

## DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

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

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

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

**Tuesday, May 28, 2019 - 8:30 AM**

**111 N. Front Street, Michael B. Coleman Government Center  
Hearing Room (Second Floor)**

**I. Attendance** 1:03:19  
Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty; Mike Lusk

Absent: Kyle Katz; Robert Loversidge; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore

City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Dan Moorhead

**II. Approval of the April 23, 2019 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**  
Motion to approve – OB (4-0)

**III. Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness – Projects Heard from a Prior Date by Commission**

**Case #1 19-5-1** 1:03:53

**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

*This was heard last month. See attached Results. At the time the multi-tenant sign was part of a graphics package that also included graphics over the building entrance and two temporary scrims. These were approved, the multi-tenant sign was not.*

**Discussion:** Staff – site and prior approval context. SW – flush against the corner or back some? OH – flush at the corner. SW – I think it would look better if it were back, expressing architectural feature of the corner of the building. It wouldn't have to be that far, a foot or so. SW are all of the tenant spaces to be used or will there be blank spaces? OH – intend to use all of them. If there are blank spots we could have a plan. Would remain white, could have vacancy or for lease information. SW – would hate to see an erratic pattern of blanks. OH – would have logo information. ML – a lot better than last month's. TH – motion to approve, OB – 2<sup>nd</sup>, don't know how else they would do it.

**Results** – motion to approve (4-0) Provision to move sign off of the corner.

**Case #2 19-5-2**

1:11:43

**Address:** 33 N. High Street - Central Ohio Transit Authority (COTA)

**Property Owner:** COTA, c/o Andrew Biesterveld, Director of Capital Projects

**Applicant:** Jay Boone, Moody Nolan, Inc.

**Design Professional:** Curtis J. Moody, FAIA Moody Nolan, Inc.

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for COTA's signage as part of renovations CC3359.05(C)1)

*The building renovation part of the project was approved by the Commission in March 2019*

**Discussion** – Staff - application shows two options. MN – backlit COTA logo, vestibule lighting, move the building's name to the left hand side. Back lit aluminum lettering will read as red. Vestibule lighting can change color as per time of year, holidays. COTA – intent is not to have continuous change of color but rather, as a specific highlight color, i.e. blue for law enforcement week, green for Veteran's Day, etc. Standard color would be red. OB – what's all the writing on Option 1A. Film that would help illuminate the vestibule. The lettering spells out different locations that COTA serves. The other option just has a solid frosted coating. Both options are intended to light up and have the vestibule glow. SW – contrast effects how the larger COTA sign will read, one should be careful not to overwhelm it. The overall COTA sign is good. A – the two computer renderings read differently, we can control the light levels to promote effective contrast. ML – which option is preferred? A- not much difference, might prefer a combination of what is presented – readability of larger COTA sign with lessened lettering of vestibule. The LED would be controllable. SW – I would prefer to be able to see into the lobby, not just have red mass. The letters are more interesting. Collectively, we have no problem with the COTA sign. Focusing on the vestibule, which is preferable? ML – lower the intensity on the vestibule lettering and the COTA will pop. SW – moving the name of the building works. OB – there's a lot of information in the locations as part of the vestibule. A – the lettering will be a #M product that catches directed down lighting. TH – motion to approve Option 1A, ML – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results:** Motion to approve Option 1A (COTA sign, vestibule with lettering, move building sign to the left). Vestibule lighting with varied colors with standard color being red. Suggestion that the intensity level on the vestibule lighting allow for sufficient contrast with the COTA sign (lower vestibule level). (4-0)

**Case#3 19-5-3**

1:27:54 14 min

**Address:** 274 E. Long St. (Northeast corner of Long and Neilston Streets)

**Applicant and Architect:** Lupton Rausch Architects / David Goth

**Property Owner:** Edwards Long Street LLC

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for details requested by the Downtown Commission for parking garage. . Specially requested are details for exterior lighting and landscaping. Signage was also requested but will be dealt with at another time.

*The overall plan was approved by the Downtown Commission at their February 2019 meeting. See attached Results. At that time, additional details were requested. Staff has issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Foundation Start*

**Discussion** - SW – focus on changes and what you want for approval today. DG ,- extensive discussions with Public Service and Drawer E Plans and streetscape requirements. There are a lot of other projects and connectivity in immediate area and the issue is what is needed in terms of compliance. Curb planters and trees along southern end as well as low ivy vegetation, running along Long St. façade. Neilston – trying to incorporate some trees in tree grates. Sidewalk space along here is limited. Three trees were requested on Neilston. Conflicts with intended parking supergraphic. Adjustments might have to be made. Description of other streetscape treatment, includes special crosswalk “knuckle” for offset of street alignment. Description of dog park landscaping. Right side of property between the garage and adjacent building will largely be ground cover and a tree. That area will be fenced at both ends. Exterior lighting shown. Emphasis on highlighting upper material with an upwash. There will be no visible light fixtures, everything tucked in.

TH – fencing along dog park had already been seen and approved? A- yes. TH - a couple of questions regarding selection of tree species – Japanese Lilac – good for overhead power lines, but not good – will branch low and potentially obstruct store frontage and signage. Check to see if there could be a better shade tree. Lowest branches at a 10 to 12 ft. height. DG – accepted version from PS, but according to staff, not critical to PS. TH - Check out and potentially make revision. DG – we are working under different constraints. ML - motion to approve the lighting and landscaping, TH – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results:** Approved (4-0) Allow for variation of trees species – work it out.

**Case #4 19-5-4**

1:41:45

**Addresses:** 518 E. Broad St. (HQ address) - 30 to 94 N. Washington Ave. (rear property)

**Applicant and Design Professional:** Frank Weaver, WSA Studio

**Property Owner:** State Auto Insurance Companies, Art Hersey

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness review for parking garage and campus development.

*This was conceptually reviewed in February, see Results. At that time, the demolition of 555 Boone St., a warehouse and vehicular maintenance building, was approved.*

**Discussion** - Staff – contextual slides shown. A – There have been no major changes since conceptual presentation. SW – this area around the Art Museum, CCAD and State Auto is really looking good. A – we have been meeting regularly with our neighbors in getting feedback.. Site information and context shown. Existing sycamores along Washington will be preserved. Pedestrianized auto court on the south side. Possible paved plaza on Washington. There are a number of vehicular entrances and exits for employees, possible public (i.e. Art patrons). Auto plaza also includes drop offs and Ubers. Meant to also have pedestrian emphasis. SW – questions about garage entrance off of surface parking to the east. FW – main entrance is off of Washington. Some visitors parking off of Washington. The rest for associates parking with internal gates. Parking circulation discussed. Existing sidewalk was done as part of Creative Campus capital improvements – no additional work will be done.

OB – breakdown the public / State Auto use of the garage. A – primarily after hours parking for the museum, but with a dedicated use during day along Washington Ave. SW – looks great. Would be good if there was some opportunity for art (sculpture). Team up with the art museum. A – we’ve discussed this already with the museum. SW – possibly work in some opportunity sites. I didn’t see planting details. A – we’ll come back with specific landscaping as well as lighting.

We'll be voting on construction CoA with coming back for details as above. DJT – there had been discussion earlier on projected art. SW – have that come in when lighting is reviewed. A – during conceptual review we were talking about projection from across the street. We are now shifting that to the south – from our own HQ. There were issues with removing trees. The plaza could function as a nice community space for projected art / graphics / movies. TH – landscaping looks awesome, we'll await for specifics. Materials reviewed, samples provided. Perforated metal screening, blue band, bollards, curtain wall system at stairs, glass. SW – bring in other materials and colors, as necessary. OB – motion (so moved), TH – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results:** Approved (4-0). Return with specifics on landscaping, lighting and materials and colors (as necessary).

**Case #5 19-5-5**

1:56:22

**Address:** 266 North Fifth Street

**Applicant and Architect:** Ford Architects , Anslee Stevenson

**Property Owner:** HCP Columbus Warehouse District LLC

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation. CC3359.05(C)1)

*A project at this address was reviewed and approved by the Downtown Commission in June of 2018. The most obvious changes from that plan to this are the removal of mullion pattern.*

**Discussion** DJT – heard and approved last year, they are coming back with some changes, primarily with the window mullion (or lack thereof) and entrance design. Contextual slides shown. As – windows will stick out a little bit. Awnings have also been removed. One more window has also been added to the rear façade. There will be a black metal window frame. Clear glass windows. The entrance is inset and at an angle. TH - Reveal of window should be limited to about 4 inches. ML – Motion to approve, TH – 2<sup>nd</sup> (4-0)

**Results:** Motion to approve (4-0)

**Case #6 19-5-6**

2:01:50

**Location:** 150-156 N. Third St. and space between buildings

**Applicant and Design Professional:** Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design c/o Sarah Mackert

**Property Owner:** Schottenstein Property Group c/o Keith Massa

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations of previously approved project including update of requested details: ● Change of wall material on south elevations ● Details of cornice on Third Street elevation of old building.

*This project was approved by the Commission in June of 2018. At that time a condition was to return on details of the historic building, one detail being the cornice. A Certificate of Appropriate has been issued for the remainder of the project and construction has begun.*

**Discussion** – New renderings distributed. SW – concentrate on changes. DJT – currently under construction. Cornice details were asked for. Recreation of parapets is a serious issue. Typically, lighter is better. SM – more information is being provided on the fiberglass cornice. Historic photo

has been provided which shows double brackets. We are proposing simplified version of this. Also change of polycarb façade on the south side. This is proposed to be eliminated. Owner someday hopes to install the polycarb, but not now. We would like your approval to just have the white façade. That would be EIFS and will match the rest of the building. New illustrations distributed. The parapet will be restored out of masonry and the bracketed cornice clipped on.

Where the polycarb is, the windows will be revealed. The first floor does not yet have a tenant so it is unclear how it will be finished. ML – move for passage. TH – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results: Motion to approve (4-0).**

#### IV. Conceptual Reviews

**Case #7 19-5-7C**

2:12:41

**Address: 554 E. Main Street**

**Applicant and Design Professional :** Jonathan Barnes Architecture & Design / co: Carly Maggio

**Property Owner:** JDS Companies

**Request:**

Conceptual Review for a 4-story apartment with ground level parking.

**Discussion** DJT – contextual slides shown. Small site at the NE corner of Main and Main – Rich St. Connector. JB – proposal has residential with its own parking on site. Small vacant lots have a lot of opportunities. Adding to housing, 19 units, 11 parking spaces. CM – enter parking form Cherry St. Two open stairs. Open corridor on the east side. Long, wide and one two bedroom unit. Elevations shown. Breaks down into tower components. Each tower with its own color. Gridded panel on the east that obstructs walkways. All cement board. A lot of fresh air and light from garage type door. TH – I like it. SM – car ports are open in the back. It will be secure. DJT – there is sidewalk along the Connector. With some trees although most of the trees are on site and will be taken. CM There will be some mesh screens on the west side. The solid masses are utility rooms. JB – because of size and location we don't think there is any opportunity for retail. SW – come back with specifics and details – materials and colors. ML – if I am a guest, where do I park and where do I get in. CM – a lot of on street parking in the area.

**Results:** Conceptual review only, no vote taken.

**Case #8 19-5-8C**

2:27:33

**Address:** 56 S. Grant Ave. (Unassigned address)

**Applicant:** Jonathan D. Riewald, The Pizzuti Companies

**Property Owner:** Capital University

**Attorney:** Michael T. Shannon, Underhill & Hodge LLC

**Design Professional:** David M. Goth ,Lupton Rausch Architecture + Interior Design / MKSK

**Request:**

Conceptual Review for mixed use, largely apartments, with retail and structured parking

**Discussion:** DJT – Grant Apartments at the corner of Grant and Oak. Context image shown. JR – currently surface parking lot that creates a gap in the urban fabric. To be replaced with a 6-story mixed use building comprised of 155 market rate apartments, 106 structure parking stalls, 6,000 SF of

retail space, as well as roof top amenity deck. Project designed to engage the pedestrian at street level specifically along Grant Ave. and Oak St. All parking access will be from Capital St. Uninterrupted frontage along Grant and Oak. Retail focus Grant, Oak St. residential flats with apartments above. Will also have streetscape improvements to streetscape standards. Same design team, including streetscape / landscape. Making Oak St. a viable residential corridor.

DG – Relating in scale to the Seneca, but not overwhelming to the rest of the block. Along Grant, at base of building, is commercial façade. Corner is main entrance. Metal panels separating the commercial base of the building from the apartments above. Walk down garden units on Oak. Rest of building stepping back from that. Reference to the renovated apartments on the other side of Oak St.

DG – attempts to break up massing of the building by materials, forms, deep cuts, combining window patterns. Balconies with reference to fire escapes creating shadow and depth. Use of vines and screens along Grant Ave. because of its shallowness. This will be done in a playful way. Composite metal panel that will be richer. Multiple brick.

SW – How are setbacks accomplished with construction techniques? DG the whole first two floors are built on concrete podium to hold parking garage. Allows for floors above to be positioned in (a lot more modulation in the façade). On top of the podium – extended U – which will allow for a court – amenity space. SW – handsome product – we will have to see the materials and details on final submission. TH – looks great overall. First floor on Grant – I like it sculpturally, but I’m concerned whether there is enough transparency to be welcoming for a retailer. Maybe a little more glass. SW – I have the same feeling. It looks a little busy. Maybe widen some of the glass areas. TH – would you be helped if you could move the Grant St. retail wall back 18” or 2’ for a little more green relief, street trees or outdoor dining? Maybe more green for Oak St. if you were to give it another 2 ft. Planter strips instead of grates which would help the health of those trees. A – there is a deep cut for greenery at the corner. We are trying to squeeze a lot of “programing into the box”.

**Results:** Conceptual review only, no vote taken.

**Case #9 19-5-9C**

2:45:37

**Address:** 134 E. Goodale Street

**Applicant and Design Professional :** Laurie Gunzelman

**Property Owner:** Arena Properties Ltd., Richard Bruggeman

**Request:**

Conceptual Review for renovation of an existing commercial ( formerly storage) structure.

**Discussion:** DJT – conceptual case at the NW corner of Goodale and Fourth. LG – unique site, connecting High St. activity with Fourth St. and Italian Village. Converting self-storage building to multi-tenant (3 spaces) commercial building. Building is fairly run down. Large billboards in parking lot. Proposal is to have new activity and new use. Opportunity for outdoor dining. Covered patio on Fourth St. side. Stage for performances on Goodale, recess in side to draw people in and entrances to tenant spaces. Use of existing brick – tuck point and clean. Store front windows as well as garage doors on east façade to open up space. There will be a roof deck for tenant space #1. There will be mezzanines for other two tenant spaces. The inside of the space has some amazing details that we are going to articulate. We will add to the building at the west end. There is existing windows (clear story) on the second level that we hope to make more operable to allow for fresh air. The structure along the top is currently there.

TH – does your client own both the parking lot and the billboard? You will be encroaching into the existing parking area with the new outdoor seating? You still hope to keep some parking spaces? LG – yes. Site plan shown. We still need to have a dumpster and other services. There isn't room on the west end. ADA access will also be maintained in front. Hope to have a nominal amount of green at the Fourth and Goodale corner to soften that edge. TH – the guidelines speak to that, 2whatever dimension you can squeeze out for greening – fence or hedge would help the whole project. SW – the brick wall will be cut out on the south side? LG - yes. TH – great, any time one has a chance to upgrade existing potentially viable buildings, that's good. SW – what's your thought on the billboard? LG – there are actually two here, one is obstructed. At least one of these surfaces would have signage related to the building – viewable from I-670. The intent is to leave the bill boards. The armature on top of the building would be for the building. TH – all of that could be tough for Commission to approve (SW – agree), a lot of stuff. If the two existing billboards weren't there, it would make it easier to approve a building oriented roof sign. SW – I like what you are doing with the building – it's a little unfortunate with the billboard.

**Results:** Conceptual review only, no vote taken.

## V. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness – New Application

**Case #10 19-5-10**

2:56:09

**Address:** 492 Armstrong Street

**Applicant and Design Professional :** Blostein / Overly Architects

**Owners:** MJS Marketing (Owner / Lessor of Wall Space)

Greek Orthodox Church of Columbus (Building – Property Owner)

### **Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for LED Message Center

*The Arena Wine and Spirits project for the building was approved by the Downtown Commission in September 2013.*

**Discussion** – DJT – contextual slides shown. OA - Building owned by Greek Orthodox Church. Sam Michael and company are planning on doing a wall on the west side facing surface parking for the Arena District. Doing LED display that would integrate with landscape feature. Other locations of LED nearby such as Huntington Park. 30 ft. long corten planter underneath LED. Two separate planters fabricate at the Idea Foundry. Bamboo will be planted in the containers. LED wall mounted above planters. Mostly advertising but at least 30% would be art based.

SW – have you looked at the Downtown Guidelines? OA – we have. SW – in my mind it doesn't fit the guidelines, it doesn't represent any location where we would do this. Also, while this doesn't have anything to do with this application, did these guys ever finish putting in a sidewalk that I thought was part of an earlier project at his location? DJT – there are two piece of properties along this stretch of Armstrong – the building that was removed and the lower portion retained to act as screening for parking and this one. Neither did sidewalks. SW – we can go back and look at both. TH – I can appreciate how you are trying to integrate landscaping in this. I have a couple of issues – per our guidelines this is outside suggested locations. The other is our inability to control content. It makes me reluctant to approve new locations. Even if this was a static sign. Adding new locations to the downtown is difficult. SW – there are certain places – Broad & High, High St., Arena District – that are specified. Overall, they are discouraged elsewhere downtown. I also wouldn't vote for a static graphic here. It's just not appropriate. ML – I would agree with what was said. Without our

ability to view content and control design, I would be reluctant to approve new locations. SW – could we have a motion in the affirmative. TH – if the applicant wants us to vote on it. OB – I suppose we could table it and do some research. I appreciate discussion about corridors where these might be acceptable. I look at this location as being in a sea of parking where changes will occur in the future and this LED could also change. I don't see much support at the current time. Don't see a point in taking a vote.

**Results** – Tabled by request of applicant

## **VI. Business / Discussion**

3:05:20

This was to be Kyle Katz's last meeting as a Downtown Commissioner. Unfortunately, Kyle was out of town for his son's graduation. A letter of proclamation from the Mayor has been written and will be given to Mr. Katz at a later.

### **Public Forum**

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

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. A19-4-4 321 McConnell – Antenna
2. ***A19-4-5M - 110 N Third - Eldorado - OB***
3. A19-4-6 289 E Naghten – Antenna - Verizon
4. A19-4-7 Columbus Commons - Tents
5. A19-4-8 51 E Gay – Signage – Bristro Phenix
6. A19-4-9 175 W Nationwide - Signage - Repurposing Arena Grand
7. A19-4-10 501 N High - Signage - Ruth Chris - HRC
8. A19-4-11 555 N High - Signage - Church Banners – Greek Orthodox
9. A19-5-1 175 W Nationwide - Signage - Repurposing Arena Grand - Revision
10. ***A19-5-2M - 123 E Spring - Miller Lite – Outfront***
11. A19-5-3 309 S Fourth - Dueling Axes – Sign
12. A19-5-4 289 E Naghten – Antenna – Sprint
13. A19-5-5 COSI Banner
14. ***A19-5-6M - 60 E Spring St - NCH Mental – AM – Orange Barrel***
15. A19-5-7 35 N Fourth - Lease Banner
16. A19-5-8 374 W. Spring St. (DePuy Synthes) Signs

**Next regular meeting will be on June 25, 2019, the fourth Tuesday of the month (four weeks away).**

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

3:10:25