

## MEETING SUMMARY

DATE **January 15, 2019**  
PLACE **MICHAEL B COLEMAN GOVERNMENT CENTER**  
**111 NORTH FRONT STREET, ROOM 205**  
TIME **3:06 PM – 5:12 PM**  
PRESENT William Fergus, Bart Overly, Matt Egner, Kim Way, Judy Box, Ryan Szymanski  
ABSENT

---

### A **CALL TO ORDER**

### B **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**3:07- 3:08** **MEETING SUMMARY – December 18, 2018 and BUSINESS MEETING SUMMARY – January 8, 2019**

MOTION BY **Way / Box**  
MOTION **To approve**  
RESULT **APPROVED (6-0)**

### C **NEW BUSINESS - APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

**3:09 – 3:15**

1. APPLICATION: **EF\_19-01-001**  
ADDRESS: **500 W BROAD ST**  
PROPERTY OWNER: **THE GRAVITY PROJECT LLC**  
APPLICANT: **KAUFMAN DEVELOPMENT**  
TO BE REVIEWED: **WAYFINDING PACKAGE**  
SUB-DISTRICT: **WEST BROAD STREET**

#### **STAFF REPORT:**

**Staff presented the relevant details as listed in the staff report:**

- The applicant is requesting to install wayfinding signs throughout the Gravity I site. Specifically for approval for updates to Mural #1 and Mural #2 (as listed in the package). Mural #1 includes tenant signage and a placeholder for artwork with no commercial copy. The application was previously approved at the November 2018 EFRB Regular Meeting without “Mural #1”. The previous approval included a ground sign, directional signage for pedestrians, low-height walls to display the graphics and parking garage branding.
- Staff recommends approval.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

**The applicant (J. Schueren, Kaufman) provided a description of the project including:**

- The revised “Mural 1” will contain an artist mural next to the pedestrian wayfinding.

**The board provided the following comments on the application:**

- Mr. Way recused himself from the discussion and motion.

MOTION BY **Overly / Box**  
MOTION **To Approve**  
RESULT **APPROVED (5-0) (Mr. Way was recused)**

### D **OLD BUSINESS - APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

**3:15 – 3:27**

3. APPLICATION: **EF\_18-07-001**  
ADDRESS: **442 W RICH ST**  
PROPERTY OWNER: **LANCE ROBBINS**

APPLICANT: **CHRIS SHERMAN**  
TO BE REVIEWED: **COFFEE SHOP EXTERIOR MATERIALS, LANDSCAPING, AND SIGNAGE**  
SUB-DISTRICT: **ARTS & INNOVATION**

**STAFF REPORT:**

Staff presented the relevant details as listed in the staff report:

- The applicant is requesting approval for a site plan, building plans and materials, building elevations, graphics, and to reduce parking from 14 to 0 spaces (previous parking calculation was incorrect at 12 to 0 spaces). The applicant came before the EFRB in July 2018 to request approval for adaptive reuse of an existing residential structure for a coffee shop. The application was approved with conditions to return for final approval of the exterior materials, landscaping, and signage. The approval included a parking modification of 12 to 0 parking spaces.
- Staff recommends approval.

**DISCUSSION:**

**The applicant (C. Sherman and Architect J. Berk) Provided a description of the project including:**

- Additional bicycle parking was added in the rear and modified the rear patio to accommodate the exterior air conditioning condensing unit, which will have a solid corten screen around it that is not treated. Since the corten will rust over time, they will have the corten sit in a pea gravel bed so the rust does not wash onto the sidewalk.
- The signage will include an aluminum custom frame channel letters that are for the primary sign with “clean” fixtures for the majority of the other exterior lighting.

**The board provided the following comments on the application:**

- Mr. Way asked if the corten is solid or perforated, and if it is treated.
- Mr. Way asked if the main light will be backlit.

MOTION BY **Overly/ Egner**  
MOTION **To approve the application on the condition that corten will sit on a gravel bed.**  
RESULT **APPROVED (6-0)**

**3:28 – 3:56** 4. APPLICATION: **EF\_18-06-001**  
ADDRESS: **435 W TOWN ST**  
PROPERTY OWNER: **MANHATTAN PROJECT LLC**  
APPLICANT: **CHRIS SHERMAN**  
TO BE REVIEWED: **EVENT CENTER**  
SUB-DISTRICT: **ARTS & INNOVATION**

**STAFF REPORT:**

Staff presented the relevant details as listed in the staff report:

- The applicant is requesting full approval for an event center, including building elevations and materials, site plan and landscaping. Graphics will be reviewed as a future application.
- Staff listed recommended changes relative to building materials and site design.
- Staff stated that including street trees along Town Street could be recommended if they are not already in place.
- Staff recommends tabling the application to provide the applicant additional time to revise the proposal based on the discussion, or to approve it conditionally with the items listed as staff approvable. The applicant should also commit to provide a historic sign or plaque with the renovation of the structure.
- Staff stated that the code will be checked to see if there is a requirement for screening between parking and residential properties.

**DISCUSSION:**

**The applicant (C. Sherman) Provided a description of the project including:**

- Mr. Sherman would like to table and revise the application including moving the doors to the center, replacing the rear CMU patio wall with concrete piers and metal or slotted panels, recreating façade brickwork on the front elevation,

updating the dumpster screening materials, installing a mural on the east elevation, moving the bicycle racks to the McDowell St. parking lot, and adding street trees on McDowell within the landscaped area.

- Mr. Sherman stated that the existing windows on Town Street are steel frames, with boards in place of the window. The proposed windows are aluminum, but could be modified for a future application. The proposed windows in the rear of the building would be of aluminum and glass (typical storefront style).
- Mr. Sherman would like materials that are more authentic and industrial for a future design.
- Mr. Sherman stated that the right portion of the east side of the McDowell parking lot has a grade and that there would be a curb of some sort to delineate the parking lot.

**The board provided the following comments on the application:**

- Mr. Way asked if any street trees were along Town Street.
- Mr. Overly asked what material the existing windows are made from and what the proposed windows would be.
- Mr. Overly gave suggestions for various building finishes and front door placement.
- Mr. Overly asked if there should be screening for the right portion of the east side of the McDowell parking lot, given the adjacency of residential garages.

**Members of the public provided the following comments on the application:**

- B. Kagel asked why there wasn't a creative reuse of the building that was torn down. She encouraged the reuse of materials such as brick and encouraged developers to use local businesses to build building components such as planters.

MOTION BY **Overly/ Box**  
MOTION **To table the application**  
RESULT **TABLED**

**3:57 – 5:07**     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:        **WEST BROAD STREET**

**STAFF REPORT:**

**Staff presented the relevant details as listed in the staff report:**

- Staff recommends to approve the demolition with conditions that tax credits or other public financing is awarded to project for the construction of multi-family housing to provide affordable housing and documentation of the existing structure to be coordinated with the Historic Preservation Office.
- Staff recommends to approve the proposed multifamily development with conditions to Board review and approval of elevations, materials, landscaping, lighting, and to provide 60 parking spaces through a shared parking arrangement.
- Staff clarified that the applicant is looking for approval of the use and design standards, which allow the building to be permitted on the site. Conditional approval of the demolition would need to be obtained in order to get approval for the building to be permitted on the site.
- Staff noted that the site has been advertised to developers for several years, but that interested parties were not able to find funding to restore the church. Staff provided copies of the Harmony Project overview.

**DISCUSSION:**

**The applicant (J. Metzler with Homeport, L. Evans with Homeport, K. Sherrill with Shremshock Architects, and Mark Shy with Brexton Construction) provided a description of the project including:**

- Homeport presented the cost estimates, obtained by Brexton, LLC, for three different church renovation scenarios: to keep the rose window, to preserve the front portion of the church, and to preserve one or both of the church towers. Mr. Metzler stated that due to the cost restraints associated with a LIHTC project (application parameters and restrictions), the ability to carry out any of the church renovation scenarios is limited.

- Mr. Sherrill noted that the building design is largely the same, but now includes a tower on the east elevation that refers back to the church, a more commercial storefront type of frontage with an awning to provide street activation and a front porch type of feel.
- Mr. Metzler stated that Homeport has engaged ASC to provide cultural resource services to document the history of the church and to begin the application process for Section 106.
- Ms. Evans stated that the LIHTC application requires approval from the board that the proposed building could be built on the proposed site. Ms. Evans states that from award notification, the project closes on financing the next year, and construction to begin 12-16 months after application. This allows the time to decide on the specific look of the building on the site. Tax credits are awarded in May or early June. No further decisions would be made pertaining to the project until awards are announced.
- Ms. Evans stated that if awarded tax credits, the church would not be demolished until the Board approves the final design elements, but that if the board could not approval the final details, then Homeport would have to give back the tax credits.
- Ms. Evans stated that they cannot commit to preserving the front façade of the church because they are not currently aware of a funding source. Committing to saving the front would create a large funding gap in the project and deem it unable to move forward in development. They would be able to commit to exploring the option of saving the front façade with potential partners and come back to the Board in February.
- Mr. Shy has 41 years of renovating and preserving Columbus buildings. Mr. Shy stated that after walking the site, he found the building to be a good condition for being vacant for 7 years, especially the towers.
- Ms. Evans stated that for affordable housing, the church is too compartmentalized and the site too small to integrate the whole structure into a larger affordable housing building.
- Mr. Sherrill stated that for affordable housing, the project needs to have metrics that are competitive against other projects competing for the same funding.
- Mr. Shy stated that using any church materials leftover from a demolition would be difficult.

**The board provided the following comments on the application:**

- Mr. Overly stated that it is not possible to include any of the three preservation scenarios into affordable housing. There may be other funding mechanisms to support selective demolition of the church and avoid loading those costs onto the project scope. He asked what the funding mechanism pressures are on the project.
- Mr. Szymanski asked when tax credit awards are announced.
- Mr. Overly wants the front façade of the church preserved.
- Mr. Way asked if Columbus Landmarks would support partial demolition, or if they want to keep the whole structure.
- Mr. Overly has no issue with approving the use, but is opposed to the development resulting in demolition of the church.
- Dr. Box asked if the development could be approved on the condition that the front façade of the church is preserved.
- Dr. Box is for saving the church, but not at the cost of losing the opportunity activate the site.
- Mr. Way would like to preserve the façade of the church, but does not want to hold the project back.

**Members of the public provided the following comments on the application:**

- B. West, the Executive Director of Columbus Landmarks, recognized the need of affordable housing in Columbus and that the potential demolition of the church would result in the loss of a piece of significant history of Franklinton.
- S. Keeney, an architect with Columbus Landmarks, stated that historic buildings provide tangible connections to the past and serve as collective memory. She encourages incorporating the church into the affordable housing development.
- B. West and S. Keeney stated that Columbus Landmarks is advocating for a type of compromise.
- C. Merkle, a member of the Franklinton Area Commission, stated he does not take demolition lightly, but given the cost and time constraints and that the asset is City owned, the project provides an opportunity to have a mixed-income community. He urges the Board to do all they can to ensure that Homeport makes its February application deadline.
- R. Smith, a local historian who was raised in the Hilltop, is concerned of losing the pieces of history that create the fiber of the community. She urged the Board to consider what will be lost and how we should relay the stories and markers of history to future generations.
- B. Kagel stated that there is no reason to destroy a historic landmark when it could be repurposed into something that retains historical significance and offer amenities to the area.
- T. Smith, Franklinton Board of Trade, stated that the Franklinton Board of Trade values any opportunity to save a historic building, but understand the constrains on the affordable housing project. He asked Homeport, what factors cause the church to not be saved and incorporated into their design.

MOTION BY **Box/ Egner**  
MOTION **To table the application**  
RESULT **TABLED**

**E OTHER BUSINESS**

**5:08 – 5:10** 1. ELECTION CHAIR and  
VICE-CHAIR

MOTION BY **Way/ Overly**  
MOTION **To Elect B. Fergus as Chair and J. Box as Vice-Chair**  
RESULT **APPROVED (6-0)**

**F STAFF APPROVED APPLICATIONS ISSUED CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

- |    |   |                                       |                   |
|----|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | <b>EF_18-11-003</b><br><b>500 W BROAD</b> | <b>11/20/2018: WAYFINDING</b>         | <b>12/14/2018</b> |
| 2. | <b>EF_18-12-005</b><br><b>40 N GRUBB</b>  | <b>12/18/2018: WINDOW REPLACEMENT</b> | <b>12/31/2018</b> |

**G NEXT MEETING**

**TUESDAY – FEBRUARY 19, 2019 AT 3:00 PM**  
**MICHAEL B COLEMAN GOVERNMENT CENTER**  
**111 NORTH FRONT STREET, ROOM 203**