

Meeting Notes from Monday, January 4, 2016 meeting of the UAC Zoning Committee:

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

- Time limits for discussion – try to keep to ½ hour per applicant. Can't always keep to this, but is a fair time limit to strive for.
- Parking calculations: current code versus UDP – discuss later
- Potential revisions to zoning code – committee should be thinking about potential zoning changes in consideration of the UDP & the projects that have already come before us this past year. Develop a priority of zoning issues for consideration
- STEP Program update – meeting was to have happened Jan. 5th, but is postponed until later
- Rory will act as chair during discussion of case #6 – 322 W. 7th Ave.

PRESENT: Rory Krupp, Craig Bouska, Susan Keeny, Deb Supelak, Pasquale Grado, Dick Talbot, Seth Golding,

EXCUSED/ABSENT: Tom Wildman, Joyce Hughes

VISITORS: Rachel Beeman,

6:30 PM – Applicant(s):

1. **345-349 W. 8th Avenue** – request for variances to allow a 1-unit side yard addition to an existing 2-family dwelling unit. **TABLED.**
2. **19 E Duncan St** – change of use for a commercial property in the northern end of the district.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Current use is a Hookah Bar.
- Applicant proposes a bar in this location. This is a change of use from Retail to a Drinking/Eating Establishment.
- Applicant also proposes outdoor patio in the space behind the building, and possibly on the east side of the building. He would also like to have a few tables and chairs on Duncan, in front of the bar.
- This is a high density residential area close to High Street.
- Mike's Late Night Slice is also on this parcel, to the east.
- Owner/applicant would like to improve the property.
- Existing building = 1448 SF
- Required parking for this change of use is 20 – 6 (credit for retail) = **14** additional spaces.
- Outdoor dining proposed is 1264 SF. 1264 SF/150 = **9** additional parking spaces.
- Total required parking = **23 spaces.**
- Variance required is a parking variance as follows:
 - **Section 3312.49, Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Required:** to reduce the required parking from 23 spaces to 0 spaces.
- There is no basement so applicant would also like to store a cooler on the back patio
- Parcel currently has two buildings located on it.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Concern with the current Hookah Bar about noise pollution in the adjacent neighborhood.
Response: Owner's intention is that bar would be a quality bar, attracting patrons from Clintonville
- Comment that there is excessive number of liquor permits in the area.
- Concern with noise after hours with an outdoor patio bar.
- Commission has approved previous outdoor patios but always with conditions:
 - No outdoor amplification,
 - No outdoor electronics (outdoor TV screens)
- Question: Is sidewalk wide enough for outdoor dining & has city been contacted regarding an outdoor dining permit if seating is in the R.O.W.? Response: Outdoor seating area will not intrude into the required sidewalk width for pedestrians. City outdoor dining permit will be required and application will be filed.
- Committee noted that there are no measurements or dimensions shown on the site plan to show intended outdoor dining. Square footage (1264 SF) requested on variance form is not related to anything on the plan. Response: Applicant is requesting more square footage to allow for development of outdoor dining to the maximum extent at the rear of the building, at east side adjacent to alley & at front sidewalk near building entrance.
- Committee suggested that applicant prepare more accurate site plan that shows extent of outdoor dining being requested and corresponding square footages. This will determine exact number of parking spaces required. Try to reduce parking variance being requested.
- Concern expressed that requested parking variance will stand for the all buildings & businesses on the existing parcel. Suggestion that Susan contact zoning staff (Jamie Freise) to clarify if variance

- applies to all buildings on parcel or just this proposed business.
- Applicant agreed to table variance request until sufficient information could be provided:
 - New site plan showing extent & boundaries of outdoor dining patios, dimensions and square footages
 - Try to reduce amount of parking being requested
- Susan will contact zoning regarding tabling this case without fines or penalties.

Motion is TABLED until February 2016. No vote was taken at this time.

3. **2453 Neil Avenue** – request for council variance to convert an existing 3-family dwelling unit back to its original single family dwelling unit with Rooming House designation.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- This renovation will repair and improve the existing house without increasing building footprint
- Original owner had not maintained the property – building was a negative impact on neighborhood
- Building was not an apartment when most recent owner occupied the dwelling
- Owner wants to restore multi-family dwelling to original single-family w/ rooming house designation.
- 9 existing bedrooms; 3 existing kitchens
- 2 of the 3 existing kitchens will be removed. 9 bedrooms will remain.
- No change to the Neil Avenue façade
- Staff supports this project:
 - Preserves a residential structure
 - Does not increase the building footprint
- Cleaned yard and completely gutted and cleared out building
- Variances requested are:
 - **Section 3332.037, R2F, Residential District:** to permit a rooming house in an R2F district.
- Property is already part of a lot combination that includes the parcel to the east.
- 0.3 F.A.R. proposed for this project is due to the lot combination.
- 5 parking spaces proposed on the vacant adjacent lot to the east. Parking spaces

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Opening comment that this proposal is not a *single family home*, as proposed by applicant. It is a Rooming House.
- Comment that Rooming House not appropriate use for this property in this neighborhood.
Response: This area not far from 3 higher intensity multi-family parcels area so proposed rooming house use is appropriate in size & density.
- Noted that this parcel is located within an existing Lower Intensity Residential Area. (University District Plan also recommends Lower Intensity Residential for this site). What is intended for the area is more single family housing and less dense student housing
- Pasquale recommended that this house be converted into 2 dwelling units - is consistent with the code. Could support a 2-unit scheme that might be converted to condos later, which might be very marketable in the future.
- Committee noted that Rooming Houses are only permitted in AR-4 zoning districts.
- Committee noted that with a rooming house designation & license, the house could be packed with students in the future – negative impact on the neighborhood.
- Applicant was complimented on intention to save the house and restore its front façade.
- House currently classified as multi-family. This was built prior to down-zoning that occurred in the 1970's.
- Acknowledgement that this is pretty dense area. But adjacent zoning is lower intensity residential. 'Spot zoning' not appropriate or recommended
- Residents in this area have reasonable expectation of living in quiet neighborhood – appeal of this neighborhood
- While the committee appreciated the applicant's desire to renovate the existing structure, they had to support the current zoning and less density in this neighborhood. Therefore they could *not* vote in favor of the requested rooming house use for this property.

Motion to approve the request for council variance for a Rooming House use for the residence located at 2453 Neil Avenue: Rory Krupp; seconded: Seth Golding. For –0; Against –6; Abstentions –1. Motion is *disapproved*.

4. **15 E. Lane, Ohio Crossing** – request for variances for mixed use proposed for the block bordered by Lane Ave. on the north, High St. on the west, & Pearl St. on the east. The owner is Scott Schiff. Mike Shannon & applicant Karrick Sherrill from Shremshock Architects presented. This was a preliminary discussion.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Other proposals for this block have been presented by previous developers and architects. The current proposal combines the parcel at the corner of Lane Avenue & High Street with the back half of the parcels located directly to the south.
- Previous concept plan:
 - 72 ft. building height (started at 88 ft.)
 - 90 parking spaces
 - Parking below grade & 3 levels of parking above grade
 - 117 beds (started at 172 beds)
 - 95 Units (started with 118 units)
 - 3 levels of parking
 - 6 stories (reduced from 7 stories)
- Current proposed plan:
 - 65 building ht. (68 ft. to parapet)
 - 151 parking spaces (includes the 40 existing parking spaces)
 - 62 parking spaces = 8 Ft. wide
 - 76 parking spaces = 9 Ft. wide
 - 7 stacked parking spaces
 - Parking below grade plus 3 levels of parking above grade
 - 5 stories
 - Lane & High parcel (Parcel A) shall remain separate parcel from existing retail site (Parcel B), per recommendation of zoning staff.
- 7 variances requested are as follows:
 - **3309.14 – Height District:** to permit a maximum height of 70 ft. in a 35 ft. maximum height district.
 - **3312.51 – Loading Space:** Loading space shall have minimum dimensions of not less than 12 feet in width and 50 feet in length, exclusive of any driveway, aisle, or other circulation area and shall be located on the same lot as the use they are intended to serve. Applicant requests a variance to allow minimum loading space dimensions of 12 feet in width by 18 feet in length and to allow loading space maneuvering across lot lines.
 - **3312.29 – Parking Space:** To permit a min. rectangular parking area of 8 ft. x 18 ft. rather than the code-required minimum parking space of 9 ft. x 18 ft.; and to permit a max. 7 stacked vehicles rather than the code-required minimum of 1 vehicle stacked parking space.
 - **3312.25 – Maneuvering:** to permit parking spaces to have access & maneuvering over and through other parking spaces and lot lines.
 - **3312.49 – Minimum Numbers of Parking Spaces:**
 - To permit bicycle parking to be located within the parking garage rather than in “highly visible areas.”
 - To reduce the required parking from 235 to 151 (84 space reduction). (The parking requirement for residential uses with four or more dwelling units is 1.5/unit. The parking requirement for eating/drinking commercial retail uses is 1/75 sq. ft. The parking requirement for mercantile commercial retail use is 1/250 sq. ft. Applicant requests a variance for Parcel A to allow a minimum of 38 parking spaces. As a mitigating factor, Parcel B will provide 113 parking spaces (an excess of 37) and will serve both parcels. The Site will provide a minimum total of 151 parking spaces.)
 - **3356.03 – C-4 Permitted Uses:** to permit ground floor residential use accessory use in a C-4 District. Such uses include: onsite leasing office, a workout facility, or a computer station/study for exclusive use by the buildings residents.
 - **3356.05(F)(1) – C-4 District Development Limitations:** to permit residential dwellings above the proposed parking garage in Parcel B without adjoining commercial use. Code allows dwelling units above parking garages or parking lots *only* if the parking facilities are adjoining to one or more other commercial uses.
- The new plans have 30 fewer units and 30 fewer bedrooms than previous schemes
- 60% of proposed units are 1-2 bedroom units.

- Approximately 20 more parking spaces than previous schemes
- Traffic Management supports proposed onsite parking

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Question: Are the elevations the same on both parcels? Response: There is approximate 3'-0" difference in grade from Lane Ave. south. Higher along Pearl than along Lane Ave.
- Question: What are the proposed floor-to-floor heights? Response: 1st floor: 15 ft. clear; 2nd floor: 12 ft.; Floors 3-5: 9 ft. ceiling height.
- Question: What determined mix of bedrooms proposed? Response: Developer did market research. Determined that 3-bedroom units didn't rent well. 4-bedroom units more desirable than 3-bedroom units.
- Question: What is unit mix? Response: 10, 1-bedroom units; 25, 2-bedroom units; 15, 4-bedroom units.
- Question: Any setback along Pearl St.? Response: 5 ft. setback off Pearl
- Question: Does building height calculation include parapets? Response: Building height excludes parapets.
- Pasquale & Deb noted that University District Plan recommends 20 ft. setbacks above 35 ft. for buildings facing alleys. Helps get daylight into alleys. Project should reflect this in its massing.
- Also important to relate to smaller scale of adjacent residential neighborhood to the east.
- Committee noted that project could get closer to a 0.60 parking ratio if accommodate 20 ft. setback off Pearl. Response: May not be able to step back exactly 20 ft. off Pearl, but could revise plan to reflect 'some' step back. Committee Response: Exact number might not be as important as the "gesture" to the adjacent residential neighborhood.
- Suggestion that could "slide" entire floor system from 3rd floor on up to create the recommended step back off Pearl. Response: Structure and fire ratings would need to be investigated 1st.
- Question: What are "amenity" spaces on the 3rd floor? Concern that these could become additional bedrooms. Response: These could be meeting rooms, lounges, & exercise rooms.
- Question: Is laundry on site? Response: Plan is for each unit to have own laundry.
- Question: Are parking designated for residents and commercial patrons? Response: Spaces will be designated for each of these building uses.
- General consensus of committee that project is moving forward in a positive way and has improved from previous schemes.

This was a preliminary discussion. No vote was taken at this time.

5. **131 E. 15th Avenue** – request for variances for an addition to the Delta Gamma Sorority House to comply with the requirements of OSU's STEP Program. **TABLED.** Zoning Committee will be scheduling meeting with OSU to discuss parameters and guidelines of STEP as relates to sorority/fraternity building projects.

6. **322 W. 7th Street** – request for variances for a proposed addition to a single family residence

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Existing 4-square house currently has no eating space in small kitchen, small 2nd floor bath, & little closet space in 3rd floor master bedroom.
- Applicant/owner proposes 3-story addition to the rear of their single family, owner-occupied house.
 - 1st floor: mudroom & kitchen renovation
 - 2nd floor: bathroom renovated into 'ensuite'
 - 3rd floor: walk-in closet for master bedroom
- Applicant also owns corner parcel to the west, which is an open, landscaped area. This will remain a separate parcel.
- Exist. house = 3129 SF; Addition = 388 SF (12% addition)
- Former owners finished 3rd floor into a master suite making existing house F.A.R. 0.54, which is already over the code minimum 0.4 F.A.R.
- Proposed addition will result in 0.6 F.A.R.
- Addition is in area of existing rear porch and increase building footprint by only 73 SF.
- Existing side yard setback is only 1.7 ft. from property line.
- Variances requested are:

- **3372.544, Maximum floor area:** to permit an increase in maximum allowable F.A.R. from 0.4 to 0.6.
- **3332.26 (c)(1), Maximum side yard permitted:** to permit the side yard setback in an R4 zone on a 40 ft. wide lot to be reduced from 3 ft. to 1.7 ft. to make the existing setback conforming.
- The variance regarding side yard setback is not required but often requested for older properties to make the existing condition conforming. This is for existing house only. Addition will have code-required 3 ft. side yard setback.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Applicants would like to have a mudroom and eat-in kitchen on the 1st floor, plus closet space. Currently no closet on 1st floor.
- Applicant selected this neighborhood (The Circles) for close proximity to OSU. Began new position at OSU a year ago.
- This historic 4-square house was once owned by former Governor Celeste.
- Question regarding nature of 'hardship' for this project. Response: Very small kitchen with no space for eating. Difficult to host family, friends and social events. Mudroom will create closet space where none exists now on 1st floor. Just 2 ½ linear ft. of closet space in master bedroom.
- Discussion about 3rd floor renovation:
 - 3rd floor was refinished into a master bedroom suite.
 - This increased F.A.R. to 0.54.
 - No record for permitting of this renovation in the early 90's.
 - Applicant wants to replace existing whirlpool hot tub with an updated bathtub, & increase needed closet space. Currently, clothes are in closet on floor below – very inconvenient.
- Addition will provide adequate space for family visits and entertaining friends and faculty.
- Question: How does proposed project relate to neighboring houses? Response: Neighboring properties have more lot coverage. Proposed addition will step back 3 ft. from property line, per code, and not extend beyond adjacent house to the east.
- Committee supported the request for variances.

Motion to approve the request for variances for the residence located at 322 W. 7th Street: Dick Talbot; seconded: Seth Golding. For –6; Against –0; Abstentions –1. Motion is approved.

7. **2212 Tuttle Park Place** - this is a variance request that was already presented and voted on at the Nov. UAC meeting. The case was tabled at the BZA with the recommendation that the project be revised and resubmitted to the UAC for further review and reconsideration. Jon Willette & Lynn Wackerly from 4 Points Development w/ attorneys Aaron Underhill, Rich Gerhardt & Stephanie Jandik presented.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Very significant project - \$14 million project
- Major items:
 - Clear Vision Triangle – resolved to the satisfaction of Traffic Management: Dan Blechschmidt
 - Setbacks – required to avoid underground utilities
 - Project has met requirements of University District Plan – has support of city staff
 - Building Height & Parking – reduced building height from 72 ft. to 68 ft. and have proposed mechanized parking system to increase parking spaces. Now a difference of 32 parking spaces between plan and current code
- Board of Riverwatch Tower on Lane Ave. has agreed & been authorized to provide overflow parking spaces at their parking facilities. Will provide 30-40 spaces in leased agreement. This will result in 1 space per bedroom. (Dan later stated that there are 76 actual spaces available at Riverwatch).
- Parking spaces will be included in rental fee.
- Parking garage northwest of the project site can lease parking spaces to this project as well.
- Variances requested are:
 - **3309.14, Height districts:** to permit a maximum building height of 68 ft. in a 35 ft. max. height district
 - **3312.49, minimum number of parking spaces required:** Option A: to permit a reduction in parking spaces from 87 spaces to 64 spaces. Option B: to permit a reduction in parking spaces from 88 spaces to 64 spaces. (*Both options utilize the Klaus mechanized parking system*).
 - **3321.05, Vision clearance:** to remove the required vision clearance triangles at the parking garage entrance as this will be an entrance only. Also to remove the required

vision triangle at the back corner of the building at the intersection of Tuttle Park Pl. & the alley with the condition that the openings around the structural 2' x 2' column be covered with mesh panels of a max. 20% opacity.

- **3372.604 (A), Setback requirements:** to permit a 15 ft. setback from Lane Avenue rather than the code max. 10 ft. setback so that the building does not encroach on the right-of-way - due the angled property line
- **3372.604 (B), Setback requirements:** to permit parking spaces to be located along Jay Alley, to the east of the building instead of behind the building, & to extend the brick front of the building to screen the parking.
- Existing building heights along Lane Avenue were presented: Riverwatch Tower: 11 stories (35 ft. height district); 328 W. Lane Ave: 200 ft. height district; Harrison Apartments: 120 ft. height district; OSU dorms: 110 ft. height district. Sites immediately adjacent to project site are in 35 ft. height district.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Pasquale noted that there are no parking spaces to give away at Riverwatch due to a 1987 zoning agreement. Parking spaces can't be given away or leased if they are a part of a previous zoning agreement & are figured into that project's parking requirement.
- Discussion on building height and setback: Height requirements have to do with building massing, compatibility and context. Reducing building height along Lane Avenue also reduces density – a plus. Suggestion to make the building 4 stories at Lane Ave. façade & increase building height toward the rear of the site.
- Setbacks & massing that acknowledge adjacent structures make a gesture toward the neighborhood - becomes an asset to the neighborhood.
- Dick noted that mechanized parking systems not allowed by code. No code sections pertaining to this. Discussion about hand-cranked that might be used if mechanical/electrical systems fail.
- Not much negative comment about mechanized parking systems to be found. Question: Does the system need to be inspected by State? (Unknown at this time).
- Noted that Carlisle's Watch had a Klaus parking system. Dick talked with owner who has regrets about installing this costly system w/ maintenance issues. Owner determined that it cost him approx. \$1 million to park 55 cars. Hindsight would have advised him to build fewer units which would have allowed him to provide standard parking layout.
- Concerning 20 ft. loft spaces, Craig noted that these don't bring in significantly more monthly rent. Suggested below grade parking could work – adds another level of parking. If get rid of loft and add parking, would be amenable to increased building height. "Future Site B" is undefined at this time. Would recommend that this parcel be considered in the total development package.
- Question: What is comparison of normal, 2-deck parking system versus Klaus mechanized parking system? How many parking spaces with each. Response: 54 parking spaces with regular 2-deck parking; 61 spaces with mechanized parking system.
- Question: Will Klaus system take up an entire floor? Response: Depends on car count.
- Dick noted that from day 1, parking and building height have been an issue. Remote parking leases not desirable. Recommends having requirements for building/parking solved on-site. Noted that previous applicant this evening had some creative, on-site design concepts for their specific parking issues.
- Ideal parking ratio: approx. 0.75 parking spaces/bed; Dick noted that workable parking ratio that has been utilized by current mixed-use projects is closer to 0.6 parking spaces/bed.
- Recommendations/ideas to consider in revising plan:
 - Building massing – important to articulate elevations with step backs that relate to adjacent neighborhood context
 - Utilize some 8 ft. wide parking spaces (Sect. 3372.521)
 - Can consider some double-stacked parking spaces
 - Context - consider future potential developments along block – 6 story buildings
 - Eliminate loft spaces
 - Aim for 0.6 parking space/bed ratio
 - Can take building height up to 72 ft. if building utilizes greater setbacks at front and rear facades.
 - Favor the option with less office space; (relative to parking ratio).
- Question: Should plan revisions show Klaus mechanized parking system? Response: Show both Klaus System and standard parking lot layout for comparison purposes.
- Applicant has some positive options to explore and will get back with committee with plan revisions.
-

VOTING RESULTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING: December 7, 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*
345-349 W. 8th Ave. - TABLED									
19 E. Duncan - TABLED									
2453 Neil Avenue	N	A		N	N	N	N		N
131 E. 15th Ave. - TABLED									
322 W. 7th St.	Y	Y		A	Y	Y	Y		Y

*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?nodet=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, January 20, 2016** 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 at least 10 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.