

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)

## DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, June 25, 2019 - 8:30 AM

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

- I. Attendance** 7:13  
Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore; Tony Slanec  
  
Absent: None  
  
City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Dan Moorhead, Luis Teba, Steve Schoeny
- II. Approval of the May 28, 2019 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**  
Move to approve OB, DP 2<sup>nd</sup> (7-0)
- III. Welcome to new Commissioner, Tony Slanec** 7:57
- IV. Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness**
- Case #1 19-6-1** 8:14  
**Address:** 402-404 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:**  
Certificate of Appropriateness for Hilton Hotel expansion immediately adjacent to the Convention Center.
- The project was initially reviewed conceptually in January with an update in April.*
- Discussion:** SW – request to highlight changes, since it had been favorably reviewed in January and April. CC – comprehensive package presented. Site plans, both upper and lower shown. CM – has incorporated input from other City departments. CC - Landscape design presented. Dark granite entry highlight. Samples provided. Feature corner at N. High and Ohio Center Way. Section shown. Planting bed separates sidewalk from restaurant. Highly visible corner and special restaurant. EG – plants and their heights will change throughout the season.
- Elevated terraces on fourth level also have strong relationship with corner. EG - Trees specified. Planting materials shown. Building program described. Floor plans

Shown and described. Connection to Coleman Skybridge and Hilton 1.0. Two special rooftop terraces on 28<sup>th</sup> floor (restaurant and also bar / lounge). Vegetative green roof over ballroom (assists with LEED credits and City drainage requirements). Exterior renderings shown. Elevations shown. Sample of dark precast brought along with material board. Orange coloration of precast will refer to the brick of Hilton 1.0 across High St. EIFS will be used on back of the building on places with no public interaction and where there is concern about weight (north side). Color will be matching. OB – where will people park? New garage (with dedicated spaces) and also existing Vine St. garage.

JM – is there a need for bollards at the High Ohio Center Way corner? CC - There are bollards elsewhere. City Traffic has had input in bollard locations. Planter wall will also act as buffer. OB – wayfinding (signage) is important – people have issues negotiating getting places. OB – move to approve, DP – 2<sup>nd</sup>. SW – thank you for the manner, steps, you took, it was helpful.

**Results:** Motion to approve (6-0-2) Hardesty and Loversidge recusing.

**Case #2 19-6-2**

25:48

**Address:** 134 E. Goodale Street

**Applicant and Design Professional :** Laurie Gunzelman

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

**Request:**

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

*This project was conceptually reviewed last month. See draft Results.*

**Discussion:** DJT – last month there was discussion about two billboards and sign structure on roof. LG – quick walk through. Currently being used as storage facility. Connection, linkage with High St. and 4<sup>th</sup> in Italian Village. Three tenant spaces. 6 parking spaces on site to be retained. Inset outdoor areas and better entries. There is also a 3 ft. site elevation change to compensate for. There will be a mezzanine in portions of the interior. Some metal corrugated siding. Canopy on the Fourth St. side. Truss to support the opening on the Goodale side. There will be seating along this edge too, as well as plantings. Beds at east edge of site to soften the edge near 4<sup>th</sup> St. It’s a tight site with not a lot of space.

Talked to the owner about use of the billboards. The current proposal is to keep the structures but not use them for off-premise advertising (billboards) but rather some amenity, i.e. projecting film – to allow that corner to be used for social gathering. At those times only handicapped parking would occur. Possibly celebrate things that are happening in this building. Tenant space are being set up for retail hospitality or restaurant such as a craft brewery. JM – what would you have when there is no projection? Would they be blank or decorative? LG – they would almost like signage as to events happening here, i.e. coming this Friday we have this band, something on premise related to the tenant spaces. ML – would it be a video board? LG – yes. DP – with those new activities and influx of people, how do you compensate for parking? LG – we did discuss this with the owner, possible parking agreements are being looked at. DP – 580 venue is great but the parking there is an issue. SW – this is a parking exempt zone.

TS – have you talked to Public Service about enhancements to the streetscape along Goodale? LG – no. The sidewalks will be cleaned up and replaced. We talked at the last meeting about landscaping and ivy. SW – you are going to use the existing sidewalks, just clean them up. LG – yes. SW – what does “clean up” mean? There are weeds and other places where the sidewalk is broken. In those places, sidewalk would be replaced. TH – it’s in really bad shape. You are doing such a good job with the building – it would be a shame to not work this out with Public Service. I’m also sensitive

that this is a \$1.6M construction project. How much should you have to spend. I don't know as a Commission we can do other than strongly encourage you to have a conversation. It appears that all of sidewalk and curb should be replaced. TS – you are looking at the parking lot as a potential venue for an outdoor event. What sort of surface treatment would the parking lot have? Asphalt, paver? LG – we don't anticipate changing it., just softening up the edges. TS – you might even think about pervious pavers, get some storm water credits.

What about what looks like had been a sign on top of the building? Is that to remain? LG – I believe we are looking to remove. SW – we need to be specific about what we are approving. I don't see the roof structure in your drawings, in elevations, for example. Our CoA should be issued with the roof sign structure gone. RL – if you decide not to do this, come back. SW – I also think we need to think about the graphic (billboard) thing, are two to remain? You need to tell us what you need these to be. Are they going to be billboards, graphics for activities on site, video screens? We have parameters as to what is allowable. LG – we intend that they would be projected or a digital screen. SW – would these also be used for other things than activities on the site? What hours of operation – 24 hrs. a day? LED will bring one response, static graphics another, projecting still another. RL – if they are video screens at those scales, they would be very expensive and the owner will want revenue. JM – again what would non-use “screen” look like? RL – what would it look like on a sunny day? LG – could have static of event on site and then flip a white surface for projection. RL – we would approve this as on premise advertising only? SW – would there be two of them? TH – I like the idea that they are going from two billboards to on-site signage piece; I would be more comfortable having you come back – it seems that we would be approving permanent signage. We would want to understand specifically what that graphic is. Staff – suggestion that the approval be broken down – building, graphics, landscaping (streetscaping) – pointed out the Versa graphics that incorporated both sign and art. SW – we also don't want to see an on premise sale. Kyle had something that was well done and worked. RL – the signage for the tenants isn't done yet so we should have all of the graphics something to approve later. SW – this gives you a chance to think it all the way through. You have heard what we are thinking. The video might be interesting, the parameters would be important. When is it used and when not used. JM – maybe the building's name (or image) could be incorporated into non-use. Create energy for that corner.

RL – I think this is a very creative and exciting reuse of a neglected building, I move approval of the application with the caveat that the applicant come back for signage package. TH – I also think we need a detailed landscape plan. SW – the structure on the roof would go away. TS – you also need to engage Public Service . I work in the Smith Bros Building and the pedestrian nature of this area is bad. Explore creating a full crosswalk. SW – that is possibly beyond the scope of this application but it's worth looking into. JM – 2<sup>nd</sup> motion. SW – approve the building the way it's submitted. Materials – Existing masonry, black aluminum framed windows, corrugated metal (black), wood in seating areas. Bring back detail on exterior lighting. Come back on landscaping, lighting, signage

**Results:** Motion to approve building as submitted. Come back on landscaping, lighting, and signage. Engage with Public Service on streetscape improvements.

**Case #3 19-6-3**

**51:33**

**Address: 554 E. Main Street**

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

**Property Owner:** JDS Companies

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for a 4-story apartment with ground level parking.

*This was conceptually presented at last month's meeting, please refer to the draft Results.*

**Discussion:** DJT – site context. CM – More material detail brought in from last month. Residential mix discussed. One parking space was lost to create ADA space. Covered bike storage is now available. Stair towers. Metal mesh on the east façade. The mesh will have random openings. JM – the metal mesh seems to have openings towards the bottom of the floor, Could this be a safety hazard? CM – there will be a secondary rail. JM – interesting sloped canopy – will that be using the same metal mesh material? Could there be a gradation of color? Some subtle changes of color such as orange. Perhaps lighting the canopies in a different way. You are using an interesting palette of color. CM – façade material will be cement board, which will probably be painted. The masonry base will also be painted.

An elevator is not required in this building. The only apartment that would be ADA available would be on the first floor. The primary window opening would be the 5 x 8 “garage doors”. Which are raised from the floor 2 ft. Cut sheets handed out (windows, garage doors). RL – any landscaping? CM – a little. SW – bring a landscape plan. RL – privacy fence along Cherry St. – what would that look like? CM – probably proposing a standard aluminum fence, we will need to come back with that. TH – come back with that and landscape. RL – I wasn't here last month – I think that this is a creative project, but I am concerned that once again that these are still schematic design drawings asking for final approval. We can't have final approval with schematic designs. CM – we have provided details and wall sections.

DP – what is your timeline? CM – we will start construction documents and permitting in about two months. Don't know exactly when construction is intended. RL – I think you've thought thru most of the Commission's questions – is there signage, lighting, Downtown Streetscape improvements. TH – tree lawn is there on connector which is sustainable place for trees. First intuition is to fill those recessed areas where there are not windows. CM – bushes considered, maybe this will become smaller trees. TH – simple and bold building, have landscape respond strongly. SW – don't understand how the canopies work. CM – won't keep rain off of you. SW – what is the bottom of it, does it rest on a wall? CM – showed drawing that explains. A – calls to entrance to the building. SW – you can walk in off of connector to the building under the canopies? A – yes. RL – p. 5 – we can see that canopy, how does that work. CM – the whole site is secure. Two gates off of connector.

RL – what is the frame for that canopy? It looks like gossamer that just hangs there but I bet it is much heavier, supported by something. CM – there will be some trap along the cement board that will carry it. CM – we will have to frame. RL – it will be heavier than you think. The rendering isn't what it seems. RL – this needs to be at least three quarters of design development. SW details RL – we need to see all of the fences and how the canopies are suspended. SW – you are hearing from us that the project is liked and let's get details. RL - If you are doing construction drawings in a the course of a month, you should have a lot of this done.

**Results:** Come back with more detailed information, specifically:

- Landscape plan
- Fencing
- Canopy details
- Lighting

**Case #4 19-6-4**

1:10:15

**Address:** 37 N. High Street

**Applicant:** Carney Ranker Architects

**Property Owner:** Haynes Holdings LLC c/o Carol Haynes, Kiddie Academy

**Design Professional:** Jennifer Carney - Carney Ranker Architects

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation of an existing commercial building and for signage.

**Discussion:** DJT – Site context, “fallow” building, relatively simple renovation – re-cladding only portions of the front facade. The rear – nothing is proposed – although it is a good opportunity for drop-off. CR – the building was an old existing bank building. Interior renovations are underway for conversion to daycare. Here for façade renovation and signage. Tile will be covered with aluminum cladding (dark bronze – which matches the window mullions). Channel backlit signage. The rounded columns will be framed out square. RK – dark seems rather sober for daycare. CR – bright lettering will pop-off. Lettering will be backlit and will stick out somewhat. Existing slate that has a nice patina will remain. All four floor will be used for daycare, basement for administrative and break room.

RL – right place for sign? – it would be up so high. Could the sign be in the middle of the first floor window? CR – we did consider putting the sign on the window – there will be a playroom behind it and there were privacy issues. We will put a liner there. TS – how will drop off work. CH – staff will assist with process. CR - CSI International signage will be taken off the front door. CH – goal is that staff will use COTA. We will also have a couple of spaces in the garage to the rear. DP – how will security work? CH – significant level of security. Each family with individual code, computer screen, each level with secure entry. Camera monitors at doors. 240 or less children are expected. ML – I’m concerned about the drop off area. A lot of kids. Is there a way to make the back a turnaround area? CR – has undergone City review. TH – this use is great to have in the core of downtown. Do you have a sense of those living downtown and those coming into? CH – we think it is a good mix, a lot of growth in the area. We also anticipate a lot of moms (and dads) from outlying areas with small children who are returning to work and would like to be close. RL – move approval, DP – 2<sup>nd</sup>. It’s well needed.

**Result:** Motion to approve (8-0)

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

1:22:34

**Address:** 240 North Fifth Street

**Applicant and Architect:** Carney Rankin Architects

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

**Request:**

1. Recommendation to Public Services for Improvements to the Right-of-Way
2. Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation to the front (Fifth Street) facade.
3. Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation to the rear facade.

CC3359.05(C)1)

**Discussion:** DJT – contextual slides shown. Elevation changes between sidewalk and original warehouse floor height wasn’t an issue. Now as an office, the ADA elevation is an issue. A -Some

tenants on the upper floors, but now a lot of vacant office space. Owner wishes to see more people and activity in this area and owns adjacent buildings. Redoing the façade entry.

Need for replacing sidewalk – in bad shape. Raising whole sidewalk up so that it is flush with the first floor level of building. Lower level at current sidewalk level next to parking meters. Some space is needed between meters and wall. Public Service pointed to new Columbia Gas split level sidewalk as a prototype. RL – that would be a much better solution. 18” knee wall (retaining wall) separating two levels of sidewalk. Railing is not necessary. Two steps at front door. There will be no landscaping because it is so tight.

RL – describe the entry – are you cutting out the brick? CR – the arch will remain. One surface will be painted aluminum to simulate corten steel. There will be round wall scones. The windows will be bronze to match. RL – signage? A – there will be signage but will come back for that.

CR – back side of building – currently series of rolling doors that will be removed and replaced simulated divided lite windows. Intends to clean up conduits and a lot of miscellaneous items in back. Will remove generator.

DP – motivation? A – half of the building is currently empty. The building to the south will be starting construction soon, as will the building to the north.

RL – generally, big improvement. TH – I have some issues with some details. Handrails at the steps – they should extend beyond the steps. Then you are out beyond the 2’-6” that the City wants. The wall – is the intent that it is always 6” higher than sidewalk? Provides curb so no one call wheel off of it. Not high enough that you need a guard rail. RL – handrails would be desirable and should be approved. TH – Public Service does play a part in approval process. Would well done concrete wall be better than brick? It would be hard to match existing brick. Maybe visual differentiation between brick and sidewalk would be better. A – don’t want a tripping hazard.

RL – move to approve. JM – 2<sup>nd</sup>. ML – I’m a little uncomfortable with a 4” wall height, maybe bring it up a bit. TS – maybe a seat wall height. RL – don’t want to be forced to have a rail. SW – motion to raise. TH – possible planting such as ivy. RL – tight warehouse district, don’t worry about plants.

**Results:** Motion to approve. Raise the wall height 12 – 18 inches (as per Public Service approval) – but not to require railing. (8-0)

## V. Business / Discussion

### Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification May 20, 2019

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. ***A19-5-9M - 145 N High - State Farm – OB***
2. ***A19-5-10M - 64 E Broad - Harry's – OB***
3. ***A19-5-11M - 34 N High N - Harry's – OB***
4. ***A19-5-12M - 34 N High S - Harry's – OB***
5. ***A19-5-13M 8 E Long Nationwide Children's – OB***
6. ***A19-5-14M 260 S Fourth-Tito's Vodka – OB***
7. ***A19-5-15M 65 S Fourth-Harry's – OB***
8. ***A19-5-16 304 Spruce – Antennas***

9. *A19-6-1M 15 W Cherry Apple – OutFront*
10. *A19-6-2M - 56 E Long St - Apple*
11. *A19-6-3M - 263 N Front - Apple – OB*
12. *A19-6-4M - 43 W Long St - Apple OB*
13. A19-6-5 223 E Town - Woodbury sign
14. *A19-6-6M - 55 E Spring - Bud – Outfront*
15. *A19-6-7M 265 Neil - Harry's- OB*
16. A19-6-8 363 E Town - sign
17. A19-6-9 406 E Main - Retail finishing – Dogtopia
18. A19-6-9 406 E Main - Retail finishing – Dogtopia
19. A19-6-11 8 E Long – Cell antenna replacements
20. *A19-6-12M - 154 N Third N - State Farm- Outfront*
21. A19-6-13 129 E Nationwide Blvd. Roof – HRC (Flatiron Bldg.)
22. A19-6-14 COSI – HRC (Central High School)
23. *A19-6-15M - 88 W Mound - Goose Island AM OutFront*

**Next regular meeting will be on July 23, 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. 1:45:48**