

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director
111 N. Front St., 8th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
111 N. Front St., 3rd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

Tuesday, April 23, 2019 - 8:30 AM
111 N. Front Street, Michael B. Coleman Government Center
Hearing Room (Second Floor)

- I. Attendance** 00:36
Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Kyle Katz; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore

Absent: Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty

City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Dan Moorhead

- II. Approval of the March 26, 2019 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**
Motion to approve

- III. Swear In Those In Attendance Who Wish To Testify**

- IV. Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness – Multi-tenant Signage**

Case #1 19-4-1 08:35

Addresses: 80 E. Rich St. (80 on the Commons)

Applicant: Daimler Group – Robert White, Jr.

Property Owner: Two25 Commons LLC c/o Daimler Group – Robert White, Jr.

Design Professional: Columbus Sign Company

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness review for wall sign (ROOT Insurance). Discussion on remaining tenant graphics finishing - graphic parameters and administrative procedures

The building was approved in June 2016 – see Results. At that time, one of the conditions was to bring back signage for approval. In September 2018 the Downtown Commission approved building identity signage for “80 on the Commons). See Results. At that time there was no discussion on future tenant signage. Staff vetting with the Chair believed that, in addition to Root Insurance (a major tenant), there will be more tenant signage on this important building and design parameters needed to be discussed.

Discussion – Internally lit with LED. Hard to predict what the other signs will be, particularly with unknown tenants. Probable blade signs for tenants on the first floor. Will come back for approval of these.

Results – Approved (6-0)

Case #2 19-4-2

09:09

Addresses: 65 E. State

Applicant: DaNite Sign Co. / Oliver Holtsberry

Property Owner: Hertz Columbus One

Design Professional: DaNite Sign Co. / Thad King

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness review for graphics:

- Illuminated tenant directory
- Two temporary perforated vinyl window graphics
- Cut vinyl graphics over entrance

Discussion - Staff briefing. Locations A, B, C & D. Location A is a multi-tenant sign and perhaps most in question. Articulating what is inside is an issue. 65 E. State is a strategically important location, next to Ohio Theater and across from the Statehouse. OH – 4 signs proposed, 2 are window vinyl to screen interior renovation and act as lease information. Duration – 3 to 4 months. Another new vinyl above main door to shops. Allows for readability. On existing dark colored glass. KK – of the signs this is the only one that looks workable. The others have a lot of issues. This one isn't great either. SW – the first two were temporary. KK – even temporary. Most of the signs will not affect their goal, they are not legible. RL – suggest that we look at these separately.

Location D. Entrance vinyl – ML – it's okay, an improvement. Motion to approve, KK, 2nd - DP. RL – do not have to come back for replacement. (6-0) Temporary scrim – KK – I don't think these are helping you. A lot going on and tough to read. Interruption by different colors. JM – I agree, very busy. I like the 65 logo. Locations B & C. I think that these scrim could be simplified, eliminate the heavy lines. Elements are distracting, such as the phone number. RL – how does this vary from an ad mural? DJT, SW – a construction, leasing, on premise information. KK – it may be temporary, but it should be positive. SW – I tend to agree but it is just a covering. KK - could be simplified and made more legible. OH – it needs to have a solid background because construction is occurring behind it. SW – I don't care, one way or another, about the screening thing. RL – I think that it is fine. The approval should be for three months. DP – I would prefer the removal of those lines. It's a lot but for only three months – Okay. RL – the building does need to have attention brought to it. SW – the retail entry is a black hole. How to get people back in there. RL – it's always been a struggle. SW – that is another issue. KK – we encourage you to simplify. SW – just because it is what it is, I would like to approve it. If the applicant wants to simplify, leave that up to them. KK – this is an important corner. A lot of traffic. A lot of people here for the arts. RL – move approval under the condition that it have a term of three months. ML – 2nd. Recommendation to simplify the design. (4-2) No Katz, Maniace.

Location A. Multi-tenant directory. DJT – shows survey. KK – this doesn't work. OH – desire to highlight tenants to get more tenants. Blanks will have tenant logos. Cabinet divided up. KK – we understand the purpose, but the design falls short. I don't even know how to start redesigning – this does not work. If you want to go look at other examples and then come back. JM – questions about tenant blanks. Maybe something that is long and thin. And metal. Getting rid of all of that white. Have a sleeker design. You can keep the 65 State. Maybe some sort of system for signage. Don't have so much white, negative space. SW – I think we are kind of barking up the wrong tree. I would not approve a sign that tried to put identification for 12 tenants. Other projects have highlighted major tenants. We are very concerned about clutter which would take away from the building. I don't think that this design suites the building. It is not a classy representation. I don't

want to personally tell you how to do it. 12 tenants and a back lit box isn't going to get my vote. RL – especially if there are only 8 tenants. Concern with too many blanks. OH – the sign that they really liked and were trying to emulate was “175 on the Park”. KK – that sign was there prior. 65 E. State is on an aspirational block and corner of the city. This is not an aspirational sign. If you want to upgrade this building and it's experience, this sign doesn't do it. Our ambition is to have you bring something back that uplifts the project. SW - Signage typically goes to the major tenant. Maybe put a monument sign up against the wall and make it look like the Huntington approach, that might work. To me this looks like something you would find on a shopping center. This is a high quality building. KK - The Shops on 65 are small, experience is not exactly high end. Some form of a kiosk where 4 or 5 major tenants are identified. Maybe both sides. SW – possibly in the planter. Or maybe a monument sign that is against the wall that gets dropped down (comes from the ground up). Has the logo. Blanks will be a hard sell. OH – I would like to come back with a new design. No need to table

Results

- Sign A (Multi-tenant) – will come back
- Signs B & C (Scrims) – approved with a 3 month term. Recommendation to simplify. (4-2) No Katz, Maniace.
- Sign D – Cut vinyl over entrance – approved (6-0)

V. Conceptual Review / Update

Case #3 19-4-3C

35:15

Address: 450 N. High St.

Applicant: Chris Meyers, AIA – Meyers + Associates Architecture

Property Owner: Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority, c/o Scott Reed

Design Professionals: Rob Uhrin, AIA – Cooper Carry (Alexandria, Va.)

Michael Linker, AIA – Cooper Carry

Chris Meyers, AIA – Meyers + Associates Architecture

EDGE Group – Landscape Architecture

Request:

Update (conceptual review) for Hilton Hotel expansion immediately adjacent to the Convention Center.

The project was initially reviewed (conceptually) in January. See Results.

Discussion – SW – please focus on what is new. CC – basement level eliminated. Complex site. Still has breezeway connection, but for service only. CM – redesign influenced by meetings with other City departments. CC - Signature restaurant remains at prominent location. Evolution of landscape design. Guest rooms have largely remained the same since January. Green roof on top of ballroom (to capture rainwater –as well as shoot for Leed Gold certification) visible from floors above (especially 28th floor restaurant and terrace). Natural material plays off of convention center Eisenman roof. CM - 14,000sf of green roof. CC - Increase in terraces.

EG – landscape – most is both R.O.W. and bridge deck. Higher level of articulation at entrances , use of conventional buff concrete elsewhere. Lighted bollards throughout. Bike parking. Seasonal planting pots. JM – would there be an opportunity for sculpture at the High St. corner? EG - Differences in elevations from street to restaurant that will be addressed. Sculptural furniture. Creating landscape interest throughout the year including winter.

CC - The property has an extensive art program similar to the Hilton One. This would be a good opportunity to provide a sculptural piece. KK – just got back from Denver and saw the bear peering in at their convention center. We need some whimsy, not just here, but downtown in general. This is a fabulous opportunity. JM – also lighting. SW – the two-story glass wall in and of itself, is a dynamic piece. CM – on the inside there might be an art piece that interacts with the outside. A section will be provided that helps explain the elevation changes at this corner. RL – is there a concern about vehicles driving into this corner? Cm – there will be protective elements.

EG – landscape will relate to treatment at convention center but will be distinct. SW – is there going to be a separation between the convention center and the new hotel?

CC – exterior materials – relating to the Eisenman convention center as well as to the original *Hilton. Vertical expression. Connectivity is important. Internal and external expression of important public spaces.* Material board and model brought. Fairly restrictive material pallet in terms of color and substance. Solid, color all the way thru, precast concrete panels. Close to the coloration of Hilton One. No concerns with terra cotta color fading because it is color through.

JM – use of EIFS on project. CC – product is only being utilized where there is far distant visibility. No public interface. Back side of tower. Color matched to precast. EIFS also used to control weight. Good life span, durable exterior coating.

Rendered elevations shown. Interior rendering brought as well – dominant persimmon color. Kinetic nature of smoke and fire. Open live fire kitchen in the restaurant. Performance of chef. Place holder signage show – actual approval will come later. Break out exterior space will have a full glass wind screen. Green roof shown.

SW – thanks for bringing this in – phasing the reviews for such an important building is the way to do it. It will expedite final approval. The fact that we have been positive is a good indication. RL – this is awesome. JM – amazing use of material. Weaving things together. SW – will things also carry through to the existing hotel. A – there will be a refresh, a lot of the functions of the Hilton One will be coming over to the new Hilton. DP – great job all the way around. RL – some sections would be helpful in terms of understanding how elements come together. Also, how the building works underneath, at the lower Convention Center Way. How the new building connects with the old. A – thinking about signage both in terms of both Hiltons and in terms of the lower level restaurant. M – also think about directing people to parking.

Results – Conceptual review only – no vote taken.

VI. Business / Discussion

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification December 12, 2018

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

- 1. A19-3-5M 15 W Cherry Apple – OutFront***
- 2. A19-3-6sc 136 E Broad - Athletic Club- Sidewalk Café***
- 3. A19-3-7 321 McConnell – Antenna***
- 4. A19-3-7M - 56 E Long St - Apple - OB***
- 5. A19-3-8M - 263 N Front - Apple – OB***
- 6. A19-3-9M - 43 W Long St - Apple OB***

7. A19-3-10 11 W Gay – Sign – HRC joint approval
8. A19-3-11 10 W Nationwide – Sign
9. *A19-3-12M - 55 E Spring - Cedar Point – Outfront*
10. *A19-3-13M - 154 N Third N - Cedar Point- Outfront*
11. *A19-3-14M - 34 N High (N) - Candid – OB*
12. *A19-3-15M - 64 E Broad - Candid – OB*
13. *A19-4-1M 260 S Fourth-U of Dayton – OB*
14. A19-4-2 390 E Broad CCAD Fashion Show Tent
15. A19-4-3 285 E State Rooftop Generator

Next regular meeting will be on May 28, 2019, the fourth Tuesday of the month (five weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404. 1:15:45