Meeting Notes from Monday, July 6, 2015 meeting of the UAC Zoning Committee:

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

- Brief discussion of agenda for the evening: application for 343-345 W. 8th Avenue <u>Tabled</u>.
- Discussed upcoming projects that involve construction of garages with apartments above similar to carriage houses in Victorian Village.
- We discussed a recent meeting with City staff traffic management, zoning and planning regarding an increasing number of projects requesting variances using the newly adopted University Plan as the basis of their request rather than the current code. The meeting was called together by Chris Presutti, Chief Zoning Official for the city. It was learned that City staff was not always of the same opinion on variances being requested for projects along the High St. Corridor (e.g. Mixed use developments proposed for Land & High versus 7th & High). City staff was made aware that UAC is placed in difficult interim period: University Plan is approved but NOT CURRENT CODE. No prescribed review method was suggested for all. Thoughtful, careful review processes by UAC has particular weight during this interim period.
- Brief discussion on major conditions/issues (other than code itself) that committee members consider most important in making decisions on zoning cases. Issues mentioned were:
 - Neighbor input,
 - Statement of hardship,
 - Is request reasonable?
 - What is the impact on neighborhood (have no negative impact)?
 - Context: what works for 1 parcel/neighborhood may not work for another
 - Precedent not as important as conditions of specific parcel
 - Magnitude: how much deviation from current code is being asked?

<u>PRESENT</u>: Rory Krupp, Susan Keeny, Deb Supelak, Pasquale Grado, Craig Bouska, Dick Talbot, Joyce Hughes <u>EXCUSED/ABSENT</u>: Seth Golding, Tom Wildman, Ethan Hansen <u>VISITORS</u>:

6:30 PM - Applicant(s):

- 1. 343-345 W. 8th Avenue Variance request to allow a 1-unit side yard addition to an existing 2-family dwelling unit. This is an R-4 zoning district where 1-4 family dwellings are permitted on each parcel. This is a previous request that was tabled from 2/3/2014. TABLED.
- 1386 N. 6th Street Requested variances for construction of a new single family residence and garage at the corner of N. 6th St. and 8th Avenue. The owner/applicant, John Gifford, presented.
 Project Information/Applicant Presentation:
 - Owner/applicant is in process of purchasing a parrow let
 - Owner/applicant is in process of purchasing a narrow lot in Weinland Park to construct a new, single family 2-story house with garage.
 - Owner has lived in Clintonville, sold his property there in June, & began looking for more affordable properties on which to build a new home.
 - Lot is very narrow: 15.3 ft. & was established pre 1959. A house may have been on this property.
 - Lot area = 1,606.5 SF.
 - 6 variances requested are:
 - Section 3372.542, Maximum Lot Coverage: to permit the building to cover 34.67% (557 SF) rather than the code allowed 25% (401.625 SF).
 - Section 3372, Maximum Floor Area: to permit an F.A.R.(Floor Area Ratio) of 0.85 (1368 SF) rather than the code allowed 0.4 (642.6 SF).
 - Section 3332.22(C), Building Lines on Corner Lots: to permit a 6" setback along the 8th St. lot line.
 - Section 3332.25(B), Maximum Side Yard Required: to permit a 15 5/8" side yard sum rather than the required 3.06 FT. (20% of lot width)
 - Section 3332.26 (C)(1), Minimum Side Yard: to permit 9 5/8" side yard along the north property line rather than the code required 3 FT.
 - Section 3332.05(C), Vision Clearance: to permit a 10 FT. vision clearance triangle rather than the code required 30 FT.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Rory began by stating this was innovative use of narrow corner lot; Dick concurred.
- Question: does any existing house I this area meet all zoning requirements? <u>Response</u>: Probably few meet all zoning requirements.
- Discussion on vision clearance variance triangle: Even though vision clearance not met, house aligns with existing houses along street – important to maintain streetscape. Also, 6th St. is oneway traffic, which may lessen traffic concerns @ this intersection.
- Pasquale corrected the chair & pointed out that Overlay requires basements and habitable attic spaces to be figured into total SF building calculations. (Residential code Section 3332 does not

- include these spaces). Important to remember that Overlay supersedes similar requirements in other code sections.
- Comment that house structure is very close to north property line which may restrict development
 of the vacant property to the north of this site. <u>Response</u>: The person who owns the house 2 lots to
 the north also owns the vacant lot. Also, exterior north walls of the proposed house have no
 windows and will be 1-hour fire-rated, as required by the building code.
- Susan asked that the owner make contact with the Weinland Park Civic Assoc. and Housing Committee regarding this project.
- Joyce felt that this should not hold up our approval of the variances being requested by the applicant. Applicant exchanged contact information with Joyce & Rory to keep communications open on this proposed project.
- Overall, the committee was that encouraged that a single family, owner-occupied house with new garage would be built on a difficult corner lot in Weinland Park. The committee supported the requested variances.

Motion to approve the request for the above listed variances for a new single family residence & garage: Joyce Hughes; Seconded: Rory Krupp. For -7; Against - 0

3. 66 E. 15th Avenue – Request for early demolition of a concrete structure on E. 15th. Erin Prosser from Campus Partners presented.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Building to be demolished was a former religious facility, vacant for approx. 10 years.
- Request is being made from Campus Partners made commitment to move quickly on the proposed 15th & High Project
- The City has requested that the proposed parking garage, planned for Subarea 5, be the 1st phase
 of the 15th & High Project to be constructed. The religious building must come down to enable the
 garage plans to commence.
- Oxford House Realty will be relocated into Subarea 6:
 - New 1500 SF office
 - 12 apartments above
 - Building will 'step down' to more residential neighborhood to the north & east.
- Tight schedule to begin garage construction & to move Oxford House so that their business remains as uninterrupted as possible necessitates early demolition.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- There was brief discussion of the fact that there will be certain phases of the 15th & High Project that will move more quickly than others and those priorities may shift as proposals for the different subareas are reviewed, and as per requirements from the City.
- The construction of the new parking garage is an example of those changing priorities.
- The zoning committee understood the need for some flexibility in scheduling as plans are developed for the 15th & High Project.
- There was brief discussion on the existing church facility. Erin presented copies of the
 original 1965 architectural plans for the project, showing an extremely tall church spire that
 was removed years ago.
- The majority of the zoning committee was in agreement that the early demolition request of the church should proceed to allow the 15th & High Project to get underway.

Motion to approve the request for the above request for early demolition: Dick Talbot; Seconded: Joyce Hughes. For -5; Against - 0; Abstentions - 2. MOTION PASSES.

4. 1497 Perry St. – Preliminary discussion of a proposed new garage with apartment above on a parcel with a side-by-side duplex residence. Applicant is owner Michael Mahaney.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Property contains an existing side-by-side duplex rental property.
- Applicant has owned property since 2011.
- Owner/applicant would like to build a 3-car garage at the rear of the property with an apartment above – 2 bedroom, 2 bath
- Owner wishes to use apartment as their residence when he and his wife are on furlough from frequent mission trips.

- Lot size: 53'-2" wide a very large lot width for the area
- Large wood deck existing in the rear yard.
- Gravel parking in rear
- Existing gravel/grass driveway to the north has typically 3+ cars parked there.
- Applicant has experience building carriage house in Victorian Village. He brought along plans & elevations of his past project.
- Plans for Perry St. property include carriage house plus deck that cover almost the entire rear yard.
- Applicant would like input from committee on how adding a separate dwelling unit to an R4 parcel would be viewed. Code allows up to 4 units (apartments) in one structure on a parcel, but more than 1 separate dwelling unit on a parcel requires a variance.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Concern expressed about the existing deck that covers a major portion of the rear yard. Looks like lot is totally covered by building or deck.
- Committee wants to see more landscaped space on property (deck not considered 'green space');
 could make a combined greenspace in rear for both apartments
- Suggestion to build rear deck overlooking rear yard onto new garage structure. Creates more connection to outdoor space.
- Property backs onto existing alley. Alley access is from two nearly existing drives off Perry.
- Concern: Driveway on property seems redundant in light of 2 existing drives off Perry. <u>Question:</u> Would applicant entertain eliminating his driveway since there are already two nearby access drives? This would help extend greenspace. <u>Response:</u> Owner would consider this.
- Craig not opposed to carriage house project. Assumption that this will eventually be a rental unit, not an owner-occupied dwelling. But would like to see less concrete and more green
- Pasquale noted that apartment over garage could be viewed as a 'mother-in-law suite' that can help recycle properties and provide places for potential retirees in district.
- Susan noted that adjacent neighbor has concerns about the large rear yard deck becoming a 'party deck'. Suggest that applicant demolish existing deck. Not in favor of any large new deck space.
- Suggestion that any proposed new patio space could be one shared hardscape place surrounded by adequate landscaping.
- Suggestion to applicant to consult with an architect to draw up plans that are specific to this
 property.

This was a preliminary meeting. No vote was taken.

5. 1398 N. High Street – This request for council variance for a mixed-use development proposed for the NE corner of 7th & High St. was already voted on at the 5/4/2015 zoning committee meeting. The committee voted in favor of all variances <u>except</u> the request for vision clearance. Since that meeting the applicant has submitted revised plans that have apparently eliminated the requested vision clearance variance. We have also received the comments of Traffic Management regarding this project. Traffic Management is not in support of the requested parking variance for the residential portion of the building.

The committee will not be reconsidering their vote. Please review the meeting notes of the April 6th & May 4th Zoning Committee meetings for background information.

VOTING RESULTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING: July 6, 2015

MEMBER	Craig Bouska	Seth Golding	Ethan Hansen	Joyce Hughes	Susan Keeny	Rory Krupp	Deb Supelak	Dick Talbot	Tom Wildman	Pasquale Grado
Attendance	Present	Excused	Excused	Present	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*	Y-N-A-R*
343-345 W. 8th Avenue - TABLED										

1386 N. 6th Street	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
66 E. 15th Avenue	Y		Y	Y	A	А	Y	Y
1497 Perry St. - NO VOTE								
1398 N. 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?nodeld=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**, **July 15**, **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. 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
- 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.