

Meeting Notes from Monday, August 4, 2014 meeting of the UAC Zoning Committee:

6:00 PM – Business/administrative session began at the South Gateway site, to walk the property with the Zoning Committee and the community. We then continued at the Pride Center for the rest of the agenda.

PRESENT: Ethan Hansen, Joyce Hughes, Seth Golding, Craig Bouska, Tom Wildman, Colin Odden, Dick Talbot, Susan Keeny

EXCUSED/ABSENT:

VISITORS: Amanda Hoffsis, President of Campus Partners; Keith Myers, FASLA, Associate Vice, President Physical Planning and Real Estate, Chair; Laura Bidwa; Rory Krupp; & other residents of Weinland Park, Deb Supelak

7:00 PM – Applicant(s):

1. **South Gateway Project** – This meeting was the 3rd meeting with the UAC Zoning Committee regarding the rezoning application for the proposed development package for the parcel located south of Gateway & east of High Street, in Weinland Park. The property is currently owned by Campus Partners. The intention is to create a CPD (Commercial Planned Development) which is a very specific, unique, registered site plan and text to describe the particular area as to how it may be developed. It becomes the zoning for the site. The current zoning of the site is ARO & R4.

As a *reminder*, the purpose of a CPD, the following code section is included herein:

Section 3361.01 - Purposes:

The purposes of the commercial planned development district are:

- (a) To encourage development of an overall design concept for commercial developments designed to be integrated into, and be compatible with surrounding environment;
- (b) To encourage development of an overall design concept for commercial developments to encourage an internal environment which will provide for the typical behaviors of the expected users;
- (c) To encourage development of an overall design concept for commercial development designed to integrate the proposal with the existing conditions to form a functioning overall environment.

Campus Partners desires to have the CPD zoning approved prior to seeking developer proposals. It is planned there would be one developer for the entire site.

Project Information, Summary / Presentation:

- There has been much discussion about the project and good input/collaboration from the community.
- Community meetings scheduled include:
 - July 16: UAC
 - July 17: UARB
 - Aug. 12: Weinland Park Housing Committee
 - Aug. 20: UAC
 - Aug. 21: UARB
- Campus Partners acknowledged some 'misses' on their part and have worked to take this information and revise the project documents – CPD & Urban Infrastructure Plan
- Common community concerns: building heights, setbacks, density, architecture
- Revised plan still proposes 4 subareas:
 - Subarea A: east of High between E. 9th & E. 8th and Pearl
 - Subarea B1/B2: south side of E. 9th
 - Subarea C1/C2: north side of E. 8th
 - Subarea D1/D2: south side of E. 8th
- Main goal of plan revisions: to reflect the neighborhood and respect existing contributing architecture
 - Subarea A should reflect the existing Campus Gateway
 - Subareas B-D should reflect the traditional nature of the existing housing stock
 - Language in the Urban Infrastructure Plan will reflect these goals
 - Trees: 1 ea. per **10** parking spaces (revised from 1 tree ea. per 20 parking spaces)
 - Urban Framework Plan will be called out and referenced in the CPD text to insure planning goals
 - Number of units: **500 units** (revised from 525)

- No unit will have more than 4 bedrooms
- Max. of **145 units** with **3 & 4 bedrooms**
- Max. of **65 units** with **4 bedrooms**
- **High Street – Subarea A**
 - Regional Mixed Use along High St. Current draft University Plan proposes Regional Mixed Use along High Street - max. 75 ft. building height.
 - New CPD calls for max. **72 ft. building height** (revised from 90 ft. building height).
 - Curb-to-building setback along High St. will match that of current Gateway.
 - Existing Gateway surplus parking of 300 spaces to be used for Subarea A parking only.
- **“Euclid Alley” - Subareas D:**
 - Average height of existing houses: 33 ft.
 - Proposed building height: **45 feet** (per current draft University Plan)
 - Setback for 1st 100 ft. from High Street: **10 ft.**
 - Setback for rest of “Euclid Alley”: **30 ft.** This will be primarily a green space barrier.
- **E. 8th Avenue – Subareas C-D:**
 - Maximum building height in Subarea C revised from 75 ft. to **60 feet**.
 - Maximum building height in Subarea D revised from 60 ft. to **45feet**.
 - 50 foot right-of-way includes 30 ft. wide street plus 10 feet to building setback line on each side of street
 - Building height steps down to **45 feet** along Section Alley
 - At existing park there is 16 foot alley plus 10 foot setback line
- **E. 9th Avenue – Subarea B:**
 - Maximum building height revised from 75 feet to **60 feet**.
 - 26 foot wide street plus 18 ft. setback line on the north side of 9th & 16 ft. setback line on the south side of 9th. Additional 10 foot setbacks added to each street side.
- Campus Partners presented the above information in a clear graphic format through their revised power point presentation

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Campus Partners worked with UAC on developing current Design Guidelines for High St.
- Tom expressed that UARB was not of similar opinion with the High Street Guidelines. Felt the proposed would go forward with or without the UAC’s input
- Collin commented that process can involve getting into agreements with developers and then developer not living up to agreements. Campus Partners’ working relationship with UAC and community does not end with this project which encourages optimism. Urged us all to be vigilant and put time into future meetings with UARB when this project is on their agenda.
- Tom expressed appreciation with Campus Partners working with the community. Stated that High St. Guidelines featured 3 stories on High St. & Campus Partners in the past stated they would not remove the corps residential neighborhood. Does not want the parking garage to count toward the project’s parking requirement
- Collin noted that High St. Design Guidelines discuss relationship to neighborhood & that density shouldn’t cross east of Pearl Alley
- Committee reminded that new University Plan currently being developed incorporates previous guidelines, including the High St. Guidelines, and that there are changes in those guidelines that have been presented and discussed (for ex., max. building heights along High St. are not 3 stories but 75 feet).
- Craig urged us to work cooperatively with developers. Keith Myers has been involved with successful projects (Arena District, Over-the-Rhine in Cincinnati) & we have his ear. Noted that there is still time for conversation & input on this project. This project could provide affordable housing type for young adults needed who can’t afford Short North or Arena Dist. rents. “Sophomore Rule” could encourage negligent property owner to either improve properties or sell them.
- Dick thanked Campus Partners for listening to community & to the UAC, and responding to most all of the concerns expressed. This comment echoed by several at meeting. Plan changes indicate that goals of good architecture & limited density were supported. Project is richer for having had these conversations.
- Joyce noted that in Weinland Park, Campus Partners learned from their mistakes & that this project shows positive growth of Campus Partners. They listened to all neighbors and made changes to the plan that addressed most (not all) community concerns. City Council will pass this. We have opportunity to work with both Campus Partners & the selected developer. Will support this proposal.

- Jen asked how the F.A.R. translates into buildings. Doesn't want to see a dominant amount of parking on site. Why not use the 300 existing parking garage spaces for the entire site?
Response: There is direct relationship between building square footage & site, & between buildings and parking that must be worked out *on site* by the developer. More building requires more parking and vice versa. This will be a design issue for the developer.
- Keith supports capping the parking. Developers will most likely have to build some type of structured parking.
- Ethan echoed supporting a limited parking requirement. Too much parking already. We must work with City to create more green space, less parking
- Deb Supelak compared project to a nuclear blast – she doesn't live @ ground zero but is in the blast zone. Wondered how this project will change market in the long term. How will it benefit the neighbors, and how Campus Partners will address the original goals of single family affordable houses?
- Keith responded:
 - Currently 26 development properties in Weinland Park, some single family, some multi-family
 - South Gateway site costs OSU \$30,000 per month to maintain. Once this site is turned over to developer, this money could go toward more neighborhood home ownership.
 - Gateway project could reduce spread of non-contributing, oversized additions to single family residences in more residential parts of district.
- Comment that term "affordable housing" brings a negative image to the neighborhood.
- Response that jobs more an issue than "affordable housing". Only 4 families financially qualified to take advantage of affordable housing
- Improved infrastructure critical to enhancement of neighborhood – power lines, sidewalks, park development, etc.
- Still concerns about:
 - Building heights adjacent to Euclid Ave. Too many young urban professionals that might limit existing diversity of neighborhood,
 - Need for 'kid-friendly' infrastructures for families.
 - Privacy of adjacent homes – neighbors purchased properties with certain expectation of privacy
 - Light pollution
 - Tall buildings will make area feel 'canyon-like.
- Apartment buildings have elevators which could be attractive to older residents who might need accessible dwelling units.
- Amanda acknowledged parking concerns & endorsed permit parking. Campus Partners has vested interest in project w/ hard-earned reputation to protect.
- Keith commented:
 - Alleys will not be used as parking solutions
 - Dense line of trees along project site will 'soften' impact
 - Increased setbacks will help address privacy issues
 - Urban areas often deal with light pollution. Cut-off shields on pole lights & lower acorn-type lights throughout
 - Transformer step-down boxes must be above ground per code. But these will be in designated, less prominent areas as allowed by code
- Susan reported that the Zoning Committee had met the week before to walk the site and make observations. It is interesting to note that many of their recommendations are very close to the plan revisions made by Campus Partners. The following are their comments and recommendations:
 - Setbacks: In Subarea D, setbacks should be 35 feet minimum; In Subareas B & C, setbacks should be 23 ft. to 25 ft. back from the curb
 - Sidewalks should be a min. of 6 feet wide for pedestrian & wheelchair/stroller passing
 - Planting strip between sidewalk and curb should be wide (approx. 5-6 feet min.) enough to accommodate large street trees along all streets
 - Recommend permit parking for neighborhood
 - Acorn decorative street lights along streets – gives residential feel to neighborhood
 - Try to locate wires underground and not overhead, if possible
 - Alley south of 8th Avenue should be concrete pavement due to future heavy traffic
 - Existing 300 parking spaces in Gateway Garage should be dedicated only for Subarea A parking requirement
 - The rest of the parking requirement must be handled by developer on site
 - Would prefer to see units with no more than 1-2 bedroom units throughout development

Motion to support the request for rezoning for the proposed South Gateway project: Dick Talbot; Seconded: Joyce Hughes. For – 5; Against – 0; Abstentions – 2. MOTION PASSES.

2. **1774 N. High Street** – This is a request to approve an expanded list of uses for an existing CPD located along High St. at site of the former College Town Bookstore. The current permitted use is only as a bookstore.

Project Information, Summary / Presentation:

- Zoning changed in 1998 from a C4 to a CPD – prior to UARB review; architecture of building not seen as positive image along High St.
- Interior space is a 2-story volume with mezzanine plus a 3rd floor , all zoned C4
- Was a former bar prior to rezoning to bookstore
- Dec. 2013 College Town Bookstore vacated due to lack of business
- C-4 uses are typical for business all along High Street.
- If new uses are approved, applicant must go before UARB for approvals as required
- Applicant sees current bookstore use as too restrictive; difficult to rent space

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Dick noted that previous bar was a notorious ‘mega bar’ and that commission felt at that time that no more bars were needed on High Street
- Dick also noted that current owner thought a bookstore was always a reliable, long-term business venture. Never anticipated that bookstores would not be needed
- Concern about allowing a 2-story bar again, with potential that such an establishment would again encourage behavior with negative impact on area; Response: History does not necessarily repeat itself
- Comment – can we tell applicant to not be successful?
- Bars very current and popular – Bar Rescue TV show – and usually very profitable in a college town. Would like to see something more *creative* than another bar in this space
- Recommendation: Expand the list of uses but not a bar at this time. If property still not rentable after a year, then come back to apply for inclusion of bar in list of permitted uses–‘*elegant*’ solution?
- Would owner consider not allowing bar in this space? Response: Owner would not consider this acceptable. This would be an additional \$10,000+cost to owner to wait 1 year. Not practical
- Owner in a very difficult position; High Street is a preferred place for a bar, but still would like to see more creative solution than a bar

Motion to support the request for rezoning to expand the list of permitted uses in the CPD for the commercial property located at 1774 N. High Street: Colin Odden; Seconded: Joyce Hughes. For – 4; Against – 1; Abstentions – 2. MOTION PASSES.

3. **Iuka Part Commons** – This is a request for additional variances for a proposed off-premises monument sign. There was only one prior variance for an off-premises sign that was submitted and approved by the UAC at their June meeting. The case has not yet been heard by the Graphics Commission.

Project Information, Summary / Presentation:

- To summarize, the project was presented and voted on and approved last month. There was just one variance request for permission to install an off-premises sign. Since then, it was discovered that there are a total of 5 variances that need to be requested. They are as follows:
 - **Section 3376.04(A)** - Residential complex identification signs: To allow manual changeable copy on identification sign in a residential district.
 - **Section 3376.04(B)** - Residential complex identification signs: To reduce the setback of a ground sign from 15 feet to 5 feet.
 - **Section 3376.04(C)** - Residential complex identification signs: To reduce the setbacks of an illuminated ground sign in a residentially or institutionally zoned district from 50 feet to 0 feet.
 - **Section 3376.04(D)** - Residential complex identification signs: To increase the height of a ground sign from 6 feet to 8 feet.

- **Section 3378.01(D)** - General provisions: A special permit shall be required to allow installation of any permanent or temporary off-premises sign not specifically provided for in this Graphics Code, including, but not limited to, any off-premises directional sign. ***This section was voted on and already approved by the UAC.***
- Deb Supelak asked if this sign has a visual impact to the nearby historic district. Response: the sign is not located within the historic district, therefore is not governed by historic guidelines
- Deb's neighbors did not think previous sign compatible with residential neighborhood. Neighbors have not seen the new revised sign design.
- Tom noted that this neighborhood has changed – more rentals, not as many single family homes
- Ethan applauded the changes and recommended that another tree be planted to replace the one that had to be removed
- Dick stated he has already planted 5 trees behind in his property
- Colin hoped that the illumination would be softer and not too glaringly bright in the neighborhood
- Overall comments that the reduced size of the sign and the way the limited copy is handled makes sign much improved over the last submittal

Motion to support the request for rezoning to expand the list of permitted uses in the CPD for the commercial property located at 1774 N. High Street: Tom Wildman; Seconded: Craig Bouska. For – 5; Against – 0; Abstentions – 2. MOTION PASSES.

VOTING RESULTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING: August 4, 2014

MEMBER	Seth Golding	Ethan Hansen	Joyce Hughes	Susan Keeny	Colin Odden	Dick Talbot	Tom Wildman	Craig Bouska		
Attendance	Absent for vote	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Present	Absent	Absent		
CASE/ VOTE	Y-N-A-R*	Y-N-A-R*	Y-N-A-R*	Y-N-A-R*	Y-N-A-R*	Y-N-A-R*	Y-N-A-R*	Y-N-A-R*		
South Gateway		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A		
1774 N. High St.		A	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y		
Iuka Park Commons		A	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y		

*Y – yes; N – no; A – abstain; R – recused

All applicants will present at the next University Area Commission (UAC) meeting which will take place (*unless otherwise notified*) on **Wednesday, August 20, 2014** at the Northwood & High Building, 2231 North High Street, one block north of Lane Avenue, Room 100. Zoning cases will be heard beginning approximately at 7:15 PM. Applicants are to bring 8 copies of their presentation that best present their specific case – the specific variances requested, plans, photos of existing properties, and a statement of hardship as to why the particular request should be granted. The vote taken by the UAC that evening will be communicated to either the Columbus Board of Zoning Appeals, or City Council, or Graphics Commission, which will make the final determination of all requested variances.

PLEASE NOTE the following parameters for all participants in Commission meetings with regard to zoning cases, per the University Area Commission's Bylaws, Article IV – MEETINGS, Section 7:

The following time limits will be adhered to for all zoning cases heard before the Commission:

1. Applicant presents case - **5 min. max**
2. Zoning Committee report/recommendation - **2 min. max**
3. Public comment (max 3 people each pro/con) - **3 min each max**
4. Applicant rebuttal - **2 min. max**
5. Commission debate - **2 min max** per commissioner who wishes to speak. Each commissioner may speak only once.