn't the city buy the property and leave it as green space?

Jan 14, 2014 3:27 PM | [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. Again limited Green Space with a reduced retail component with the 1400+ parking space allotment and the residential expansion to 465 units 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 12:56 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

KeySterling 12 points

I think the retail on high street makes sense.

Again the residential doesn't fit the surrounding neighborhoods.

Why isn't this area being proposed to more of a premier retail / type a office space. The old Dublin area has been redeveloped but it has a major intersection to support commerce and destination.

The schools are going to have to look at the impact of more children. Under a all of these scenarios.

Jan 18, 2014 8:30 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

Marvellen McLaughlin 6 points

I like the buffer of trees along Evening Street. Why does there need to be access to Evening Street?

Jan 18, 2014 2:57 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

MMR456 21 points

The scenario indicates that there's two acres of green space. Is that two contiguous acres, or two acres divided up among the total parcel? How much of that green space is "active" space that can be used by the community as opposed to "passive" space that, while pretty and green, isn't necessarily usable? Also, I'm opposed to traffic ingress or egress onto any of the existing streets--Larrimer, Longfellow/Hayhurst, or Evening. Access to the planned space should be limited to ingress and egress via High St.

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

[Reply](#)

smagill15 31 points



Too many flats in this one. The office building size is better because it's on the smaller side. Some people would like to live right on the hustle and bustle of High Street, so the apartment right on High Street is a nice idea- looks better than putting sterile office buildings right against High.

Jan 22, 2014 12:40 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](#)



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 6:50 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Aura Whittaker 21 points

I like this scenario the best; has the most green space and least parking. I think the density on residential is too much and I would like more green space.

Jan 24, 2014 5:59 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Aura Whittaker 21 points

Ignore this. Should have been put in scenario 1 instead.

Jan 24, 2014 6:04 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)



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 4:11 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 be 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

Is this a "quad" on a university campus? Definetly NOT the Worthington style.

Jan 26, 2014 6:59 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Pamela Fair 10 points

The housing density on this scenario is out of control ... 465 units, including 400 flats. I don't think this housing will appeal to those wanting senior housing. Nor will it appeal to the younger 20/30 something demographic the City seems to desire. There is nothing else on the property to attract the recent graduate/young professional crowd. Simply building 4 story buildings with flats crammed in them will not cause young professionals to opt to move to WOR instead of the Arena District, Short North, Clintonville. The City needs to embrace what WOR is ... a family community. The idea that you can build housing that will appeal to seniors and young professionals alike is ludicrous. Worse, this housing will appeal to neither. What about high end housing? WOR lacks housing that offers large lot sizes & the chance to build - those homeowners go to Dublin, Powell, or New Albany. As for senior housing, I think ranch style patio homes would be more in keeping with WOR's character.

Jan 27, 2014 9:22 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

For all 5 scenarios.....

Before the 2007-8 recession, office space was in great demand and short supply. Preferred land use changes over time. We need to be prepared when the pendulum swings the other way again and good quality office space is again in demand. We need to think long-term. Doesn't Worthington have fewer offices per capita than other suburbs? Maybe we (residents and City) need to "bank" part of the land for office building(s) for when the pendulum swings. Until it swings, it could be "temporary" green space.

When clicking on the maps of the denser housing structures, they'e uninspiring. I wish we could see some



better examples. Architects know how to design pleasing buildings, *IF* we demand it. I took a city-sponsored tour of dense housing in Columbus. It was eye-opening. Urge the city to provide such tours again. The tour changed my opinion about quality dense housing options.



Jan 27, 2014 4:29 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

Commercial/retail buildings along High Street should be closer to the street and should have out-front bench/patio landscaping (see along High in old Downtown Worthington, including sidewalks (I see no sidewalks along High Street). All 5 scenarios devote too much green space between the buildings and High Street. The buildings facing High Street should have a longer north-south dimension, consuming the too-large green space shown in Scenarios 2-5. Frontage on High Street is too commercially valuable to have that much green space there. Imagine more sidewalk and sitting space like what's in Downtown Wor.

Jan 27, 2014 4:33 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

Construct 3-story buildings along High Street. They would complement the large buildings across the street (City Admin and Fire/EMS). They would bring in more local businesses, keeping more dollars in the Wor economy longer (not just increasing city income tax and prop tax revenues). Taller buildings leave more land space for green space. Before the 2008 crash, Worthington approved a 3 or 4 story building just north of the Sprint Lube. Three-story buildings have existed in Worthington for decades. They are part of the current city character: northwest of Selby & High (white brick), condos on Proprietors Rd north of Rt 161, the main Anthem Building on High across from Shoedinger's, the 6 story office/apartment building under construction on West Wilson Bridge Rd, the Residences of Worthington (condo) on High south of Rutherford-Corbin Funeral Home.

Jan 27, 2014 4:34 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Sarah Johnston 39 points

But Fred, I think we need to do whatever we can to encourage people to first upgrade the B and C-grade office space that floods Worthington. At the moment (or at least as of a few months ago) W'ton had NO A-grade office space, and what we have was viewed as getting worse (as it got older). I don't want to put A-grade in this new project and watch the existing spaces become abandoned and further down-graded. And I agree that there might be quality options for dense housing, as in the new-ish project on Main Street in Bexley (although I don't myself prefer to see dense housing of any kind at UMCH). It all depends so much on paying close attention to details.

Jan 27, 2014 4:35 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Worthington Ohio 29 points

You have 1000 characters left.

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