

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE **January 8, 2019**
PLACE **MICHAEL B COLEMAN GOVERNMENT CENTER**
111 NORTH FRONT STREET, ROOM 312
TIME **12:05 – 1:05 PM**
PRESENT William Fergus, Bart Overly, Matt Egner, Kim Way, Judy Box, Ryan Szymanski
ABSENT

A CALL TO ORDER

B STAFF INTRODUCTION

C NEW BUSINESS

12:08 – 1:05

1. APPLICATION: **EF_18-12-004**
ADDRESS: **79, 83-85 MCDOWELL ST**
PROPERTY OWNER: **CITY OF COLUMBUS**
APPLICANT: **COLUMBUS HOUSING PARTNERSHIP, INC (HOMEPORT)**
TO BE REVIEWED: **DEMOLITION, NEW CONSTRUCTION**
SUB-DISTRICT: **EF_18-12-004**

STAFF REPORT:

Staff presented relevant details about the project:

- Homeport is proposing a four-story, multi-family development at the corner of State and McDowell.
- The project is anticipated to be submitted to OHFA as a 2019 tax credit application.
- The project is being developed in conjunction with the approved Gravity II development and will utilize parking and site amenities provided for the larger development.
- The development includes a mix of one, two and three-bedroom units, for a total of 50 units, and a total of 64 parking spaces – 4 onsite spaces and 60 spaces in the Gravity II parking garage.
- The site is currently owned by the City of Columbus Land Redevelopment Division (Land Bank) and is occupied by a historic church structure.
- The City supports demolition of the church due to the condition of the structure and the estimated cost to renovate and restore the structure.
- Staff support of the demolition is based on the conditions of:
 - award of public financing through tax credits or other financing for the project;
 - documentation of historic structure by cultural resource consultant.

DISCUSSION:

The applicant (J. Metzler and L. Evans, Homeport and K. Sherrill, Shremshock) provided a description of the project. The applicant noted that the request at the January 2019 Regular Meeting will be for an approval with conditions, and the applicant is able to work with the Board to finalize the exterior materials over the next several months.

The board provided the following comments on the application:

- K. Way stated he is not sure about a literal representation of the church on the east elevation as shown. He asked what the cost would be to move the church and if it is feasible to move. He also stated he would like to see more storefront glazing on the McDowell elevation to activate the street (fitness center/lobby)

- M. Egner stated he is in support of affordable housing, but believes there are other sites in EF that can provide affordable housing if the proposal is not able to incorporate the existing church building.
- B. Overly stated he is optimistic that the affordable housing can be provided on the site in addition to saving a portion of the church. He recommended saving the front façade of the church and incorporating it into the new building. He also recommended a “barbell” design for the building.
- R. Szymanski stated he is not sure if preserving a portion of the front elevation is appropriate, but that he has done that on a project he worked on in the past. He also stated that if Homeport works on a feasibility study to review preserving a portion of the church the Board should be open to a wide variety of preservation options (i.e. entire elevation, a window, the entrance, etc.)
- J. Box stated she is in support of the proposal based on the use. She would like to see some reference to the church in the new building, but that preservation of the church is not needed.

The applicant responded to Board comments:

- K. Sherrill stated it may be possible to salvage and reuse some of the buildings materials, but that not much of the existing building materials are worth saving.
- L. Evans stated Homeport may be able to conduct a feasibility study on saving a portion of the church, but it may not result in a portion being saved due to financial restraints.

Staff responded to Board comments:

- The property has been actively marketed for 5 ½ years.
- Potential users have not been able to make the finances work out with church restoration.
- The project location is important because of the project development with Gravity II and shared amenities between the sites.
- The Historic Preservation Officer visited the site and also believes that restoration is cost prohibitive due to the condition of the building and the type of materials (concrete block).

H

NEXT MEETING

TUESDAY – JANUARY 15, 2019 AT 3:00 PM

MICHAEL B COLEMAN GOVERNMENT CENTER

111 NORTH FRONT STREET, ROOM 203