

Meeting Notes from Tuesday, October 5, 2015 meeting of the UAC Zoning Committee:

6:00 PM – Business/administrative session. We discussed briefly discussed the following topics:

- Review of agenda & tabled applicant cases – 357 W. 7th Ave. (new 4-car garage).
- Motion to adopt a strategy to limit each zoning case discussion to ½ hour per applicant – Pasquale; second – Dick. Pasquale proposed motion similar to that used at UARB meetings. Works to move agenda so that meetings won't linger late into the evening. Committees may establish own rules, per bylaws. For –6; Against –0; Abstentions – 1. Motion is approved and will be adopted at tonight's meeting.
- Craig agreed to record motions and votes for this meeting.

PRESENT: Rory Krupp, Susan Keeny, Deb Supelak, Pasquale Grado, Dick Talbot, Craig Bouska, Seth Golding (arrived after 6:30),

EXCUSED/ABSENT: Tom Wildman, Joyce Hughes

VISITORS:

6:30 PM – Applicant(s):

1. **1530 Grant Avenue** – A request for both a rezoning and a council variance to construct a new multi-unit apartment building in a C4 zone. Proposed building is on Grant between 11th and Chittenden. Applicant is architect Bhakti Bania. The applicant presented previously to the zoning committee in April and last month. At last month's meeting, the Zoning Committee voted to disapprove the requests for variances. The applicant then tabled the case, and it did not proceed to the full commission for a final vote. Since then, the architect, in consultation with the owner, has revised the site plan and building design. The next step for the zoning committee regarding this applicant - to entertain a [motion to reconsider](#) the previous zoning committee vote.

Discussion:

- Susan noted that this committee has voted to reconsider a case a few years ago– the proposed COOP Café at Indianola & Cliffside.
- In light of significant revisions to the site plan, the committee agreed to entertain a motion to reconsider.

Motion to reconsider the request for Rezoning & Council Variance for 1530 Grant Avenue: Dick Talbot; seconded: Craig Bouska. For –6; Against – 0; Abstentions –1. Motion to reconsider is approved.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Architect Bhakti Bania noted concerns from committee expressed at last month's meeting involved overall building size & the lack of green space.
- Major revisions to the plan:
 - Building is now divided into **2 buildings** – North Building = 3,808 SF & South Building = 4,076 SF. (*Eliminates variance Section 3372.566, Building Separation & Size (C) - maximum allowable calculated floor area of 10,200 SF.*)
 - Created parking at the rear (east) side of buildings, near RR tracks. (*Eliminates variance Section 3372.521, Supplemental Parking Requirements: to permit parking & maneuvering between the building & Chittenden Ave. since no parking or maneuvering is permitted between any building & public street.*)
 - Moved dumpster out of R.O.W. – (*Eliminates variance Section 3372.569, Refuse Storage (A): to permit refuse storage in required setback from R.O.W.*)
 - Created greenspace along Grant Ave.
 - **16 units** (previous plan had 18 units) – each building has 8 units each.
- **34 beds** – same as previous plan:
 - Same number of 3-bedroom units, increased 2-bedroom units, eliminated 1-bedroom units:
 - 2, 3-bedroom units;
 - 14, 2-bedroom units;
 - 0, 1-bedroom units.
- Current (2) variance requests are:
 - **Section 3372.565, Building Lines:**
 - Required setback from Grant = 30 FT.

- Actual setback from Grant – North Bldg. = 11'-6", South Bldg. = 14'-9"
 - Required setback from 11th = 50 FT.
 - Actual setback from 11th = 10 FT.
 - Required setback from Chittenden = 25 FT.
 - Actual setback from Chittenden = 10 FT.
 - **Section 3312.27, Parking Setback Line (2):**
 - Required parking setback = 25 FT. from R.O.W.
 - Actual parking setback is 7'-7" from 11th Avenue
- Revised Plan has not yet been presented to Weinland Park Housing Committee

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Pasquale commented that building still does not have direct pedestrian access off the main street façade – Grant Ave. Question: Why doesn't applicant want pedestrian access off the street, similar to the vernacular architecture of surrounding buildings? Response: This is an apartment building structure versus single family homes in neighborhood.
- Rory still would like to see access from the street for the building units.
- Dick appreciates the new configuration and the new, large green space created that borders the parking lot but allows some sight lines to parking lot; legitimate attempt to split the building, as suggested at last meeting.
- Deb note the new building footprint is more consistent with neighborhood
- Question: Is there sidewalk along Grant? Response: Yes. Developer is providing, not the city.
- Question: Is the courtyard (between buildings) locked? Response: Breezeway is open to the air but gated.
- Applicant plans to go back to Weinland Park Housing Committee
- Consensus that applicant has made great strides to integrate plan better into neighborhood, but would still like to see more connection to Grant – more street engagement.
- Applicant commended on amount of trees added to plan
- JC Hanks, property owner, noted benefits of revised plan:
 - Split the large building into two buildings
 - Maintained living spaces oriented toward Grant & drives kept toward back of property
 - Building access via interior corridor provides more security for tenants;
 - Would rather have pedestrian activity focused on street rather than loitering up on individual's front porches
 - Initially preferred not to break up building, but resultant massing is better now
 - More green space adds to property
- Pasquale still doesn't find plan contextual with neighborhood, but it's understood that we are voting on variances only.
- Seth questioned about proximity to fairgrounds site and potential for homeless to linger on this property. Response: Gates at each side of 'open air' internal corridor to be locked. Security very important to success of new apartments.
- Complimented that applicant included expense of adding sidewalk along Grant to project scope of work. Comment that with major expense of adding this sidewalk, applicant should strongly consider extending concrete walks to connect public sidewalk to individual units – not that much additional pavement required to do that.
- Committee had overall sense that plan revisions have improved project. Still a concern with lack of street engagement. But appreciated applicant's willingness to work with committee to achieve project that is more appropriate for neighborhood.
- Committee recommended that applicant continue to meet & work with Weinland Park Housing Committee as project moves forward. Applicant agreed.

Motion to approve the request for Rezoning: Dick Talbot; seconded: Deb Supelak. For – 5; Against – 1; Abstentions – 1. Motion is **approved.**

Motion to approve the request for Council Variance: Dick Talbot; seconded: Seth Golding. For –6; Against –0; Abstentions – 1. Motion is **approved.**

2. **114 E. 5th Avenue** –Karrick Sherrill from Shremshock Architects presented more developed plans for a proposed mixed-use building located on the NW corner of 5th & Summit, at the southern boundary of the University District. This was the 2nd meeting with this applicant.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Plan revisions since previous month's presentation include:
 - Slight reduction in number of units from 35 to **33 units** to relate to adjacent building setbacks
 - Building orientation is same as before with primary elevation along 5th Ave. But additional building elements – masonry 'wing' wall & landscaping – create continuity along Summit.
 - More fully developed elevations
 - Still 4,000 SF of commercial space, but 2,000 SF planned to be *restaurant* use. Increases parking requirement from 62 to **77 required parking spaces – 46 parking spaces provided.**
 - Less landscaped area in revised plan; only 1 tree in parking lot.
 - More 1-bedroom units than 2-bedroom units.
- Plan elements that remain the same:
 - Propose 2 buildings, back to back; frontage on 5th Ave. and alley to the north.
 - Each building - 3 stories ht. Parking on 1st level; townhouse units above.
 - ADA Handicapped Accessible unit on 1st floor.
 - Vehicular access from alley to the west, Francis Place.
 - Francis Place currently one-way traffic (south). Propose to add northbound traffic lane. Traffic Engineering wants widened entrance drive at 5th & Francis Place.
 - No curb cuts along Summit
- Italian Village Commission likes the plan. (A similar project is proposed directly opposite 5th Avenue in the Italian Village).
- Variances being requested are:
 1. Section 3356.03, C-4 Permitted uses: to permit residential uses on the 1st floor of buildings located in a C4 zoning district.
 2. Section 3309.14, Height districts: to permit maximum building height to be 45 ft. in a max. 35 ft. height district.
 3. Section 3312.21(A), Landscaping & screening: to permit the number of required shade trees to be reduced from 4 to 0 trees.
 4. Section 3312.21(A)(2), Landscaping & screening: to permit the min. required soil area in landscaped islands or peninsulas to be reduced from 145 SF to 0SF.
 5. Section 3312.49, Minimum numbers of parking spaces required: to permit the number of required parking spaces to be reduced from 77 to 46 parking spaces.
 6. Section 3321.05 (B)(2), Vision clearance: to permit encroachment into the 30 ft. vision clearance at the corner of 5th & Summit, and into the 10 ft. vision clearance at the intersection of Francis and 5th.
 7. Section 3356.11, C-4 district setback lines: to permit buildings with a residential use to be subject to the same minimum building setback requirements from the R.O.W. as apply to C4 permitted uses – this would be an 8 ft. setback from the Summit St. R.O.W.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Vision clearance is a safety concern at this location. Parcel was built when there were no vision clearance requirements, but still a very busy intersection. 4 lanes of traffic might not require as much vision clearance? Response: have asked for more vision clearance than is needed at alley. At intersection of 5th & Summit, plan tries to relate to established urban architecture. All 4 corners of this intersection will have buildings up to the property line
- Question: Review parking? Response: plan bases parking ratio on 1 parking space/unit + 25% reduction per the Overlay.
- Committee appreciated *not* developing 3-4 bedroom units - mainly 1 & 2-bedroom units.
- Question: has there been input from Traffic Management? Response: not yet – waiting.
- Seth noted that Short North cut back on parking requirement. Disagreement among committee on whether or not reduce parking requirements have negatively impacted Short North.
- Proposal that if applicant agrees, to wait for input from Traffic Management prior to voting on the variance requests.
- Applicant and zoning committee in agreement to delay vote until Traffic Management completes its review of this project. Applicant will return with this information next month.

No vote was taken at this time.

3. **1525 N. High St., Campus Taco Bell Development** – The third meeting to review progress and variances for the proposed mixed-use development on the site of the current Campus Taco Bell. Developer David

Ruma, owner Skip Weiler & attorney Mike Shannon presented revised plans & Council Variance.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- David Ruma reviewed revisions. Most of the mixed use building has remained the same.
 - **6 stories – 70 ft.**
 - **3 levels parking** (1 level below grade, @ grade, mezzanine) – **115 parking spaces**
 - 1st floor commercial along High St. – 4,350 SF retail; 2,800 SF restaurant (1 space /75 SF parking ratio used for both commercial spaces)
- Plan revisions, per committee recommendations, include:
 - **95 units** (decreased from 101 units)
 - **148 beds** (decreased from 158 beds)
 - Modified unit configuration to achieve 1 parking space/**unit** (increased from 0.6 parking spaces/bed)
 - **116 parking spaces** (increased from 115 spaces)
 - At rear (west) façade, building steps back 20 ft. above 3rd story
 - Revised maximum roof height to **72 ft.**, exclusive of decorative cornices & roof top mechanical equipment (decreased from 75 ft.)
- Requested variances are:
 - **Section 3356.03, Permitted uses in a C4 Commercial District:** to permit ground floor accessory residential uses (leasing office, work-out facility, and computer station/study) exclusively for the use of building residents.
 - **Section 3309.14, Height districts:** to permit a building height of **72 ft.** in a district that limits the height of buildings to 35 ft.
 - **Section 3312.49(C), Min. numbers of parking spaces required:** to reduce required parking for both residential and commercial spaces from **238 to 116** parking spaces.
- Question: Why not step building back on other facades, especially at south side adjacent to existing commercial building? Response: If building were to step back 20 ft. on other facades, would need more 3-4 bedroom units to make building numbers work. Building owner to the south, Buckeye Real Estate, prefers no setbacks to having 3-4 bedroom units adjacent to his property.
- Applicant committed to having 1-2 bedroom units – prefer to have units marketed at young professionals rather than students.
- Could reduce number of units by adding more 3-4 bedroom units, but applicant feels 1-2 bedroom units will be better for project.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Comment that entire building sets back 10 ft. from property line at south elevation, except for portion of parking lot
- Craig – concern that building would be eventually ‘flipped.’ But applicant has worked with community and w/ Buckeye (adjacent neighbor) and spent time discussing setbacks, site plan, and room configurations. Feels this project will be a good neighbor.
 - Discussed balconies on south elevation. Buckeye has no problem with balconies on this elevation.
 - Working on joint walkway between buildings to help make that space safer & easier to maintain for both property owners
- Dick questioned how would paint and maintain building on north side – very tight to adjacent property line.
- Applicant has gone through ‘soft’ preliminary review with planning & traffic management @ the city. Staff appears to be favorable toward project. Applicant submitted ‘boiler plate’ statement from city with some general comments
- UARB review will be on Oct. 15th.
- Pasquale noted that building height at the alley façade shown on plan indicates 40 ft., not 35 ft. max as per University Plan. Concern that to ignore plan recommendations sets a precedent. Would like to see 35 ft. height limit honored. Response: University Plan recommends 20 ft. setbacks for portions of buildings above 3 stories (or 35 ft.). Proposed plan does step back after 3rd story, which is 40 ft. above grade. 40 ft. needed to accommodate mezzanine parking level.
- Craig commented that trade-off for more parking is a taller building.
- Dick noted that any structure this size will impact adjacent neighborhood. But, applicant was asked for (1)-3rd story setback along alley, & (2)-1 parking space per **unit**. Applicant did this. Commercial parking matches what is used @ existing Gateway garage. Good revised plans.
- Removing existing Taco Bell drive thru supports more pedestrian traffic in neighborhood.
- Project will also make improvements to alley behind.

Motion to approve the request for Council Variance: Craig Bouska ; seconded: Dick Talbot. For –3; Against –2; Abstentions – 1. Motion is approved.

4. **OSU Mixed Use, West Lane Avenue, 2212 Tuttle Park Place** – The 3rd meeting to discuss variances for the mixed use project located at the NE corner of Lane Avenue & Tuttle Park Place. Lynn Wackerly and Jonathan Willette from 4 Points Development presented revised plans and variances.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Applicant began by comparing current code with new University District Plan (UDP), as recommended at the last meeting. Additional sheet submitted lists code variances being requested alongside respective applicable recommendations of the UDP. (*See further discussion that follows*).
- Variances being requested (with revisions noted in red) are:
 - **Section 3309.14, Height Districts:** to permit a building height of **72 ft.** in a district that limits the height of buildings to 35 ft.
 - **Section 3312.49, Min. Number of parking Spaces Required:** to reduce the number of required parking spaces from 90 to **52 spaces.** (*51 parking spaces would be required using 0.375 parking spaces per bed in the UDP.*)
 - **Section 3321.05, Vision Clearance:** to remove the requirement for clear vision triangles at the entrance to the parking garage off Tuttle Park Place, and at the NE rear corner of the building at the intersection of Tuttle Park Place and the alley.
 - **Section 3372.604, Setback Requirements:**
 - **(A):** to increase the permitted max. setback from Lane Ave. from 10 ft. to **15 ft.**
 - **(B):** to permit 6 parking spaces along the side of the building (along Jay Alley) rather than being located behind the principal building with a min. setback of 5 ft.
- The main plan *revisions*:
 - At the rear alley, the building portion above 35 ft. is setback 20 ft. from the alley, per UDP
 - Entire 1st floor set back 5 ft. further from Lane Ave. (15 ft. rather than 10 ft.) to avoid existing underground water line along Lane Avenue. City requires distance of 20 ft. to be maintained between building and water line
 - 5 units (9 bedrooms) added to roof top level to maintain same number of bedrooms.
- Plan elements that remain the same:
 - 54 apartment units (94 bedrooms)
 - 72 ft. building height
 - 2 levels of parking
 - 1900 SF retail on 1st floor facing Lane Ave
 - 3000 SF office on 2nd floor.
 - Entrance only to parking garage off Tuttle Park Pl. – supported by City's Traffic Management.
 - Exit only from parking garage onto alley to the north.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Question: Have the setbacks reduced the amount of parking? Response: No.
- Question: How do you have the same number of bedrooms if building is set back 20 ft.? Response: reconfigured units so bed count and parking remain the same. Additional units added to rooftop plan.
- Question: How will units be lease? Response: leased by bed.
- Comment that 3-bedroom units become 'party units.' Response: tried to avoid 4-5 bedroom units. Only studios, 1 & 2-bedrooms units probably wouldn't make economics work well.
- Comment that "Phase B" (site directly north, by same owner) may have different owner in future. What's preventing developing that lot now? That site will probably require variances. Why not consider both parcels now, so don't have to come back with additional variance requests? Response: north parcel owned by a trust now. Have a 5-year lease w/ 3 years left on the lease. Can have 2-5 year options on lease, but development of that site undetermined at this point.
- Pasquale – point of clarification on last page of plan revisions submitted that columns highlighted in "beige" – these figures are not code. (*See "Project Information" above * & continued discussion below.*)
- Please Note the following points on the University District Plan:
 - UDP *is* the adopted land use plan for the district
 - Guidelines from the UDP are not city code & not intended to supersede conformance with city code requirements & policies. Current code should be used in all calculations and variance requests.
 - UDP can provide a basis for considering development proposals *but should be balanced against the specific site & neighborhood conditions.*

- Other plans submitted this evening used a 1 space/bed ratio for parking. If delete a floor or reduce some commercial will also reduce parking requirement.
- With shallow structural system proposed, & reduced floor-to-floor height, additional floor is added. Appears to be too dense for the site. Also, shortened height for 1st floor commercial not compatible with adjacent buildings.
- Applicant stated they have secured 11 remote parking spaces to fulfill parking requirement. Zoning Committee needs to have a signed long-term lease agreement for these specific spaces in order to consider these parking spaces counted towards the required parking. BZA (Board of Zoning Adjustment) also would like to have this documentation.
- Concern how any parking fees are handled. If *not* included in the rent, students more likely not to pay for parking space and to try to park in adjacent neighborhoods. Negative impact on nearby residents.
- Applicant stated that their plan was revised per the comments at the last meeting and per the guidelines of the UDP.
- Committee feels project is too dense for the site.

Motion to approve the request for Council Variance: Pasquale Grado ; seconded: Dick Talbot. For – 1; Against –5; Abstentions – 1. Motion is *disapproved*.

5. **1976 N. High Street** - a request for graphics variance for off-premise graphics. The specific site is the property adjacent to the Campus McDonalds on High St. Applicant David Hodge presented.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Applicant has leased the space on this wall for potential off-premises advertising mural. Has worked on this for a couple years.
- Requested variances are:
 - **Section 3372.606, Graphics:** to permit off-premises advertising sign
 - **Section 3382.06, Graphics Commission Special Permit:** to allow off-premises graphics.
- This variance request brief was very thorough in its explanation of why the graphics variance should be granted, including citing previous legal cases and photo exhibits.
- Applicant stated that any proposed new graphic mural would have to be reviewed by the Graphics Commission
- New UDP doesn't contemplate this set of circumstances.
- Applicant noted that this variance request will either be loved or hated. Feels this blank wall provides opportunity for cutting edge, artsy, interesting graphics – appropriate for this space
- Sited banners at the Shoe, the Shot, even a billboard on High St. This is a painted mural, not a billboard with flashing lights.
-

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Pasquale noted that 1984 started the cleanup of off-premises advertising graphics along High St. Community in support of not wanting this type of advertising
- Are exceptions along High St., but should adhere to consistent design guidelines already written into overlay. Response: This mural is different from a billboard.
- Understood that this mural is *not* a billboard & that not total success in cleaning up all of High St. But there has been significant improvement.
- Susan noted that planning staff not in support of this variance request. Zoning staff hasn't commented yet.
- Rory noted that in theory request sounds good, but nothing prevents advertising vodka/alcohol (as on Weinland Park billboard). Content changes could occur based on amount of money offered for the space.
- Deb commented that advertising doesn't necessarily contribute to healthy lifestyles. Response: UARB approval will provide checks and balances on what is advertised.
- Craig approved of public art. But that is different from advertising. Ohio Stadium cited in variance request is in its own separate zoning district.
- District is in midst of great change. Want to get this right the 1st time. Don't want district to be burdened with 'bad' advertising. Response: If someone proposed this in urban spine of Bexley, would support this (*David sits on Bexley's planning commission*).
- Applicant commented that not good to have a large blank wall.
- Concern that to have entire wall covered with graphics is excessive. Concern with how big mural would be (exhibit 1 shows entire brick wall eligible for graphics.)
- Concern that 1 person could lease space to another for advertising. Response: applicant

intentionally vague on size of mural & wall size to not limit creativity. City can place any conditions it wants on variance such as no alcohol, no tobacco, etc. Applicant will be leasing site & seeking vendors.

- Comment that overlay clearly states off-premises signs are prohibited. Response: Applicant aware that commission may not be in support of this project.
- Applicant applauded for creative way to earned income. Suggested turning to OSU & Wexner Art Center to find potential spots for off-premises advertising on their buildings.
- Applicant commended for a courteous, professional presentation in the midst of little support for his project.

Motion to approve the request for Graphics Commission Variance: Craig Bouska; seconded: Dick Talbot. For –0; Against –7; Abstentions – 0. Motion is disapproved.

6. **357 W. 7th Ave.** – request for reduced side yard to construct a new 4-car garage. **TABLED.**
7. **67 E. 15th Avenue, Delta Tau Delta Fraternity** – request for a 3-story addition to an existing 3-story fraternity house to accommodate sophomores per the OSU's new STEP program. This is the 2nd meeting with this applicant. The request was tabled at the May zoning committee meeting until further information could be gathered on any STEP program building requirements. Presenters were attorney Nick Cavalaris, Delta Tau Delta alumni volunteer, Buck Byrne and architect, Joe Segna.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Existing house is 12,781 SF; addition is 5,087 SF.
- Adding 3,000 SF to building footprint.
- Reason? - STEP program. If agree to the rules of this program can house sophomores.
- Have discussed project with Campus Partners
- Fraternity lies just outside the new CPD created for the 15th & High St. Project – 200 ft. from High St. – has been there 60 years
- 3-story addition has parking on 1st level at grade.
- Plan tries to balance parking with open space, walkability of site. Parking area is landscaped & has grid paving w/ openings for grass – helps mitigate storm water runoff
- They have a 3-year parking lease at the KKG house adjacent to their property. (*Lease not presented at this meeting.*)
- **14 parking spaces** provided on site. Not all utilized by fraternity.
- **28 rooms; 36 beds.** Would like to see *60 beds in the future.*
- Updated list of variances being requested are:
 - **Section 3372.564, Parking:** for a substantial rehab of an original contributing building, the formula in this section = 21 required parking spaces. 14 spaces provided. Parking reduction is **7 spaces.**
 - **Section 3372.566, Building size and separation:** No building shall exceed 10,200 SF. Existing building is 12,781SF. Total proposed building square footage = 17,868 SF which exceeds building limit by **7,668 SF.**
 - **Section 3372.567, Max. Floor Area:** maximum F.A.R. permitted for this AR4 zone = 0.80. Proposed building F.A.R. = 0.09, exceeding limit by **2,118 SF.**
 - **Section 3372.568, Building Height:** max. allowable highest element other than a chimney = 40 ft. 11.5 ft. of cornice is **42 ft.**
- Adding a net of 3 bedrooms.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Question: Why can't fraternity just make existing spaces better? Why the need for much more square footage? If vote in favor of this then we must vote for all who want to expand their fraternity houses.
- Question: What happens to these buildings when the fraternity is disbanded? (*Such instances have recently occurred*). Makes it very difficult to recycle these very large buildings. Response: master lease on fraternity is with OSU.
- Question: Why not house just sophomores? Response: need leadership of 3rd & 4th year students. Not enough space to house all sophomore members now.
- If fraternity cannot provide the space, students will go elsewhere, & membership will decline
- Clarify that fraternity must rent to OSU students, participate in Student Life meetings, & maintain GPA.
- Applicant presented OSU document on STEP program from the office of Student Life – 1st document that zoning committee has had on this program. Document very vague in terms of types of required spaces in living facilities – no sizes, minimum or maximum space requirements.

- Comment that OSU unilaterally created this program without input from fraternities and sororities or area commission. Recycling that size of a building very difficult. Proposed building and variance request is too large.
- Pasquale noted that there had been 7 years work to relocate Evans Scholars residence house. Now they rent space from another group. Greater parking needs than ever anticipated 7 years ago
- Observation that OSU knew that only 3200 beds would be built on campus and need that many more beds. Why not utilize vacant beds available in the core campus area? Some old fraternity buildings have been recycled into new housing options.
- Comment that we are all caught in a transition period – difficult to accommodate all sophomores successfully into good housing options off campus. Sympathize with applicant’s dilemma.
- Question: does fraternity rent parking spaces? Are students charged for each car? Response: Have an agreement with KKG house for 20 spaces.
- Comment that there has been talk of preserving a “fraternity row” as a separate district. Location is coveted spot near campus.
- STEP program had 2 years of beta tests. Designed to retain students on campus and graduate them.
- Further discussion of zoning committee’s vote on this variance request: Could vote tonight and include comments on the STEP program in letter of recommendation to highlight difficulty of these variance requests. Or could postpone vote until meeting with OSU can be scheduled to discuss STEP program and its ramifications. Response: Applicant doesn’t know if waiting a month will result in a meeting with OSU. (*Susan has been in communication with an OSU person to try to facilitate a meeting between UAC and OSU regarding the STEP program. To date, nothing is scheduled*).
- Comment that more such variance requests anticipated. Wise to push for meeting with OSU before too many more projects are underway
- In the end, applicant requested the zoning committee’s vote on the requested variances, with the understanding that there would be the potential of a negative vote.

Motion to approve the request for Variance for 67 E. 15th Avenue: Dick Talbot; seconded: Seth Golding. For –1; Against – 6; Abstentions – 0. Motion is disapproved.

8. **7th & High St.** – This application for Council Variance was presented to and voted upon by the zoning committee in May 2015. The zoning committee voted to recommend approval of the variances *except* for the vision clearance variance. This recommendation was presented to the UAC meeting in May 2015. At that meeting, the UAC voted to disapprove the entire request for council variances for this project. As additional information, Traffic Management was also not in support of the requested variances. However, Planning staff *did* support these variance requests.

Since these meetings, the applicant has revised the plan to bring it more in line with comments presented from the UAC. The resulting plan features a residential parking formula of **1 parking space per bed**, (*The previous plan featured 0.375 spaces per bed*). The parking garage expanded on the lower level to permit an increase from 108 to **156 residential parking spaces**.

A note on how to proceed with this plan change was sent by David Hegley who advised that we cannot revote an issue. Pending further input on this matter from the city attorney and staff, the zoning committee felt it could not proceed at this time with any reconsideration vote or any recommendations.

No vote was taken.

VOTING RESULTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING: October 5, 2015

MEMBER	Craig Bouska	Seth Golding	Joyce Hughes	Susan Keeny	Rory Krupp	Deb Supelak	Dick Talbot	Tom Wildman	Pasquale Grado
Attendance	Present	Present	Excused	Present	Present	Present	Present	Absent	Present
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*	Y-N-A-R*
Motion to limit discussion of each case to ½ hour.	Y	A		Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
1530 Grant – motion to reconsider	Y	A		Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
1530 Grant Avenue-rezoning	Y	A		Y	N	Y	Y		Y
1530 Grant Ave-council variance	Y	A		Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
114 E 5th Avenue – NO VOTE									
Campus Taco Bell	Y	A		Y	Absent for vote	N	Y		N
OSU Mixed Use, West Lane Ave	Y	N		N	A	N	N		N
1976 N. High Street	N	N		N	N	N	N		N
67 E. 15th Ave.	N	N		N	N	N	Y		N
7th & High St. – NO VOTE									

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

The following link is to the on-line zoning code, for your use and information:

https://www.municode.com/library/oh/columbus/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT33ZOCO

For Commission Presentations:

Commissioners may speak twice, up to 3 minutes each time per Bylaws Article IV, Section 1(b).

For All Zoning Presentations:

Applicants will present at the next University Area Commission (UAC) meeting which will take place (*unless otherwise notified*) on **Wednesday, August 19, 2015** 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 presents their specific case – the specific variances requested, any plans, photos of existing properties, and a statement of hardship as to why the particular request should be granted. There is also an available overhead screen and projector for applicant

power point presentations. 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 our REVISED bylaws, Article IV – MEETINGS, Section 7:

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

1. Zoning Committee presents the facts of the case - **5 min. max**
2. Applicant Presentation - **7 min. max**
3. Zoning Committee report – **5 min. max**
4. Public comment (max 3 people each pro/con) - **2 min each (max)**. Only those who complete speaker slips prior to the case being heard will be considered for speaking based on the order the slips were received
5. Commissioner discussion: Commissioner who wishes may speak once per round for **1 min (max) for 2 rounds**. A Commissioner cannot save time for their second round or transfer their remaining time to someone else
6. Applicant response - **3 min (max)**
7. Commission vote
8. A motion to extend the max time limits can be made at the beginning of the case stating which portion(s) should be extended and by how long. The motion must pass by two-thirds (2/3) majority with no debate on this motion.