

UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-6096 F (614) 645-6675

MEETING SUMMARY

date	September 27, 2018
place	Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room 111 North Front Street, Room 204
time	4:00pm – 7:30pm
present	Stephen Papineau, Pasquale Grado, Keoni Fleming, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Frank Petruziello, Kay Bea Jones
absent	

THE AUDIO SYSTEM FAILED TO RECORD THE PROCEEDINGS
THE FOLLOWING MEETING SUMMARY IS BASED ON NOTES AND RECOLLECTIONS OF THE MEETING

- A. 4:00 – 4:05**
- 1.** **Business of the Board**
Approval of Meeting Summary from July 2018
Ms. Jones / Ms. Uhas-Sauer
To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.
7 - 0 to Approve
- B. 4:05 – 4:09**
- 1. Applications for Certificate of Approval**
- | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|----------|
| app no.: | 17 East Lane Avenue | CoreLife |
| applicant: | UID_18-08-001 | |
| reviewed: | Sean Clark (DaNite Sign Co.) | |
- signage
- staff report:
- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended approval.
 - Mr. Clark reviewed the modifications to the sign proposal.
 - Mr. Petruziello asked about the details of the sign construction.
- discussion:
- Mr. Clark reviewed the sign materials and construction details; black channels and trim caps with white lens.
 - Mr. Petruziello requested that the sign cabinet be 3" in depth.
 - Mr. Clark expressed concern at the possibilities of hot spots and commented that 5" is an industry standard
- motion by Ms. Jones / Mr. Fleming
motion To approve the proposed sign as submitted.
vote 7 - 0 to Approve
- 2. 1444 North High Street** **Mixed Use Addition**
- | | |
|------------|--|
| app no.: | UID_18-02-010 |
| applicant: | David Keyser (dkb Architects), Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate) |
| reviewed: | Conceptual –mixed use addition |
- staff report:
- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended approval of the proposed addition with condition of detailed construction documents prior to issuance of COA.
 - Mr. Keyser reviewed the modifications in the plans and elevations based on Board comments.
 - Ms. Jones enquired about the depth of the balconies on the High Street Façade.
 - Mr. Keyser replied that there are no balconies, the railings are flush with the building face.
 - Ms. Jones requested that the railing detail be removed; the detail detracts from the other patterns of the High Street façade.
- discussion:
- Mr. Fleming commented that the courtyard façade and layout are working; the High Street façade needs a little study, consider simplifying.
 - Mr. Petruziello remarked that the canopy on the South created too much shadow, could it angle with the storefront; that the flying brick on the second floor troubled him.
 - Ms. Jones commented that the improvements courtyard, stairs and corridors works.
 - Ms. Uhas-Sauer was encouraged by the evolution of the design.

motion	<p>Tabled. To consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Remove the (recreated) railing detail from the High Street façade.2. Review the canopy and storefront on the South portion of the building3. Review the brick above the storefront on the South portion of the building.
3. app no.: applicant: reviewed: 4:35 – 4:50	<p>2591 North High Street Old North Arcade UID_18-09-008 Sean Clark (DaNite Sign Co.) signage</p>
staff report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site, location and existing site conditions; staff recommended conditional approval based on reduction of the size and proper location of sign.• Mr. Clark reviewed the program and details of the projecting sign.• Mr. Grado remarked that the sign was entirely too big; the sign on the side of the building was not reviewed by the Board.
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Petruziello commented that the sign should be integrated, the wall sign is different than the banner which is different from the proposed projecting sign.• Mr. Fleming concurred that the graphics are inconsistent.• Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that the client may want to think about the historic nature of the neighborhood, the Old North is on the Registry of Historic Places, the district extends from Hudson to Arcadia.
motion	<p>Tabled. To consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Reduce size.2. Move location of sign.3. Present a comprehensive sign idea for the building.
4. app no.: applicant: reviewed: 4:50 – 5:05	<p>139-141 West 9th Avenue Multi-Family UID_18-09-009 Mike Church (Northwest Builders LLC) addition</p>
staff report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended approval conditioned on reducing the size of the parking apron to increase the amount of landscaped area and include one shade tree 2.5" caliper min; permit level drawings and details.• Mr. Church reviewed the program and design of the building; several images of other projects were presented to the Board including 190 West 8th Avenue.• Mr. Grado remarked that 190 West 8th Avenue would not have passed muster with the Board; many of the details are way off at 190 West 8th Avenue – the post, railings, stair and roof lack the finesse of the porch it replaced.
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Fleming concurred with the assessment of 190 West 8th Avenue; the drawings for this project will need to show the details and the drawings will need to followed; the staff comment about more space at the rear makes sense, why is the apron that wide.• Mr. Church replied that the apron can be reduced in size.• Ms. Jones expressed concern regarding the porch details on the other building; the porch roof may be able to be salvaged, the piers and railing do need work.
motion	<p>Tabled. To consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Increase the landscape area at the rear of the building.2. Fully detailed drawings.

5. 1980 North High Street Charleys

app no.: UID_18-09-010
applicant: Michael Smith (SignSmith LLC)
reviewed: signs
5:05 – 5:20

staff report:

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended to remove the cabinet behind the two illuminated wall signs; reduce the depth of the projecting sign; the projecting sign shall be mounted at joints in the terracotta not into the terracotta itself.
- Mr. Grado observed that the projecting sign is not appropriate and the wall sign has issues too; why not remove the backer panel, remove the Philly Steaks - Wings sign, move the Charleys sign down to align with the PNC Bank sign.
- Mr. Fleming concurred the projecting sign should not be mounted into the terracotta; the projecting sign should be moved to the edge of the terracotta.

discussion:

- Mr. Petruziello stated that the sign needs to be design for this building; a stock sign haphazardly placed is not the right approach; we have been working to correct the deficiencies of this building over that past year or so.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer remarked that the theater was built by Leo Yassenoff in 1947; 10,000 people were present at the opening.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the drawings need to reflect the actual site conditions.

Tabled.

To consider:

motion

1. Relocate projecting sign or remove.
2. Remove backer panel, remove Philly Steak – Wing sign and shift Charleys sign down.
3. Drawings that should existing site conditions.

C.

1. 1980 North High Street Evolved Body Art

app no.: UID_18-09-010
applicant: Michael Scherl (MES Painting and Graphics), Nick Wolak (Evolved Body Art)
reviewed: Code Enforcement | signs
5:20 – 5:40

staff report:

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended disapproval of the existing/proposed signs.
- Mr. Grado commented that the signs should take clues from what was previously approved; limit sign/logo to the projecting sign and place the address on the horizontal band.
- Mr. Wolak replied that this is one of the last independent businesses left on High Street; the signs and graphics reflect the style of the business.
- Ms. Jones remarked that the Board does not have a particular issue about the color or style of the graphics; it is more about the number of graphics and how they convey the nature of the business; use your artistic skills to develop a proposal.

discussion:

- Mr. Wolnak stated that this Board is trying to push small businesses out.
- Mr. Ferdelman remarked that all signs and building modifications require a Building Permit; a COA is required to obtain a Building Permit and in this case a permit was not filed and was not reviewed by this board; this board would have suggested less signage which would have actually saved the business money; the Board has worked with many small businesses, ask Jimmy and Toula at Buckeye Donuts; the Landlord is familiar with the approval process for this building.
- Mr. Fleming stated that the Guidelines are clear about appropriate signage in the District; your sign professional should have reviewed the process for doing signs in Columbus; all signs require a permit.

Tabled.

To consider:

motion

1. Limit sign and graphics to name, logo and address of building.
2. Place logo and name on the vertical panels
3. Remove the wall sign on the adjacent building.
4. Remove the large address panel

<p>2. app no.: applicant: reviewed: 5:40 – 6:02 staff report:</p> <p>discussion:</p> <p>motion</p>	<p>2500 North High Street UID_18-06-008 George Berardi, Jonathan Leonard (Berardi Partners) Conceptual mixed use redevelopment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff made no recommendation; the proposal will be before the Board next month for a zoning recommendation.• Mr. Berardi reviewed the modifications in the plan and the new reduced list of variances.• Ms. Jones remarked that the recess in the middle of the building ...• Mr. Petruziello remarked that the buildings still lacks the markers of a good retail building; the ground level retail needs to be differentiated from the residential above, express commerce; how will signage be handled; these perspectives are not helpful in this review.• Mr. Reeds asked about the materials along the South façade• Mr. Fleming remarked that the scale of the building seems appropriate.• Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the proposal still leaves out any ideas of what the Wilcox building will look like; the neighbors to the East will be most affected by that building. <p>Tabled. To consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Detailed planometric elevations, sections and details; less perspectives.2. Articulation of the retail base.	<p>Mixed Use</p>
<p>3. app no.: applicant: reviewed: 6:02 – 6:52 staff report:</p> <p>Discussion:</p>	<p>2180 North High Street UID_18-08-004 Christopher Johnson (CA Student Living), Bhakti Bania, Bharat baste (BBCO Architects) David Hodge (Underhill & Hodge) Conceptual mixed use redevelopment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended selective preservation of the existing buildings and reduction of the height of the building at the North portion of the proposed building.• Ms. Bania reviewed the modifications in the proposal; reduction of the retail footprint; breaking down the scale of the proposal with setbacks and materials.• Mr. Johnson remarked that the proposal creates additional beds for the Columbus housing market and the uses in the development will be parked, unlike the existing tenants and uses.• A. Chan (owner of City Cut, 2198 North High Street) stated that her and her team supports the proposed development; the new space will allow City Cut to expand from 630sf to about 1250sf and will be modern and updated; more opportunity to expand and parking for customers.• Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the courtyard buildings are the Alhambra Court Apartments that were built in 1904, the type is almost exclusively found in the University District; the units are about 120' from the oldest residence in the City, the Beers cabin of 1804; the site is sandwiched between two historic districts; the location is always active and is fully occupied; the height and massing of the proposed buildings are hard to justify in this context, this is not a through away site; great sensitivity to the history and the character of the neighborhood should be the primary concern.• Ms. Jones remarked that the attention to massing and materials are superficial; there is much concern within the community about losing affordable units and the character North of Lane, the View on Pavey Square is mediated by the 6 remaining buildings that hold the attention along High Street while the height and mass of the new units address the rear of the property; this proposal ignores and creates a new context to the detriment of the property to the North, forever in shadow; this particular property and the adjoining buildings have a different social order than the one being proposed, many long term residents, not all students.• Mr. Petruziello commented that he is not interested in an option that merely maxes out the site and is rapped in good intention; the architecture needs to be good, composed of good materials, not homage to the old but must have a relative scale of elements; a floor must be taken out of the North portion of the building; maybe the building can be reoriented.• Mr. Fleming said that he is usually the member pushing density, but in this particular site has a context that must be addressed and it must be appropriate in scale; the proposed building is not appropriate, it is a big building and lacks the human scale of what is around it.• Mr. Grado stated the auto entrance on Norwich is very problematic, can all auto access be moved to Pearl Alley; the frontage along Norwich is completely compromised by the garage.• Ms. Bania stated that the two entrances were a result of a traffic study.	<p>Mixed Use Redevelopment</p>

- Ms. Uhas-Sauer left the meeting.
- Mr. Johnson replied that the traffic study was mandated by the Public Service Department; the remediations were approved by Public Service; it will be difficult to address the Board's concerns, the proforma must make sense; the proposal addresses the parking needs for the tenants and visitors; cannot reduce the scale and make the project function properly.
- Mr. Fleming stated that the Board is charged with assessing whether development proposals are appropriate for the neighborhood and context they are located; the Board has made clear comments about massing and scale and not about the number or need for parking.
- Ms. Jones remarked that a shadow study would reaffirm the impact on adjacent buildings.

Tabled.

To consider:

1. Reduced the height of the Northern portion of the building.
2. Address the existing context.
3. Reorient the building to reduce mass at North.

motion

4.

2725 North High Street

Mixed Use

UID-18-01-007

Matt Canterbury (Borror Properties), Dave Volterro (SCA Architects)

Zoning Recommendation | CV18-052 | mixed use redevelopment

app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
6:52 – 7:25

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- The proposal requires variances from:
 - 3325.281- Parking and circulation, the required number of parking spaces is 66. The Applicant is requesting a variance to permit a total of 60 parking spaces.
 - 3325.231 (A) - Setback requirements. To allow a drive aisle between the ROW to principle building.
 - 3325.231 (B)- Setback requirements. To permit a portion of the parking located to the side of the principal building to have setback three feet beyond the principal building setback as depicted in the submitted site plan.
 - 3356.03- C-4 permitted uses. To permit dwelling units be located on the first floor of the project and adjacent to restaurant and retail/office uses.
 - 3372.604 - Setback requirements. To permit a portion of the parking located to the side of the principal building to have setback three feet beyond the principal building setback as depicted in the submitted site plan.
- Staff recommended support of the requested variances.
- Mr. Fleming recused himself from this case.
- Mr. Canterbury reviewed the process with the UAC and CAC; UAC recommendation and the number and type of variances.
- Mr. Volterro commented that a parking study showed that the mix of uses and their time offsets mean that the parking should never be overcapacity.
- Mr. David Hodge (representing Olentangy Village) stated that Olentangy Village has experienced problems with visitors to the near by businesses using the spaces in the private development; the reduced parking standards of the UDZO will have a detrimental effect on the adjacent property; the UIDRB should not support the parking reduction.
- Mr. Grado remarked that the landscape bump out along the Northwest portion of the site could accommodate three additional spaces; the rationale to open out onto the Glenn Echo ravine are mute due to the recent installation of a chain link fence along the property line.
- Mr. Reeds stated that he was comfortable with less parking on the site.
- Mr. Petruziello remarked on the Southeast corner seems unresolved; the corner is too wide.
- Ms. Jones disagreed with the statement; the wider corner works in the composition of the buildings; the parking reduction seemed appropriate.

staff report:

discussion:

motion by
motion
vote

Mr. Papineau / Mr. Reeds

To support the requested Variances

5 - 0 to Approve

D. 7:25- 7:30

Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

		items approved
1.	UID_18-08-005 219 East 17th Avenue	roof
2.	UID_18-08-006 257 East 11th Avenue	parking
3.	UID_18-08-007 1489 North 4th Street	siding
4.	UID_18-08-008 2060 North High Street	reface sign Holistic
5.	UID_18-08-009 1988 Iuka Avenue	roof
6.	UID_18-09-001 362-364 King Avenue	roof
7.	UID_18-09-002 363 King Avenue (Porch)	porch
8.	UID_18-09-003 21-23 West 9th Avenue	porch
9.	UID_18-09-004 49-51 West 9th Avenue	porch
10.	UID_18-09-005 81-83 West 9th Avenue	porch
11.	UID_18-09-006 1473 Belmont Avenue	porch
12.	UID_18-09-007 83 Mc Millen Avenue	roof & siding
13.	UID_18-09-012 431-433 West 8th Avenue	roof
14.	UID_18-09-013 95 McMillen Avenue	roof
15.	UID_18-09-014 237 East 11th Avenue	roof
16.	UID_18-09-015 2251-2253 Neil Avenue	roof
17.	UID_18-09-016 37 WEST 8th AVENUE	roof
18.	UID_18-09-017 57 East 17th Avenue	replace deck
motion by	Ms. Jones / Mr. Reeds	
motion	To approve the Staff Issued Certificates of Approval.	
vote	6 - 0 to Approve	

E.

Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	UID_18-02-011_RECOMMENDATION 99 East 11th Avenue (CV18-042)	6/28/2018: zoning recommendation	8/28/2018
2.	UID_18-05-001 1525 North High Street (Taco Bell)	6/28/2018: signs	8/28/2018
3.	UID_18-05-001 1525 North High Street (Taco Bell-Rev1)	6/28/2018: signs	9/20/2018
4.	UID_18-05-008 165 East 13th Avenue (Multi-Family)	6/28/2018: addition	8/17/2018
5.	UID_18-07-005 124 West 8th Avenue (Multi-Family)	8/23/2018: addition	9/20/2018
6.	UID_18-08-002 18 East 11th Avenue (Elia Athenian Grill)	8/23/2018: canopy sign	9/18/2018
7.	UID_18-08-003 1624 North High Street (City Gear)	8/23/2018: sign & awning	9/4/2018

F.

1.	Next Meeting October 25, 2018 111 North Front Street, Room 204 4:00pm
----	--

