

Meeting Notes from Monday, September 6, 2016 meeting of the UAC Zoning Committee:

6:00 PM – Business/administrative session.

- Reviewed the agenda items. No site visits this month
- Discussed last UAC zoning vote and carriage houses in the district
- Discussed briefly succession plans for zoning committee

PRESENT: Susan Keeny, Brian Williams, Pasquale Grado, Rory Krupp, Deb Supelak, Craig Bouska

EXCUSED/ABSENT: Seth Golding, Dick Talbot

VISITORS: Jim Bishop, Bill Brownson, Myron Phillips, Scott Dewhirst

6:30 PM – Applicant(s):

1. **Battelle Institute** – request for re-zoning of the parcels bounded by King, Battelle Dr., 5th Ave and Olentangy River Rd. from commercial & parking zoning to a UCRPD. Applicant is Patrick Jarvis, Senior VP of Marketing and Communications. Also in attendance were Jim Groner, Atty., Dennis Shemp and Gary Wolfing.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Battelle would like to change from the current C2, C4 & P1 zoning designation of multiple lots to a single zoned parcel of **UCRPD – University-College Research Park District**. (see link of this zoning designation @ https://www.municode.com/library/oh/columbus/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodet=TIT33ZOCO_CH3374UNLLRERKDI)
- UCRPD is a 110 ft. height district – allowable building height is 110 ft.
- Property currently divided into many small parcels.
- Research park zoning more appropriate to current work Battelle is doing:
 - Not really any commercial (C2, C4) work being performed here
 - Job creation away from campus
 - Clarity for work being performed – consistent with OSU collaborations at their Medical Center & large educational research needs.
- Parking: 1300 existing spaces south of 5th Ave. 1000 spaces don't get used
- OSU is zoned UCRPD.
- Comments from city staff, passed out at this meeting, note that city staff concurs with new zoning designation, but has questions and needs more information from applicant.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- **Question:** How is the goal for other research institutes different from or the same? **Response:** Very different. Battelle's research is specialized, brings money to OSU & is more applied research – small prototypes.
- **Question:** Why not just ask for parking variances? Why change entire zoning? **Response:** Battelle's work is not really commercial (office, retail). They're doing cooperative work with OSU & closer to their zoning designation than any other. Campus will be utilized better because less parking will be required. Also, don't typically like to apply for variances.
- **Question:** Will Battelle expand its type of research? **Response:** Not really expand. Research more applicable to current work. Some small batch prototypes created here.
- **Recommendation:** Committee asked that important items be salvaged. **Response:** No.
- If additional parking is required in future, could use SW corner of property, near the Olentangy River, to create structured parking.
- Can currently park everyone on main campus – do not need additional 1000 spaces from lot south of 5th Ave.
- It was noted that Battelle was good to & for the community.
- Noted that lack of parking is always an issue in University District. But also noted that proliferation of asphalt parking lots can have negative impact on community.
- Comment that Battelle has history of many changes impacting neighborhood. Battelle expanded in 70's & eliminated houses and 2 of "The Circles" to accommodate need for more building and parking. Now additional land is not needed, but gone are historic houses and 2 of "The Circles".
- **Question:** What are long term plans versus short term needs regarding zoning change?
Response:
 - No immediate development plans, but Battelle trying to blend with surrounding neighborhood.
 - Removing outdated, non-contributing buildings – technology doesn't need as many structures
 - Many buildings built over last 7 decades are past prime; easier to demo than to renovate

- Trying to pull back physical building from neighborhoods
- Question: What is current zoning on parking lot south of 5th Ave.? What are plans for that site? Response: Current zoning: P-1, parking & M, warehouse. Plans: in discussion to sell land for mixed use development.
- Question: What will be effects of realignment of Cannon Dr. on Battelle? Response: Current Cannon Dr. will be maintained to provide ability to bring people from campus to Battelle as now.
- Question: Will guest entrance to Battelle off King be changed? Response: No plans yet. Just completed exploring traffic movement on realigned Cannon Dr. Will begin to look at Battelle Blvd.; are mindful of traffic movement.
- Question: How will Battelle be a good neighbor? Any development plans? Zoning can allow manufacturing. Are there any limitations in the proposed zoning? What development standards are being considered? Is there anything neighbors can rely upon other than 'good faith' statements? Response: No current plans. Can do some manufacturing with new zoning, but there is another site outside this district that allows manufacturing. New zoning will exempt Battelle from more strict parking standards.
- Question: Battelle has been good neighbor, but has gone through many changes. Neighbors concerned about many more potential changes that could affect neighborhood. They ask that any zoning change align with the district plans, particularly with neighborhood (The Circles, Dennison Place, and NECKO) plans to become a local historic district. If Battelle plans include new buildings on this site, will those plans come before the neighborhood? Response: Any building plans will have to follow setback standards typical for neighborhood.
- Question: Why this rezoning request now, if current zoning has worked for 80 years? Conditions can change, even though Battelle has been a good neighbor. Can't there be development standards written in zoning text? Response: Battelle is not for profit charitable trust. Actively support Columbus schools as part of it mission to community. Has vested interest in community.
- Question: But why now the request? Response: Battelle is now leasing facilities in other locations, which is operationally infeasible. Want to consolidate resources at main campus – efficiencies. Don't want to keep coming back for variance requests for any future improvements. Don't need this large amount of parking today.
- Concern expressed that no development standards or limiting text is included in rezoning request. Response: Not in Battelle's interest to anger neighbors. Battelle just wants to be more competitive to draw in top talent to the area. Good for Columbus and neighborhood.
- Question: Can we be assured that manufacturing from W. Jefferson campus won't be brought to King Ave. campus? Response: Plan is to have just small batch prototype assembly jobs – 35 people +/- . No radioactive work, some chemical work.
- Question: Since historic character of adjacent neighborhoods is significant, can't there be some conditions added to Rezoning Application – Green buffers? Tree plantings? Maintaining existing green planting beds along King and Battelle Dr.? Height restrictions? Open space requirements? Respecting scale of adjacent neighborhoods? Response: Battelle will take a look but no promises.
- Action: There was general consensus that the Rezoning Application as presented would not be supported by the Zoning Committee. Applicant agreed to table the request until next month.

Request for rezoning was tabled. There was not vote taken at this meeting.

2. **Tuttle Park Skate Park** – preliminary discussion of plans to create a skate park out of 2 existing tennis courts. Presenter is Rick Miller, Design Manager, RLA.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Rick was advised that the idea of a new skate park at Tuttle Park should be presented to one of the UAC Committees. There was some confusion as to which committees – planning or zoning – he should present.
- There are no variances being requested. It was agreed that this should be a presentation to the entire commission, to keep them informed.
- Plan is to demolish the 2 existing tennis courts and replace them with a skate park.
- There will be no increase in amount of pavement in the park – Skate Park has similar footprint as tennis courts being removed.
- Columbus Recreational Commission sponsoring project. Budget is approx. \$100,000 - \$150,000.
- Project still has to go through Storm Water Management review.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Question: Is this skate boards and BMX's? Response: Both. Bikes are allowed on other skate parks.
- Question: What are hours of operation? Response: Skate Park will follow current park hours.

- Question: What controls or supervision? Response: Police enforced area. Officers could patrol on more regular hours. There will be no controlled access, no added fencing.
- Question: Will there be lights on the Skate Park? Response: There are existing lights on tennis courts. These could be timed to go off at 11 PM.
- Question: Will there be a dedicated off-road bike trail? Response: Trail was removed, but there is public pressure to re-install it. Paths are being staked out from Tompkins; already in process.

It was agreed to add the proposed Tuttle Skate Park to the Sept. 21, 2016 UAC agenda, under "Presentations".

3. **1408 N. Grant Avenue** – request for variances for the proposed multi-unit Grant Park development. Applicant is the Wagenbrenner Development. This project was previously presented to the Zoning Committee in December 2015.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Project was on hold from last December. Worked on site engineering and grading. Also made some plan revisions based on comments from Zoning Committee.
- Basic scale and scope of project similar to last presentation
- Plan revisions as follows:
 1. Revised setback along Grant to 7 ft.
 2. Turned a couple units to face Grant Ave. to match orientation of the rest of the development. Enhances and reinforces residential streetscape.
 3. Added swimming pool in one courtyard area to compete with amenities being offered at the new South Gateway project.
 4. Reconfigured parking, but number of spaces remains the same as previously proposed.
- Revised plans presented to Weinland Park Housing Committee. Weinland Park is supportive of the project. reconfiguring parking lot
- Variances being requested are as follows:
 1. Section 3363.01, M, Manufacturing Districts: to permit residential development of up to 375 dwelling units in the M, Manufacturing District.
 2. Section 3363.24, Building Lines in an M, Manufacturing District: to reduce the Grant Avenue building setback line from 25 feet to four (4) feet and to reduce the E Fifth Avenue building setback from 60 feet (Thoroughfare Plan) to five (5) feet.
 3. Section 3312.09, Aisle: to reduce the required 20' minimum aisle width for two-way travel due to proposed property lines dividing certain aisles, while applicant proposes certain aisles to be divided by a property line, but the total aisle width shall be 22' – 24' and applicable easements shall be provided for use of the aisles.
 4. Section 3312.25, Maneuvering: to reduce required maneuvering area for 90 degree parking spaces from 20' to 2' – 12' due to proposed property lines in parking lot aisles, while all code required maneuvering shall be provided in the aisles with easements where applicable.
 5. Section 3312.27(4), Parking Setback Line: to reduce the N. Grant Avenue parking setback line from ten (10) feet to three (3) feet for two (2) parallel parking spaces on the driveway on Parcel 2 and on Parcel 6, the off-site parking lot.
 6. Section 3312.49, Minimum Numbers of Parking Spaces Required: to reduce code required parking from 1.5 spaces/unit to 1.25 spaces/unit, 1.60 spaces/unit, 2.50 spaces/unit and 0.50 spaces/unit for Parcel 1, Parcel 2, Parcel 3 and Parcel 5, respectively, subject to off-site parking on Parcel 6 being provided for the use of dwelling units on Parcel 5, thereby providing 0.98 spaces/unit for Parcel 5.
 7. Section 3321.05(A.1), Vision Clearance: to reduce the required clear vision triangle for the driveway intersection with N. Grant Avenue on Parcel 2 from 10'x10' to 3'x3' to permit a parallel parking space 3' from the property line on each side of the driveway.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- There were many positive comments about the project.
- Consensus was that project was improved as result of above modifications.
- Question: What is future potential of green space? Response: Intent is to maintain it as open amenity to residents.
- The Zoning Committee was very supportive of the project.

Motion to approve the request for council variance for the new multi-unit housing development to be located at 1408 Grant Avenue: Craig; seconded: Brian. For-5; Against-0; Abstentions-0. Motion is approved.

4. **1445 Summit Street** – request for variances to expand the existing parking lot at Orton Labs. No one attended the meeting to present. No discussion.

No vote was taken at this meeting.

5. **131 E. 15th Avenue** – request for variances to expand the existing Delta Gamma sorority house to meet the standards of OSU's STEP Program. Presenters were Jeff Brown, Attorney & architect Mitch Acock. This case was presented at last month's Zoning Committee meeting.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Applicant agreed at last month's meeting to try to incorporate Zoning Committee's comments into a revised plan.
- There is a quota system for sororities – pledges are divided equally among sorority houses. Increasing interest in Greek membership.
- Project data:
 - Original plan had 36 additional rooms; new plan has **24 additional rooms**
 - Total beds increased from 33 existing to **54 beds**.
 - Size of addition is same as before: 7,000 SF.
 - Eliminated rooms on one floor to create one large chapter room
- Have learned that we don't have to make changes per the STEP program. Sororities and fraternities not required to be a part of this new program. But if sorority is housing sophomores, must follow certain program requirements such as study space for each student & office space for faculty.
- This is an old sorority that would like to increase its membership and offer experience of more members living together under one roof – bonding experience.
- E. 15th has a concentration of these institutions that date from the 50's
- Variances being requested are:
 - Section 3372.564 parking: to reduce the number of additional parking from 19 to 15 spaces
 - Section 3372.566 building separation and size: to increase the building size from 10,200 to 17,329 sq. ft.
 - Section 3372.567 maximum floor area: to increase the maximum floor area from 14,000 to 17,329 sq. ft.
 - Section 3372.568 height: to increase the allowable of the building from 40 to 47 feet 6 inches.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Pasquale comment that he is opposed to project: UAC was originally misled by other Greeks (*not this applicant*) that OSU was mandating Greeks to participate in this program. They were never required to do so, & there is enough housing currently available for all OSU freshman and sophomores. Also increasing density is not wise plan for this area. Response: nearby Edwards project features additional concentration of housing.
- Zoning Committee and UAC are planning to sit down & continue conversation with OSU Student Life concerning creative new zoning for E 15th – special 'Greek' zoning parameters.
- Comment that we should be considering economic development along E. 15th that utilizes these large structures for 12 months, not just 9 months out of each year. New plans should consider room layouts that can adapt to visitor housing during summer months or bed-&-breakfast s – think outside the box. Could be revenue producer for Greeks.
- Response: Greeks encourage comradery with living together. Important component of Greek life. There is also a need there – more members – and would like to expand facility to accommodate growth.
- Comment that expanded building plan is twice as big as should be. Goal is not to move increased density of High St. development into neighborhoods. E. 15th not appropriate place for this growth.
- Comment that there are other ways to bond together other than living in same house – be creative. Think about adapting existing complexes into housing.
- Concern about how to repurposing very large houses back into society once they are not needed.
- Question: How many sorority/fraternity expansions have we approved so far? Response: Only one & that was a complete demo and new build with *no increase* in bed count.
- Comment that interest in sororities/fraternities ebbs and flows. Future interest may wane and then left with large building to fill. Response: There is a 6:1 ratio of involvement in Greeks to living together in the house. Greeks believe they are not at capacity yet.
- Overall, Zoning Committee not supportive of this large addition & increase in number of beds. Also

lack of parking still a concern. Would like to have applicant wait until further work could be done on creating new zoning category for E. 15th. However, applicant wanted to proceed with vote, knowing we might not be supportive.

Motion to approve the request for variance for an addition to the existing Delta Gamma sorority house located at 131 E. 15th Avenue: Deb; seconded: Rory. For–0; Against–4; Abstentions– 1. Motion is *disapproved*.

6. **165 E. 15th Avenue** – request for early demolition of an accessory storage shed on the site of the Beta Theta Pi fraternity. The existing fraternity house has already been demolished in preparation for the construction of a new fraternity house.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- The block storage shed is small accessory structure in the SE corner of the property.
- The storage shed was omitted from the original demolition permit application that allowed the existing fraternity house to be torn down.
- The City requires that each structure to be demolished must be noted on the application, even small accessory buildings.

Discussion, Comments/Observations:

- Question: Is this an old structure? Response: Is a later addition and a non-contributing structure
- Additional discussion not needed. Committee was in agreement that this structure should be demolished.

Motion to approve the request for early demolition of an accessory building located on the site of the Beta Theta Pi located at 165 E. 15th Avenue: Craig; seconded: Brian. For–5; Against–0; Abstentions– 0. Motion is *approved*.

VOTING RESULTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING: September 6, 2016

MEMBER	Craig Bouska	Seth Golding	Brian Williams	Susan Keeny	Rory Krupp	Deb Supelak	Dick Talbot		
Attendance	Present	Excused	Present	Present	Present	Present	Excused		
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*		
1408 N. Grant Avenue	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y			
131 E. 15th Avenue	N		A	N	N	N			
165 E. 15th Avenue	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y			

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

***Revisions are noted in red.**

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=TIT33ZOCC

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 17, 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.