

Meeting Notes from Monday, March 2, 2015 meeting of the UAC Zoning Committee:

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

- Variance applications: Susan reviewed the 3 main types of variance requests – BZA (Board of Zoning Adjustment) Application, Council Variance, and Graphics Commission Variance Application. Passed out zoning definitions and overview.
- Announcement of 15th & High Urban Framework Plan: proposed mixed use development east of High St. across from OSU. Campus Partners to bring proposed CPD to zoning committee next month
- Brief discussion of agenda for the evening.

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

EXCUSED/ABSENT: Joyce Hughes, Ethan Hansen, Dick Talbot, Tom Wildman

VISITORS: Jerry Lowell, L. Camille Dunn, Jim Maniace, Josh Myers, Jared Schiff, Michael Luck, Mike Fitzpatrick, Paul Kwapich

6:30 PM – Applicant(s):

1. **1583 N. 4th Street** – This request for council variance to permit a ground floor residential use in a C-4 zone for a new 2-story residential development on the NW corner of N. 4th and Chittenden. *Tabled until the next month.*
2. **2020 N. High Street, The View on High** – This is a request to approve the final graphics package for the new multi-unit residential development located at the site of the existing Wendy's on High Street. Presenter is Stanley Young from the DaNite Sign Company.
 - **Per Section 3382.07, Graphics Plan, & Section 3377.25 :** to create a graphics plan for 1 or more wall signs identifying the entire use or building on a lot to be utilized in addition to any allowable wall sign serving 1 or more individual activities, provided such signs are a part of an approved graphics plan for the entire use or lot.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- The previous approvals for this project have included a variance for the Wendy's sign on High St., and Certificate of Approvals from the UARB for the building identification sign, parking directional signs and the LED digital parking sign.
- Current submittal for review is regarding the Retail Tenant Signage Criteria for storefronts along High St.
- All tenant store sign lettering will be required to comply with Tenant Signage Criteria
- All tenants must secure proper signage permits
- Future changes to signage or for new tenants must comply with Tenant Signage Criteria
- Signs made of paper, cloth, cardboard, stickers or flags are prohibited
- No moving digital signage
- No backlit panel signs or neon signs
- Individual letters may be backlit or lit by external light fixture.
- JSDI Celmark (developer) will review all signage to make sure it meets all Signage Criteria Guidelines.
- Individual letters on all signs are mounted on the same metal channel.
- Letters are to be no greater than 18" in total height.
- Applicant presented sample letter type and display channel

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Pasquale noted that the 18" do not conform to the design guidelines of the Overlay in the University District. Letters are to be no greater than 12" in height
- Susan noted that design criteria calls out both 18" & 19" high letters. Suggest maintaining district design guidelines found in the Overlay.
- Deb noted a text section stating that JSDI (developer) reserves right to waive any requirement in the Signage Criteria. Suggest that this text be revised so that Tenant Signage Criteria is always maintained.

- Seth appreciated applicant presenting actual sign samples; applicant will provide those at the UAC meeting
- Applicant agreed before the March 18th UAC meeting to:
 - Provide samples of letters and display rail
 - Modify letter height to a max. 12" height
 - Add language that any tenant signage approved by JSDI must also meet the requirements of the Tenant Signage Criteria plus any criteria required by the governing bodies.

Motion to approve the request for the proposed final graphics package for the View on High: Seth Golding; Seconded: Pasquale Grado. For – 6; Against – 0; Abstentions – 0. MOTION PASSES.

3. **1525 N. High Street** – This was a preliminary presentation of a proposed mixed used, multi-story, residential development located at the current site of the Taco Bell on High Street, across from the Campus Gateway. Applicants are owner Skip Weiler & developer David Ruma.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- No variances have been determined yet. Applicant desires to review entire plan as a whole while in conceptual design stage
- Goal:
 - To meet intent and specifications in new University Plan
 - To serve as transition between modern architecture to the north & existing traditional architecture to the south.
 - To promote independent, not communal, living arrangement through mainly studio-type apartments.
- Existing Taco Bell will be demolished
- 1st floor retail – Taco Bell will take one of these retail spaces
- 5 floors of residential above – 1-2 bedroom efficiencies w/ kitchen; no shared living rooms
- Approx. 90 studio apartments; 30, 2-bedroom apartments
- Amenities for all could include weight room, outdoor deck
- 2 ½ levels of parking – 1 level @ grade, 1 level below grade & ½ level up; approx. 100 total spaces.
- Multiple attempts to acquire the Get Go site to the north, but owners not interested in selling.
- Current project statistics: **123 units, 156 beds, 100 parking spaces**

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Pasquale – concerned with 6 story building height – a lot for this site. Suggested looking at The View on High (Wendy's site) to examine setbacks off High St. Code allows 1 ft. building height increase for each 1 ft. building setback. Response: Applicant has met with Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate) who is rehabbing the adjacent historic 3-story apartment building to the south. Mr. Garland is comfortable with the height as long as it scaled down toward their development
- Rory didn't mind 6 stories – felt it was appropriate to place more density along High St.
- Applicant noted that it's difficult to work out 1 & 2 bedroom units and keep building scale down.
- Questions: Does the project park itself? Will parking spill into adjacent neighborhood? Response: Can't provide parking space for every resident and for retail spaces as well. Too costly to dig down for another level of parking. Haven't determined commercial uses, but there is an approximate 0.50 parking ratio. No exact ratio determined yet.
- Seth asked about cost for parking spaces. Concern that renters won't pay for a parking spot and try to park in the nearby dense neighborhood – *negative* impact on neighborhood. Wouldn't that leave empty parking spaces? Would these vacant spaces be rented to others? Response: Too costly to have empty parking spaces. Applicant can't imagine any empty parking spaces.
- New University Plan supports 0.375 parking ratio. Applicant proposes around 0.50 parking ratio.

- Suggestion that at next meeting applicant provide some contextual drawings to show how massing compares to adjacent buildings
 - Project timeline – completion around fall '17 (similar to Buckeye Real Estate's project to the south)
 - Suggestion to work on a cooperative landscape scheme with Buckeye project to present uniform look along High Street
 - Deb liked idea of building design transitioning from modern to traditional architecture
 - *Reminder: Task of the Commission is to vote on variance requests & not on architecture or building appearance, however related these areas might be.*
 - Committee liked the overall concept and felt that increased density was appropriate and closes a gap along High Street.
 - Question: As more properties improve along High St. is there a concern with competition for tenants? Response: No – competition just validates the neighborhood and is timely, as long as it meets vision and standards for neighborhood.
4. **15 E. Lane Avenue** – This was a preliminary presentation of a proposed mixed use, 3-story residential development at the SE corner of Lane Avenue and High Street. It is the site of the current Shell gas station. The applicant is Elford Development. They presented a similar project for this site in November 2013.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Proposed mixed use building attempts to find balance between taller building with more units and tight site with limited area for parking.
- Statistics –
 - **3 retail spaces** on 1st floor,
 - **27 single bedroom units** on floors 2-4,
 - **12 parking spaces,**
 - **4 stories**
- Previous project submitted had same statistics as above but with only 10 parking spaces.
- Commercial spaces not yet determined, but project will qualify for 50% parking reduction for commercial use along High Street
- Current elevation shows large curved panel at corner with large digital graphic display created by Orange Barrel Media. Display is static, not rotating signage.
- Second large digital display proposed for rooftop with masonry parapet
- Wanted to create iconic corner building
- Not many commercial spaces along High Street with this potential display space. Digital display could be utilized by OSU for events. Rental of digital display could also help offset costs of having fewer units due to this tight corner site.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Pasquale noted that parking reduction below what is code-required is acceptable on this site, but graphics are inappropriate. No billboards currently allowed in district, per Overlay.
- Recommendation to develop a drawing showing massing relationship of proposed project to adjacent buildings/properties
- Applaud applicant for addressing the need to develop this corner property with appropriate uses. A signature corner with much exposure and prominence.
- Building massing and site layout engage the corner in a positive way.
- Applicant noted that retail shops on this property will draw mostly a walking clientele.
- Great deal of discussion over the digital graphics proposed on the building façade and on the rooftop.
 - Will change the look of the neighborhood
 - Billboards and roof-mounted signs prohibited per code: Section 3372.606, Graphics. Cannot support signage presented. This corner not a mini Time Sq.
 - Digital graphics & 'billboard-type' signs have not been supported in the District.
 - Digital graphics & flashy displays will attract much attention, but may also create safety issues for drivers & pedestrians: not paying attention to what's happening @ ground level.

- General consensus that roof-mounted signage/screen needs to be eliminated. Allowing digital graphics could spearhead additional similar graphics elsewhere in the District: potential negative impact on District
- Response:
 - Not many commercial spaces along High Street with this potential display space. Not many places where this type of display graphics makes sense.
 - Digital display could be utilized by OSU for events.
 - Rental of digital display could also help offset costs of having fewer units due to this tight corner site.
 - In context of High Street, doesn't change the character of the campus neighborhood.
- Deb noted that her neighbors had current concerns about proposed building, but building might eventually grow on them
- Susan noted that ratio of parking spaces to units appears inadequate. Response: residential parking ratio is approx. 0.375 as recommended by the new University Plan.
- Commercial parking count not determined yet, which will add to parking requirement. Response: mainly walkers, not drivers, who will frequent proposed retail spaces.
- Question: why not build additional below-grade parking level? Response: very constricted corner site; required ramping would take up much sq. footage resulting in not enough additional parking spaces to justify construction expense.
- Craig noted the difficulty of developing this corner property. Could potentially support project if get rid of digital graphics – trade-off.
- Pasquale noted that developers could check into the SID for this area. Funding from SID could provide for sidewalk replacement, etc. Contact Matt Hansen at UDO: matt@universitydistrict.org
- Question: What type of commercial envisioned here? Response: Potential eating establishments as this is food-driven area per neighborhood demographic.
- Pasquale suggested potential tenant: US Bank that vacated location @ 16th & High.
- Recommended applicant look at development examples from other similar cities.
- Noted also that building tagging is nuisance throughout District and should be monitored.

VOTING RESULTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING: March 2, 2015

MEMBER	Craig Bouska	Seth Golding	Ethan Hansen	Joyce Hughes	Susan Keeny	Rory Krupp	Deb Supelak	Dick Talbot	Tom Wildman	Pasquale Grado
Attendance	Absent	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Present	Present	Absent	Present	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*	Y-N-A-R
1583 N. 4 TH Street - TABLED										
2020 N. High Street	Y	Y	E	E	Y	Y	Y	E	A	Y

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

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, Feb. 18, 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 present 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. 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.

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