

Meeting Notes from Monday, June 4 2018 meeting of the UAC Zoning Committee:

6:00 PM – Business/administrative session.

- Review agenda
- Discussion on

PRESENT: Susan Keeny, Rory Krupp, Craig Bouska, Aaron Marshall, Pasquale Grado, Seth Golding

EXCUSED/ABSENT: Brian Williams, Matt Beaton

VISITORS:

6:30 PM – Applicant(s):

1. **99 E. 11th Avenue** – variances to redevelop the 5 lots with two (2) apartment buildings totaling 24 dwelling units. Presenter is Dave Perry for Buckeye Real Estate. This is the 2nd meeting with this applicant.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- The original proposal features demolishing 5 existing houses along 11th Ave. and building 4, 4-story buildings in their place, plus new townhouses along 10th Ave.
- Original plan had 56 bedrooms, 56 parking spaces.
- Current plan proposes keeping the 5 existing houses along E. 11th Ave., and building 4 new units along 10th Ave. to the rear.
- UIDRB suggested keeping the existing 5 houses and renovating them
- Required variances are as listed:
 1. Section 3333.035, AR4, Apartment Residential District Use: to permit 3 existing 2-dwelling unit buildings as part of the total of 22 dwelling units, and all dwelling units will be located on 1 tax parcel, thereby permitting 3, 2-dwelling unit buildings, not on separate parcels, in conjunction with 2, 4-dwelling unit buildings on the proposed 8 unit building.
 2. Section 3325.705, Supplemental Parking Requirements, to permit pavement of part of the west perimeter yard for a driveway to enclosed and surface parking.
 3. Section 3325.905(A), Maximum Lot Coverage: to increase lot coverage from **30% to 39%**.
 4. Section 3325.907(A)(B), Parking, to increase lot area devoted to parking and maneuvering from 35% to 43%, while 70% & to decrease required parking from **86 spaces to 46 spaces**.
 5. Section 3325.911(C), Building Separation and Size, to increase the permitted calculated floor area of the building fronting E. 11th Avenue from **10,200 square feet to 17,460 square feet**.
 6. Section 3325.913, Max. Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.): to increase F.A.R. from **0.60 to 1.06**, including F.A.R. of the 5 existing buildings and the proposed new building.
 7. Section 3333.255, Perimeter Yard, to reduce perimeter yard from 17.5 feet to: **East:** 2 ft. for existing E. 11th Ave. dwelling and zero for part of the parking lot; **South:** zero for driveways to the new 8 dwelling unit building and to 10 ft. for the proposed building setback; and **West:** zero to 3 ft. for pavement and existing dwelling side yard, respectively, as depicted on the Site Plan dated 4/27/2018.

Discussion/Comments/Observations:

- Question: Did you attend the Weinland Park Housing Committee meeting? Response: Yes & received a majority vote of approval.
- Question: How does parking in this plan compare to parking in previous plan: Response: Previous plan had 1 space per bedroom (56); current plan maintains existing houses which eliminates parking spaces.
- The area from 11th Ave. to 9th Ave. had been untouched and very unattractive. Also unsafe. The proposed new development cleans up area and creates clustered housing that can create sense of neighborhood.
- Proposed project site functions as a 'transition zone' between the dense High St. commercial corridor and the lower scale residential area to the east.
- The committee was very supportive of the revised plan and its corresponding variances.

Motion to approve the request for variances to develop the property located at 99 E. 11th Avenue: Seth; seconded: Rory. For–5; Against–0; Abstentions–0. Recused –1. Request for variances is approved.

2. **44 Clark Street** – council variance for new carriage house garage with dwelling unit above. Applicant is Margaret Ensign. Jim Brenan, Architect also present. This is a preliminary review.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Applicant proposes to build a carriage house – 2-car garage with dwelling unit above.

- Current property has no garage.
- Applicant's home has 2 bedrooms and does not have room for parents to stay over. Carriage house can also provide rental space for additional income
- Property is close to High St. and garage would provide secure place to park car and become a barrier against the alley.
- Applicant met with City & Zoning Clearance in March and was not told initially that she had to also meet with area commission. Process at City regarding variances is confusing; no written rules & guidance.
- City gave applicant initial list of variances.
- Adjacent property owner to the west has garage set on property line.
- Applicant presented initial site plan, plans and elevations for proposed carriage house.

Discussion/Comments/Observations:

- Comment that carriage house as proposed appears to be very large – dominates the site.
 - Comment that cannot support structure that tall (28 ft.) on the property. Less concern with material selections than with massing of a very large structure. Response: Architect will reduce size (width) of garage: 35 ft. deep x 25 ft. wide.
 - Code requires 4 spaces: 2 off street parking spaces per dwelling unit.
 - Noted that some dimensions on drawings missing or not correct.
 - Applicant was given suggestions to help reduce bulk and mass of structure. It was noted that the design should be compatible with the historic character and scale of the neighborhood.
 - The following recommendations were listed for the applicant to consider before attending the next zoning committee meeting:
 - Need to determine new F.A.R. (Floor Area Ratio) for property with the new carriage house
 - Helpful to bring contextual photos – pictures of adjacent properties, alley, and neighborhood to see how proposed project works with the neighborhood.
 - Need to consult with city zoning clearance staff to determine accurate and complete list of variances.
 - Massing of the carriage house as presented at tonight's meeting is too large. Suggestions: modify the footprint, lower the eave height, create step-backs on 2nd floor, create dormers, add porch facing rear yard, etc.
 - We know this was a conceptual preliminary review, but make sure the site plan has accurate dimensions. This is the site plan that will be tied to the variance request
 - Note that it is important to take enough time to determine the exact variances you will need as the exact variances are the only things on which the Commission can vote.
 - Applicant mentioned that parking permits and visitor's passes could be used to address parking issues. ***PLEASE NOTE:*** *Even though an area is designated a permit parking area, it does not guarantee that you would have a parking space available at all times. The street is public and is for every resident in the designated permit parking area.*
 - The applicants will review the suggestions of the zoning committee and contact us when ready to present their project again.
3. **2725 N. High Street** – New variance request for White Castle/Patrick J's property. Second meeting with this applicant. The zoning committee previously voted in favor of this project, but the applicant *did not* present to the full UAC for a final vote. Since then the project has changed in scope and variances. The project still has the same application number. Per our bylaws, the committee may vote to reconsider a project given substantial change to the proposed project.

Motion to reconsider the project proposed for 2725 N. High St: Susan; seconded: Craig. For – 5; Against – 0; Abstentions – 0.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Discussion of the revised project continued.
- Project is a gateway to the University District (and also to Clintonville). Significant site
- Proposed new site plan with parking area to the north of the site; both ravine to the west and High St. are referenced
- Parking area is seen as both 'park' and parking
- Elevations still being developed
- Original plan had retail on 1st floor, offices on 2nd floor, apartments above; variance request for 5 parking spaces, height variance
- New plan features commercial on 1st floor, & 2 levels of residential above, variance request for

- 3 parking spaces, no height variance
- Commercial entrances will be along High St., not at side as on previous plan
- No tenants for commercial spaces are known yet, but parking requirement based on restaurant use – most intensive parking requirement
- Avg. proposed building height will be 39 ft.; 43 ft. to top of parapet
- Plan as presented is preliminary only.

Discussion/Comments/Observations:

- Question: Will there be outdoor seating, and is setback deep enough to save existing trees?
Response: North end of the site can accommodate existing trees; south end is too tight to save the existing trees; most trees along western boundary will be saved
- Question: Will there be overlook to ravine & Olentangy River? **Response:** There will be an observation deck to overlook ravine. Cannot have direct access to ravine because any access would go through private property
- It was noted that there is a homeless camp in that area of the Olentangy & that a security fence was erected to keep homeless away from Olentangy Apts.
- Previous design made references to White Castle and Olentangy Park. New design won't be quite as literal with these references
- Project has been before UIDRB for design review. UIDRB is split on 'traditional' versus 'contemporary' design.
- Overall, committee felt the revised project was sensitive to the neighborhood and felt positive about the approach and scale.

This was a preliminary meeting. No vote was taken.

4. **300 West Lane** – request for graphics variance for sign with changeable copy for Panera Bread on Lane Ave. Mike Davis from Kessler Sign Co. presented.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- This is a request for graphics variance. Panera would like to replace their current sign with a new LED sign that has changeable copy.
- Remote changeable copy allows management to change advertising & specials easier and quicker than the manual way they must do it now.
- Current code does not permit changeable copy in the University District. PLEASE NOTE: The UAC has approved previous variance requests for remote changeable copy for the Turkey Hill at Dodridge & High and the United Dairy Farmers at Hudson & High. This was for changing prices only. Not for advertising.
- Applicant noted that Varsity Club & College Traditions on Lane Ave. has a new sign with changeable copy. Applicant noted that with such nearby examples of changeable copy, they believed their request for the same would be acceptable. He noted that changeable copy is approved in other areas of the city.

Discussion/Comments/Observations:

- To the best of the zoning committee's knowledge, neither College Traditions nor the Varsity Club applied for any variances for changeable copy on exterior signs.
- Question: How does the size of proposed sign compare with existing sign? Response: Existing sign is 5'-6" wide; proposed sign is 5'-3". The Panera logo sign remains as is.



Sign in question is the narrow white rectangular sign below the Panera Bread sign.

- Question: What is the size of the area for changeable copy? Response: Original manual copy area was 8.25 SF. Proposed changeable copy area is 10 SF.
- It was noted that Graphics Commission has approved signage over and against commission recommendations in the past.
- More information is needed on what signage has been previously approved along Lane Avenue.
- Applicant agreed to table the request for graphics variance.
- Zoning Committee agreed to research similar type signage along Lane Ave. & any variances.

This variance request was tabled until further information could be presented. No vote was taken.

5. **1370 N. 5th Street** – new infill house in Weinland Park located on a vacant lot on 5th St. Shremshock Architects presented.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- New single family infill house on vacant lot.
- Variance request:
 - Section 3325.08, Max. Floor Area Ratio: to permit a Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) of 0.55 instead of the code maximum 0.44.
- Having a finished basement increases house square footage, which puts building over the maximum F.A.R. for this zone.
- Adjacent properties are similar in context and are over the maximum F.A.R.
- Rear yard will be fenced in

Discussion/Comments/Observations:

- Question: Has Weinland Park Housing Committee seen this plan? Response: Applicant is scheduled to meet with Weinland Park in May – after this Zoning Committee meeting.
- Question: Are plans identical for each house? Response: Plans are nearly the same – just minor differences. The size and scale are the same.
- Rory stated that plan fits with character of neighborhood and is supportive. Suggested to increase the roof pitch similar to existing houses.
- Committee was generally supportive of both new infill houses, but requested that the applicant meet with the Weinland Park Housing Committee before the zoning committee makes its recommendation.
- Applicant agreed to do so and agreed to table the request for variance until after the meeting with the Weinland Park Housing Committee.

6. **1386 Hamlet** – new infill house in Weinland Park located on Hamlet. Shremshock Architects presented.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- Proposed project is nearly the same in size and design as new house proposed for 1370 N. 5th Ave. The above information is similar. *See discussion above.*

Discussion/Comments/Observations:

- Proposed project is nearly the same in size and design as new house proposed for 1370 N. 5th Ave. The above comments are similar. *See discussion above.*

This variance request was tabled until applicant could meet with the Weinland Park Housing Committee. No vote was taken.

7. **21 E. Duncan** – variances for new hookah bar in existing commercial building.

Previous to tonight's meeting, the applicant tabled this variance request until the next month.

8. **15th & High** – revised CPD proposal from Campus Partners. Erin Prosser & Oscar from Campus Partners presented. This is the 2nd meeting on this project.

Project Information/Applicant Presentation:

- The original CPD text was emailed to committee.
- Revised CPD text with corrections noted in red was presented to zoning committee.
- This is still a preliminary presentation to continue discussions about proposed work at the 15th & High St. site and explain why a change to the original CPD was required.
- Last month Erin presented that what set this process in motion was the recent acquisition of the property located at 20 E. 14th Ave. This would complete the block. Property needs to be re-zoned

- OSU would have 4 floors of office space above 1st floor retail.
- Floor-to-floor ceiling height is typically higher for office use than for residential use. The allowable max. height as stated in the original CPD text was based on residential use above commercial.
- Request is to allow an increase in allowable building height which requires revisions to original CPD that was voted on and approved in 2015, and adopted as ordinance.
- 3 main items:
 1. 20 E. 14th property is being added to the CPD
 2. Height variance being requested for subareas 2A, 2B, 2C, 9.
 3. Development standards for all these area will be cleaned-up

Discussion/Comments/Observations:

- Not much discussion as this was a last minute agenda item.
- Campus Partners wanted to project before us on a regular basis to keep commission informed of process and revisions.
- Question: Why not have CPD for entire area? Response: Cannot control areas that Campus Partners do not own.
- Committee will review the red-lined markups of the CPD text for next month's meeting and be prepared for questions.
- *It should be noted that since the Zoning Committee meeting, a corrected CPD text and rezoning application has already been sent to the city and a copy of this received by the zoning committee chair.*

This was still a preliminary meeting. No vote was taken.

VOTING RESULTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING: May 7, 2018

MEMBER	Craig Bouska	Seth Golding	Brian Williams	Susan Keeny	Rory Krupp	Pasquale Grado	Aaron Marshall	Matt Beaton	
Attendance	Present	Present	Excused	Present	Present	Present	Present	Absent	
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*	
99 E. 11 th Ave.	R	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y		
2725 N. High St.-motion to reconsider	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=TIT33ZOCO

For Commission Presentations:

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

PLEASE NOTE:

For All Zoning Presentations:

Applicants will present at the next University Area Commission (UAC) meeting which will take place (*unless otherwise notified*) on **Wednesday, May 16, 2018** 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 hard 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

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.