



Back



My Favorites

Pages

Modules

0

View Site



Worthington

Help

Community Voice



Search



Community Voice > Visioning UMCH > Scenario 4

Title Scenario 4

Feature

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

Cancel

Tags

Votes

0

14

Idea Details

LAST MODIFIED by Worthington Ohio on 1/27/2014

ADDED by Worthington Ohio on 12/20/2013

ACTIVITY 14 votes 25 comments 70 views

Discussion



Peter Macrae 10 points

This is my least favorite of the 5...very segregated uses...way too much housing...no variety of open space. 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 4:35 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



MATTHEW E BAKER 10 points

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

Dec 24, 2013 12:20 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



TSmith 25 points

Too much residential, and only office not retail it looks like. No park centerpiece, Nothing to really make it feel good for visitors. Needs a park centerpiece like village green and some retail.

Dec 24, 2013 1:54 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



Steve P 12 points

Lots of rows of housing in a big grid. It appears to have fewer actual units than other scenarios, which may reduce traffic concerns. The first four scenarios seem to follow a basic and standard pattern, with very little real and substantial variety among them. We have various types of residential in the back, as much as will fit based on their type. We have primarily office space and large, above-ground parking lots on the east side of the property. These all appear to be very marketable from the point of view of a developer, but how will this development plan, and others, truly enhance the value and quality of our city? The office space may bring in new commerce, but where is the "win" for residents of our city?

Dec 24, 2013 7:22 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



CBFindlay 10 points

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

Dec 26, 2013 8:41 AM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



Ty Wait 10 points

I like the buffers and walk/bike paths on the south and west sides of the development. Multi-level parking and green space along High St. are pluses, as is the access road into the development (between the parking garages). The high SF office space is also a plus.

I would favor the "t-bone" approach in Scenarios 1-3 instead of the road off the Longfellow curve. Shift all Single Family (SF) lots east, narrowing the east-most lot, and add an ingress (one-way, south) on the west side of the west-most SF lot. The road into development from Evening St. should also be a one-way ingress. Expand the retail, perhaps into the first floor of office buildings to 15-20K SF.

Higher density apartment (condo quality) housing will help support retail business, so I would suggest replacing the townhomes and southern Zero Lot Line units with them, plus some open green space adjacent to the Tucker Reserve on the southern end.

Very glad Tucker Reserve kept on southern end.

Dec 29, 2013 6:35 PM | Flag as Inappropriate

Reply



Beth Jewell 19 points



Please see my posts under scenarios 1, 2, and 3. I would also like to echo Steve P's & Matthew Baker's comments above.

Dec 30, 2013 10:00 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)

0

[Worthington](#) [Help](#)



Andy Minard 25 points

I agree, this is again way too dense. This does not complement the existing city. I would hope we can get different scenarios. I'd prefer moderate office and retail and mostly single-family homes (with lots).

Jan 2, 2014 10:33 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



JAS 16 points

I agree with others, this is not a favored alternative. The density is too high and green areas too small.

Jan 9, 2014 2:08 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Sarah Johnston 39 points

Way too much housing of a 'projects'-like quality (the effect overall is pod-like). We need more green space and more retail and restaurants to bring the community together by attracting them to something they genuinely like. Right now, this looks like a miniature version of the suburbs we were all fleeing when we moved to central Worthington: places to sleep and watch TV at night while seeking a real life elsewhere during the day. In fact, a lot of the scenarios look like that.

Jan 10, 2014 8:58 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 heavy emphasis on Office Space and the 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 12:59 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



KeySterling 12 points

This is my least favorite residential scenario. This would be a great money maker for a builder. Tons of homes packed tight doesn't seem appropriate.

Jan 18, 2014 8:34 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Marvellen McLaughlin 6 points

Way too much!

Jan 18, 2014 2:53 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



MMR456 21 points

Very housing dense. If all of that housing is indeed geared towards families, presumably with school-aged children, then where are all of those children going to go to school? Evening Street is already bursting at the seams, with overflow being handled by the McConnell Arts Center. I would rather not imagine the school zoning issue that this scenario would undoubtedly engender in the community.

Jan 19, 2014 11:16 AM | [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.

Jan 21, 2014 11:20 AM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



smagill15 31 points

Too much office space. Everything seems jammed together in this one- so many office buildings, so many townhomes right on top of each other- not enough green space.

Jan 22, 2014 12:37 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](#)

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](#)



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 4:12 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Glenn Tucker 18 points

I don't think this plan works, too much traffic in the old existing neighborhoods, I live close to Evening St Elementary. Try driving around 5:30 6:00

Jan 26, 2014 9:03 AM

[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 1:29 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Pamela Fair 10 points

All of the scenarios lack sufficient green space, but this one is the worst with a measly 1.2 acres. Further, all the scenarios lack any imagination, and are merely variations on a theme of too dense housing, lack of green space, unneeded office space, and traffic problems.

Jan 27, 2014 9:32 AM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

Comments I've heard: 1) I do not like the way such buildings look; I do not wish to see such buildings near where I live. 2) Those types of buildings will be slums in 20, 30, 40+ years. 3) Persons who live in those buildings are not the type of people I want in our city. 4) Such higher density will bring in too many children which stresses our school system. 5) Having such buildings will destroy the character of Worthington, not enhance it. 6) Having 400+ residential units would create a traffic nightmare (see my traffic comment in Scenario 2).

Answers to the above: A) Such buildings already exist in our city: Apartments/duplexes on east side of High opposite Riverlea; on Pittsfield Dr, Proprietors Rd and North St east of Morning; east & south of St Michael's; south side of Short St diagonal from post office; Morning & Stafford; Morning & Clearview; sr apartments at Hartford-Stafford, on Highland not far from High; Residences at Worthington (condo) south of Rutherford-Corbin.

Jan 27, 2014 5:15 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

Answers cont'd...

B) Many of those buildings are decades old & they're not slums. C) Are "the types" of people living in those buildings not the types we want in our city? I have heard fewer complaints about them than what I rarely hear about residents in single family neighborhoods. Residents living in our city's current dense housing buildings are an asset, not a debit. They have been a part of Wor for a long time and adding some more of them, along with more single-family home folks, would not degrade the character of Wor. D) Do the current apartments' children stress our schools more than the children in single family homes? Can our schools handle further enrollment increases? The superintendent of WPS stated he does not foresee a problem with more children that might attend from dense UMCH buildings.

Jan 27, 2014 5:17 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



Fred Yaeger 32 points

Answers concluded....

E) I do not hear any complaints about how existing denser residential housing destroys the character of Worthington. I even wonder how many residents notice them much or at all. Would the character of Worthington be changed if there were no apartments in the city? Yes. Would such change be for the better? No - people there add to the character of Wor. Would the character become worse with more dense housing/retail/office? Not if the structures are well-designed, built and maintained as seen in the older dense housing already in our city.

Jan 27, 2014 5:18 PM

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[Fred Yaeger](#) 32 points

0

[Worthington](#) [Help](#)

Answers concluded.....

E) I do not hear any complaints about how existing denser residential housing destroys the character of Worthington. I even wonder how many residents notice them much or at all. Would the character of Worthington be changed if there we no apartments in the city? Yes. Would such change be for the better? No - people there add to the character of Wor. Would the character become worse with more dense housing/retail/office? Not if the structures are well-designed, built and maintained as seen in the older dense housing already in our city.

Jan 27, 2014 5:18 PM | [Flag as Inappropriate](#)

[Reply](#)



[Worthington Ohio](#) 29 points

You have 1000 characters left.

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