

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, July 23, 2019 - 8:30 AM

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

### I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore; Tony Slanec

Absent: Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty

City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Dan Moorhead, Luis Teba, Marc Rostan

### II. Approval of the June 25, 2019 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve, RL, DP 2<sup>nd</sup> (5-0)

55:30

### III. Swear In Those In Attendance Who Wish To Testify

### IV. Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness

#### Case #1a 19-7-7

56:58

**Location / Address:** 471 E. Broad Street

**Property Owner:** Motorists Insurance (to **encova** INSURANCE)

**Applicant:** Columbus Sign Company

#### **Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for new skyline graphics signage at 471 E. Broad St. CC3359.05(C)1

*An LED band of light at the top of this building was approved by the Downtown Commission in October 2018. The current proposed new signage is at the same location and about the same size of the existing signage.*

**Discussion** – SW – straight forward. Both staff and Chair though this should be brought to the Commission’s attention because the signs are very visible on an important building. DJT – some of the “motorists” signage is already being removed. A – Size of the signs will be relatively the same. RL – significantly larger because the letters are all lower case, even if the letters are the same height. A – overall square footage meets standards in terms of height and width. There are 6 letters as opposed 9. RL – we don’t have size standards for skyline graphics. A – this is a critical location – the flagship building. Band was approved by the Commission last fall, which is reflected in new submission. There will be no change in the architectural treatment of the building (Color). RL – why is the

Motorist signage being removed? SW – a sign can be removed, but a new one cannot be installed. JM – my feeling is that the letters are a little bit too large, particularly from an angle. I would make it a little smaller, not much. A – sign square footage be reduced slightly. I will bring this to Columbus Sign. No production has started. SW – I like the new line around the building (not keen about the color changes) and that the new sign will be blue. The new sign is simpler, the Motorists is dated. You are going from 9 to 6 letters which is good. Reducing the size of the letters a little bit might be helpful. I like what you have better. DP – could this information on a reduction be submitted to staff? RL - Why don't we just specify height? 6'-6"H from 7'-11"?" A – proportionally that would reduce the area quite a bit, including reducing the length by 10'. We are trying to stay within the area that was traditionally used by Motorists for so long. The encova sign as submitted fits exactly where the motorist had been. SW – if you think the dimensions don't work, come back. We are trying to get this moved along. We don't want to get into a cycle of review. Send something out that does work. Possibly show two alternatives that will be distributed to the Commission. RL – do we need to vote on this? ML – I move to approve this pending resubmission of two different options that the Commission will decide on. DP – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results** - Motion to approve this pending resubmission of two different options that the Commission will decide on. (5-1) Loversidge no.

**Case #1b 19-7-1**

1:12:00

**Location / Address:** 250 Cleveland Avenue  
**Property Owner:** Columbus State Community College  
**Applicant and Architect:** DesignGroup  
**Sign Company:** Columbus Sign Company

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for signage at the new School of Hospitality Management and Culinary Arts Building at Columbus State Community College. CC3359.05(C)1)

*The project was approved by the Downtown Commission in April 2018 and is now nearing completion.*

**Discussion** DJT – Signage for Columbus State's new Mitchell Hall. Signage also includes one for a restaurant. DG –the signage is relatively small, 18 inches. The signs are non-illuminated, with the exception of the illuminated restaurant sign. RL – tasteful and well done, move for approval. ML – 2<sup>nd</sup>. Other aspects of design have already been approved.

**Results** Motion to approve (6-0)

**Case #2 19-7-2**

1:15:16

**Address:** 200 Civic Center Drive  
**Applicant and Design Professional:** John Behal (Behal Sampson Dietz) Keith Witt  
**Property Owner:** CC13 Parking LLC

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for new punched openings and windows at 200 Civic Center Drive. CC3359.05(C)1)

**Discussion** KW – there is a new tenant on the ground floor who will be adding offices as well as a conference room. SW – like the idea of windows on the ground floor, the punched windows look kind of squat proportionally particularly when compared to the windows at the next level up. Where is the ceiling? KW – it's at the top of the windows. There is also a grade change. JM – the

window proportion was also my feeling, more verticality would be in order. ML – possibly do a curtain well. KW – possible to pick up on the top of the chrome band. ML – try to match the windows up above. ML - move to approve pending revision of window to add lower muntin to resemble (height and horizontal bar) of upper windows, resubmission to staff. JM- 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results** Motion to approve pending revision of window to add lower muntin to resemble (height and horizontal bar) of upper windows, resubmission to staff. (5-0-1) Loversidge recusing.

**Case #3 19-7-3**

1:23:40

**Address: 226 North Fifth Street**

**Applicant:** Gayle Zimmerman, Ford Architects

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

**Design Professional:** Mark Ford, Ford Architects

**Request:**

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

**Discussion -** DJT – owner owns adjacent buildings to the north which are also in the process of renovation and have recently been be for the Commission. Proposal to change the front entrance and to add an ADA lift on the recessed side to the south. Rectilinear entrance was also approved on the project immediately to the north (240 N. Fifth St. – by a different architectural firm). GZ – also had project at 266 N. Fifth previously approved by the Commission. Existing images shown, additional handout. Entryway presented, including additional detail. Entryway will not project further than current. SW – will existing brick arch be eliminated? GZ – yes, the owner is refreshing the entrances also working on the interiors. This will be a relationship with the adjacent properties. SW – have you removed elements of other entries? GZ – 266 N. Fifth – the entrance was also altered. RL –only one arched element was taken out at 240, where there were numerous other arched elements. This building has more character to begin with and this arch is the only one and the most defining element. I think this is the wrong approach. JM – I’m also thinking along those lines, what you’ve done is beautiful – have you thought of keeping a similar concept but curving the top. Keeping the vault. Doing something sleek. Tie in the arches from the top.

SW – could you super impose an entryway over the existing arch? Is the existing glass old? RL – not part of the original. SW – I think the brick arch is part of the building. What happens if someday in the future someone wishes to restore the original. I’d be inclined to put something over the original, even if it had to come out a little bit. RL – have the glass come out further. The existing brick entrance is the essence of the character of the building. SW – the storefront canopy could go away. ML – new treatment could be very exciting. You don’t want to lose what makes the building special.

ADA lift part of application – RL – I couldn’t figure out what you were asking for. GZ- currently, the lift is in the inside lobby off of Fifth. Wishes to put the lift on the exterior on the south in the recessed area. Has been working with City’s Traffic Management on its placement related to alley and parking. This is the primary way that people, including the handicapped would enter the building. DJT – other elevation changes in Warehouse District have been met with different solutions, including the ramp at 2240 N. Fifth. RL – this building’s front door is already accessible. GZ – correct. RL – now you are going to make it non- accessible. Now you are going to make the handicap access around in the back. GZ – the new lift is at the main employee entrance adjacent to the parking, which would include visitors. RL – will this be marked or signed? GZ – signage is not currently in place, but the owner will provide. RL – would you be opposed to putting in another lift off the entrance? The front door of the building is where ADA

tries to make accessible is proposed to be not accessible. I have an issue with that. We're trying to make front doors accessible, this one already is. JM – can you explain why. GZ – new interior image shows – currently in the front entrance there is a semi spiral stair with a lift. The owner is removing that and providing a new entry stair on the right and a grander monument stair in the middle, a place for conversation and collaboration. Intention to pull the lift closer to the predominant user entry on the south side. JM – you couldn't also incorporate a ramp or lift off the front entrance? GZ – a ramp is not being considered. SW – there are a lot of stairs there. RL – you are spending all of this effort to create a grand new space and then you are telling ten percent of the population you can't come in. JM – are there lifts that are attractive. That could be integrated into the design?

SW - could you reexamine this issue of placement of the lift along with the appearance of the entry. You are getting our thoughts. DP – I think this should be tabled.

**Results** Tabled, no vote taken.

**Case #4 19-7-4M**

1:39:14

**Address:** 60 E. Spring Street

**Applicant:** Orange Barrel Media / Pete Scanland

**Property Owner:** JSD Spring LLC

**Request:** Approval of dimensional change to previously approved ad mural. CC3359.05(C)1\

Change from four to two mural surfaces to allow for more workable dimensions. External size of murals will be brought in so that the total area does not change. Remains two dimensional, lit, vinyl mesh banners. Total area of murals remains at 5,774 sf

*Reconsideration - attached are Results from December 2018 meeting. Note vote was 2 – 2 to approve, which meant motion failed.*

**Discussion** DJT – had Children's Hospital ad mural that closed the space and was approved administratively and was asked to come back for formal approval by the Commission. This occurred in December 2018 and was turned down by a 2 to 2 vote. New proposal is to keep the area the same total by bringing in the exterior dimensions and closing the space in between. PS - OB has struggled historically to deal with the four panels in terms of coming up with a cohesive image. What I heard in December was that the Commission was uncomfortable with increasing the size beyond what had previously been approved. Today the aggregate area remains the same. This gives us greater flexibility in terms of design and cohesive images. It would actually be 4 sf smaller.

SW – are the panels on the left also smaller? PS – just the ones on the right. We'd be happy to reduce the ones on the left. SW – my big concern with this is the massiveness, even if it was reduced to the same square footage. When it is put together it looks bigger. I like the four discreet panels. You guys are good at design parameters. The four discreet panels don't seem to have the same mass. PS – sometimes we come up with a decent job with the four panels but sometimes less so, just four billboards. The ad murals fit the space of each building, not a predetermined size as a billboard would do. In some cases we could continue to use four panels. We'd like some flexibility. I believe this is consistent with the advertising mural plan in that size is not increased, still meeting the intent of the program. RL – I like that you've painted the building dark, it creates a frame. DP – I like this mural. JM – I'm trying to like this and I like the existing image but I feel

a little like Steve. Working with the existing is more unique. The larger area looks more commercial and less successful. ML – this is one of the more effective sites. I like the idea of giving you flexibility of two approaches. It would help with creativity. PS – provided the square footage stays within. We'd be happy to move in the one on the left. TS – the image on the right side is impactful and relates to the scale of the building. The one on the left could break up into two panels. Need to create some rhythm. PS – When you do that you get two conventional billboard shapes. Joining them together allows us to have continuity. RL – when you do four that works, you do something that is clever and pulls them all together. SW – put a motion on the floor? RL – I make a motion to approve this request as shown on page 4 with the condition that the left hand mural area be reduced accordingly and that a drawing be sent in. DP – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results** Motion to approve as stated above- (3-3) No – Wittmann, Maniace, Slanec. Motion Fails

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

**Address: 554 E. Main Street**

1:51:30

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

**Property Owner:** JDS Companies / Brian Wilmers

**Request:**

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

*This was conceptually presented in May and for final review last month. A number of additional details were requested: 1.) landscape plan ; 2.) fencing; 3.) canopy details; and 4.) lighting Please refer to the attached Results.*

**Discussion** DJT – background. SW – focus on needed items. RL – what we were looking for, no objections, just needed details. Landscape – low shrubs. SW – specified? CM – at this time, just no –nothing specifically located. SW – no problem with landscape concept – just bring specifics back. CM -presentation of fencing. Transparency desired. The canopy fencing is more custom. Lighting shown. Details of canopy shown, including section. RL – move approval. ML – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Result** Motion to approve (6-0) Bring back specificity on landscaping.

**Case #6 19-7-6**

**Address: 600 E. Broad Street**

1:59:30

**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. Demolition of small sales building.

**Discussion** - DJT – a “sister” in that similar narrow parcel and similar design treatment. Site does include billboard. Proposal is to build around the existing billboard thereby maintaining its “grandfathered” status. The billboard faces both east and west. This is the initial appearance of the submission – staff advocates for phased submission but applicant decided it was so close to Case #5 in terms of design that it needed undergo conceptual.

RL – how does this building, irrespective of the billboard, compare to Case #5? JB – small properties, narrow lots, often overlooked. Answer housing issues and make use of the properties. Model development for small, efficient infill. Parking on grade with perhaps one or two ground

level apartment, with two or three floors of apartments above. RL – looks like the only difference is that one side is shorter to expose the billboard.

JB - The people that own the billboard have approved the apartment configuration. DP – was there any discussion on removing the billboard? RL – I think this concept of developing small sites is great and I see how it can be adapted however I think it is unconscionable that the whole building is being designed around a billboard when the guidelines and code have made it perfectly clear that billboards are not wanted downtown. When the ordinance was approved we had hoped that billboards would go one at a time as new developments take over a site. I think this is wrong. It's a clever solution, but I think it is wrong. JB – what would be preferable – have a vacant lot? DS – the billboard is under a long-term contract and has been there for about 60 years. It's either we build around the billboard or the lot remains parking and underutilized at that. The billboard is under a long term contract.

DP – the renderings show a blank surface but in reality it would be something else. My concern is that the reality of a billboard would detract from a great project. DS – we are going to make an outdoor terrace above. These apartments are for people in the service industries – work force housing. We'd like to do both projects together – economies of scale.

JM – could there be any restrictions over what types of ads are run here? DS – decisions about what to run would be from Lamar Advertising, we won't have input. We have a long term lease with Lamar. DS – it is lit at night. SW – do they have the right to convert to LED? SW – could we have a motion to put it on the floor? TS – move to approve, RL – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

JM – Broad Street is a prominent street and the entry is on the east. Could you make Broad St. façade a little more engaging? Use of color or something else. RL – or landscaping. SW – panel with vines. JB – we could explore a landscape buffer. CM – there are trees on Broad St. DS – those trees have been neglected. SW – bring back specifics on the landscaping and explore Broad St. façade. DS – we'll bring something back. We would like to get started. I'd also like to talk to the City forester. SW – corrective pruning would be order. DP – this will add to the Broad St. experience. SW – and good for Jefferson.

**Results** – Motion to approve (6-0) Bring back details on landscaping and explore how to dress up Broad St. façade. Discuss with City forester.

## V. Business / Discussion

2:22:37

### Public Forum

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

#### Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. A19-6-17sc 201 S High Tios - Sidewalk Cafe
2. ***A19-6-18M - 35 W Spring- West Coast IPA-Lamar***
3. A19-6-19 W State - DogStop sign & awning
4. ***A19-6-20M - 34 N HighN - Jeni's – OB***
5. A19-6-21 262 S Third - Weiker Sign
6. A19-6-22 400 Grove - CSCC Market Sign
7. ***A19-6-23M - 80 S Sixth - Primary One – Lamar***
8. ***A19-6-24M - 274 S Third - BudDiscovery Reserve – OB***
9. A19-7-1 - 17-12-2 101 E Main Reno - CoA- 7-2-19

10. A19-7-2 118 N High – Antennas02
11. ***A19-7-3M 260 S Fourth-Yuengling – OB***
12. A19-7-4 339 N Front - Starbucks – Mech
13. A19-7-5 51 N High - HRC – ADA
14. A19-7-6g -Hilton Skybridge Graphics - Hilton2
15. A19-7-6row Hilton Skybridge Graphics - N High - Hilton2
16. A19-7-7 555 W Goodale - Temporary Banner
17. ***A19-7-8M - 56 E Long St - Apple - OB***
18. ***A19-7-9M - 263 N Front - Apple – OB***
19. ***A19-7-10M - 43 W Long St - Apple OB***

**Next regular meeting will be on August 27, 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. **2:23:50****