

PCPW Worthington City Council Survey, 2019

We appreciate your participation in PCPW's questionnaire. This survey and the resulting Voter Guide will serve the purpose of educating the Worthington electorate on the thinking and underlying values of their City Council candidates on the vital issue of UMCH and its role in our city's future.

For questions that include a Yes/No or Agree/Disagree option, please indicate a clear choice, followed by whatever comments you choose to make. The character limit for each question is 600 characters (about 4 average sentences).

PCPW's vision for the UMCH property includes 10 acres of commercial development (2-3 stories with integrated parking) fronting High Street, which is approximately 25% of the total property acreage. Do you think this is about the right scale of commercial development for the property? Please provide a YES or NO answer, and explain your position.

I think this is a great start. We could do more office, of course, and I don't think anyone would mind that. I think the community is very concerned that apartments, which do not generate net tax revenue for the city, would be built there and I would oppose that generally. PCPW's vision is generally the right one: a mixture of office and parkland.

PCPW's position is that both senior housing and a large signature park can be built within Worthington's city limits. To achieve this, the city would need to locate the park at the only remaining suitable site, i.e., UMCH, while senior housing can be built in multiple, smaller locations in the city. Do you agree or disagree with this position? Please indicate whether you AGREE or DISAGREE, and explain your position.

Agree. We have a lot of senior housing in Worthington already. I grew up here. Think about how many senior centers have been developed since we were kids. Sunrise. Now Bickford. Residences of Worthington. The new project at 161 and Proprietors Road. Another on Wilson Bridge. The Shops at Worthington Place. We have many senior communities that are relatively new - either since I grew up here and under construction today. There's no reason to use UMCH, our only undeveloped site for office and parkland, for that when senior housing can be built, and is being built, virtually anywhere in the city.

What are your thoughts on how the development outcomes at UMCH could impact the children and youth of Worthington, and in what ways?

Supt. Bowers noted at a public forum that if UMCH is built out with apartments or houses, elementary school kids would be moved due to overcrowding. Some assume this means neighborhoods like Potter's Creek might be moved from Evening Street Elementary. Some worry housing might add more to waiting lists for homes in Old Worthington or Estates. It isn't in the city's interest to build houses nor apartments. We are a residential community as it is. We need the tax base from offices. We need the buffer from parkland. It's ideal for that—right by city hall. Community events could be held there.

Does high-density housing fit into your ideal outcome for the UMCH property? Yes or No. If yes, what is the largest number of housing units (apartments, condos, and single-family combined) that you would find acceptable for the UMCH site? Please provide a YES or NO answer, and a number of housing units, if applicable.

I'm not interested in high density housing or apartments at UMC. It's basic economics. Housing does not produce enough money to pay for services like police/fire, parks/rec, or city roads. Apartments are worse. Those who say we have a shortage of housing aren't looking at the new apartments at Worthington Mall, new senior housing on Proprietors, new condos in the Mason's Lodge, new houses on New England, etc. Organic growth is everywhere. Why build a huge apartment complex? It won't pay what offices do for the city, which is key for nice roads, outdoor pool refurb, or new shelter houses.

PCPW believes that a large public green space with amenities—accessible to every member of the community—will better preserve the character of Worthington than would a “new urbanism,” high-density development. Do you agree or disagree with this position? Please indicate whether you AGREE or DISAGREE, and explain your position.

A large public space is a great idea for the site. But, by High Street, I think everyone, including PCPW is proposing offices. The more offices we can build without getting too close to residents, the better for city income taxes—our #1 source of revenue. At the same time, we have a special opportunity to build a park there that is safer for kids than the Village Green, and it’s easier for parking, to host large events, etc. Wouldn’t be nice to listen to music without looking at orange temporary fencing or worrying about kids getting hit by passing cars?

"Worthington currently has sufficient park space." Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Please indicate whether you AGREE or DISAGREE, and explain your position.

Council president discounted a park at UMCH saying we have enough parks. Many residents are offended because she is clearly willing to spend \$3 million McCord for unnecessary changes like a walking path and relocating gardens. If offices could be built on the street facing half of UMCH, it could cost less than \$3 million to buy the rest for a park. The city could make money renting a park shelter, built like Wells Barn at the Conservatory for events. We lack vision on our city council. We need new people and new ideas. Some worry council leaders are too friendly with Lifestyle Communities.

PCPW’s proposed public green space includes amenities such as an amphitheater, rentable event facility, sports field, community gardens, and large open spaces for community events. Please comment on the value of these types of amenities to the Worthington community in comparison to the value of additional commercial and/or residential development.

Many Central Ohio communities enjoy these kinds of amenities. We have a city council that is more interested in spending millions for minor face-lift to McCord Park. It may not be necessary to build it all at once. If the community ever wants to enjoy these amenities, where else could amenities like these be built? Our community is limited in space, and the schools are not offering large areas of space for events.

The current S-1 zoning for 30+ acres of the UMCH site does not allow for residential and/or additional commercial on that portion of the property. Would you vote to rezone the S-1 parcel to allow for high-density residential and/or additional commercial? Please provide a YES or NO answer, and explain your position.

Houses and apartments don’t make economic sense. Leading city officials in Central Ohio know that offices/commercial pay the bills and that rooftops cost money. Voters have a chance to elect city leaders that will act decisively and avoid stagnation and vacillation. Voters can reject leaders supported by developers and others closely associated with developers and choose city leadership that truly focused on a strategic forward path for Worthington.

Have you signed the PCPW petition? Why or why not? Please provide a YES or NO answer.

No. I have not been asked to sign the petition. I can’t recall a time when I have ever signed a petition about pertaining to any issue. Even so, I have stated my position. I am a champion for those residents concerned the future development of the UMCH property would overcrowd our schools. I am a candidate that you can elect that will not be pressing for apartments on the UMCH land. I will be advocating for the solution that will generate the most revenue for the city—offices—and a park.

Have you accepted, or would you accept, any campaign contribution (financial or in-kind) from Lifestyle Communities (LC), or any entity or individual that is legally or professionally associated with Lifestyle Communities (LC)? Please provide a YES or NO answer.

No. I have not accepted, nor will I accept campaign contributions from Lifestyle Communities. I will not accept support from developer-affiliated interests.