

Meeting Minutes

Downtown Commission



Location: 111 North Front Street, Room 204

Date: October 26, 2021

Time: 8:30am

Commissioners Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair), Jana Maniace (Vice-Chair), Robert Loversidge, Mike Lusk, Tedd Hardesty, Tony Slanec, Otto Beatty, Jennifer Rittler, Trudy Bartley

Absent:

Staff Present: Luis Teba

Call to Order (8:35)

- Swear in Staff
- Introduction of Commissioners
- Overview of Hearing Format
- Public Forum

A. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting

Discussion: N/A

Motion: To approve the minutes as presented.

Motion by: Loversidge/Rittler (8-0-0) APPROVED.

B. Continued Applications

- 1) N/A

C. New Applications

- 1) **DC_21-10-005**

150 East Broad Street

Continental Downtown Properties / Moore Signs

Request for Action

Graphics

Installation of an aluminum projecting sign.

Discussion:

Steve Moore presented

- Wittmann asked if they could anchor the sign into the mortar.
- Moore said he felt they could.

Motion: To approve the proposal with the following condition.

- Approved with the plates enlarged to enter the masonry.

Motion by: Loversidge/Slanec (8-0-0) APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

- 2) **DC_21-10-001**

50 South Grant Avenue

Pizzuti South Grant Apartments LLC / Jon Riewald

Request for Action

Graphics

Installation of private art on the SE corner of the building.

Discussion:

John Riewald and David Goth presented.

- Maniace asked what it looked like from the inside in the daytime.
- Goth replied that the image almost reverses itself. It is public art and a veil.
- Maniace asked if you can see people inside.
- Goth replied that you can see inside.
- Riewald said it is lobby and café seating area. In the daytime you can see inside.

Motion: To approve the proposal as presented

Motion by: Lusk/Maniace (9-0-0) Approved

3) **DC_21-10-003**

100 North High Street

Eclipse Real Estate Group / Meyers + Associates Architects

Request for Action

New Construction

Construction of a 15-story mixed-use structure with streetscape improvements.

Discussion:

Nick Munoz, Chris Meyers, and Kurt Miller presented.

Greg Talamo was a member of the public.

- Loversidge stated that the entryway and first floor addresses their concerns.
- Lusk asked how close they were to the Atrium Lofts.
- Munoz said they have visited the Atrium Lofts. They reviewed the basement structure to confirm the depth of their basement walls. Their footings extend to 16 feet below grade. This basement won't extend that far down. They have thought about how they will flash their brick wall and their building's to protect the gap.
- Miller said they also gave some consideration to the northern wall.
- Meyers said they have had sun studies.
- Loversidge asked what the materials were in the courtyard.
- Miller said it would be metal panels in the courtyard.
- Meyers said they are developing it as a four sided building.
- Maniace asked if the metal vertical elements was a matte finish, or will it be satin or sheen.
- Meyers said it would have a combination of matte on the darker colors, and satin on the copper finish.
- Maniace said that is great. The satin can pick up the surrounding colors and create some variation.
- Wittmann asked if there was a building that came out where the sculpture garden is.
- Munoz said it is a new building. There was a building there that was removed.
- Meyers said the preservation office asked if they could shield the view of the new openings on the north façade of the White Haines building.
- Wittmann asked if the courtyard would be open to the public.
- Munoz said you can see through, but it is mostly private space. You would access it from potential gallery spaces in the White Haines building and the restaurant.
- Wittmann asked what would be on the alley.
- Munoz said a wall with a gate.
- Meyers said the HP office wanted something with permanence.
- Maniace asked if they had considered lowering the height to positively impact the Atrium Lofts
- Meyers said they studied it, but they would have had to lower their building all the way to the High Street facade. They tried to provide something of a courtyard view, instead of just a blank wall.
- Loversidge asked about the rooftop mechanical.
- Meyers said they would have clusters, and in certain interior areas, such as dead areas in the garage.
- Loversidge said this was a very good, complete submittal.
- Talamo said that they have an issue with a height of this building. The atrium is the only source of natural light. The current penthouses all have that beautiful south facing view. They appreciate the courtyard. The Nicholas has vacant first floor commercial space, they also have 27 vacancies in 230 apartments; an 11.7% vacancy rate. Their owners are questioning the need for additional units in the area. There are several parking garages in the area, there is plenty of overflow parking in the area already. Is the 6 story parking garage necessary? Could it be built underground? The sun study shows the sun at the highest, and the winter view. The concerns for the loss of light is related to their

property value, especially when considering the property abatements in the area. The loss of natural light will severely impact our property values.

- Loversidge asked if there was any legal concerns regarding height they should consider.
- Teba replied that everything they were proposing was by right.
- Bartley asked about the process with working with your neighbors. What else is Edwards doing to be a good neighbor to Atrium lofts? The other concern is the vacancy rate, and the additional units that are coming onboard. She just wanted to make sure those comments on the record.
- Meyers stated that amenities of a building like this are intended for the residents of this building. There is an eyesore there now, in the form of a vacant empty lot, and buildings that are condemned. The caring for the neighbors is the redevelopment to all the buildings. Some of the vacancy is related to the eyesore of our site. The improvements to the east side, will directly affect the west side. The parking will have a combination of residents and visitors to restaurants. It is also a public access for additional parking. Having parking on site is a good draw to the retail and restaurant spaces. If we push this further into the ground, it is a significant cost difference, it also creates a deep concern to negatively affecting adjacent buildings. Initial designs were taller and didn't have a courtyard. Through the effort of being aware of our context, that's what drove the design to work for the development structure. I think from a developers perspectives, the fact that there is a significant investment to improving almost this entire block.
- Maniace asked if there was public parking.
- Meyers said it was for the retail and restaurant spaces. It also provides spaces to the buildings to the south.
- Maniace asked that if the building was a floor lower due to reduced parking, it could help the Atrium Lofts. This city is a community and a society, and she hates to see people's investment be negatively impacted.
- Wittmann said there are a number of units that face north east and west in the proposed building, and the White Haines building. There is direct light and other light sources.

Motion: To approve the proposal with the following conditions.

- **The applicant return with private art, graphics, and lighting.**

Motion by: Lusk/Loversidge (6-2-1) APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. [Hardesty recused]

4) **DC_21-10-006**

Astor Park

Confluence Development LLC / Getch Partners

Request for Action

New Construction

Construction of a residential building.

Discussion:

Jon Riewald, Sam Lukino, Jeffrey Pongonis presented.

- Loversidge asked if the mortar in the brick was dark or light.
- Lukino stated it was black.
- Loversidge said he felt the units over the entry/amenity space was an improvement.
- Wittmann asked what the indentation was on the west side.
- Lukino said it was a separation between the float and layered.
- Wittmann said an entry-point may be interesting there. He also thought the colors were interesting. He stated he liked the view corridor into the courtyard.
- Maniace asked if the metal was black aluminum.
- Lukino stated that it was.
- Rittler stated she appreciated the color palettes. It brings some urban vibrancy. What was their strategy on screening mechanical?

- Lukino said it would all be in the central spine of the building. Nothing is in the courtyard. Only the generator is in the courtyard. Everything is on the roof or internal to the building.
- Maniace asked how they softened the garage. She wondered if there would be accent crosswalks between building block A and the park.
- Lukino replied that they worked with the city to get appropriate screening of the garage.
- Riewald said there would be pavers between the parking spaces, and in the alley. They decided to keep the pavers out of the intersection and crosswalks due to maintenance.

Motion: To approve the proposal with the following conditions.

- **The applicant return for approval of graphics.**

Motion by: Loversidge/Hardesty (9-0-0) Approved

5) **DC_21-10-007**

Astor Park

Confluence Development LLC / Getch Partners

Request for Action

New Construction

Construction of an office building.

Discussion:

Jon Riewald, Sam Lukino, Jeffrey Pongonis, and Dan Gore presented.

- Maniace asked if they had adequate accessibility.
- Pongonis said that the grade change at the front was too steep. The north entryway does access all points of the building, and is near the parking garage. You can also access the front door by going under cover around the building.
- Gore said the crosswalk at the northeast was also near the VIP entrance to the stadium.
- Slanec asked why the landscaping is interesting all around the building, but it doesn't transition to the north.
- Pongonis said that it transitions along the sides of the office building, and the residential buildings into a landscaping similar to Gay Street.
- Gore stated that they are trying to knit together the landscaping between the stadium and the park.

Motion: To approve the proposal with the following conditions.

- **The applicant return for approval of graphics.**

Motion by: Lusk/Maniace (9-0-0) Approved

D. Conceptual Applications

1) **DC_21-10-002**

400 North High Street

Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority / Schooley Caldwell Associates.

Conceptual Review

Graphics

Installation of a 440sf LED display on the Ohio Center Garage.

Discussion:

Steve Munger and Jordan Edmunds presented

- Wittman asked if the image was to scale. It seemed too big.
- Munger said it was to scale 11'x40'
- Wittmann asked if the scrolling marque would only show on-premise content.
- Munger said it would.
- Wittmann had concerns that the off-premise advertising could be a beer commercial. He can see connections between Ohio Tourism and the Convention Center. Is there any other restriction beyond that?
- Edmunds said it would mostly be related to the Convention Center.

- Wittmann said if they could make that restriction, it makes it an easy situation. He likes the idea of a graphic. I am reluctant to do LED advertising. I don't like flashing signs along the inner-belt. I don't feel the sign is too big, it is reasonably sized.
- Munger said that it would conform to the Convention Center ad guidelines.
- Wittmann said it would could be more than that. Relate it to the convention center or tourism in Ohio.
- Edmunds said they would be willing to make that concession.
- Maniace said she agreed that made sense. Because otherwise 49% will just become an advertising billboard. Keeping it restricted to tourism or the convention center made sense. She asked if they expected to advertise for revenue.
- Munger said they were primarily interested in getting the LED display approved.
- Wittmann asked Bootes if they could approve that.
- Bootes said they could if they felt the restrictions were appropriate, and they agreed with the definitions laid out in the guidelines.
- Teba said they could put those restrictions in their application, and he would include that language in the staff report.
- Beatty asked if they would show multiple images.
- Munger said they could, but there would be restrictions on how often they would change the content.

Motion: N/A

Motion by: N/A [Tedd Hardesty and Bob Loversidge recused]

2) **DC_21-10-004**

340 East Fulton Street

340 East Fulton LLC. / David Blair

Conceptual Review

New Construction / Demolition

Construction of a four-story, mixed-use structure with 66 low income units.

Discussion:

Joseph Whickham, Mike Williams, and David Blair presented.

- Loversidge asked if the top of the courtyard would be landscaped.
- Blair said they would have planters and some landscaping.
- Beatty asked if the curb cut on Fulton would be both ways or not.
- Blair replied that it could be both ways.
- Beatty stated that Fulton is almost an extension of a highway now. What is the speed going to be? What do they envision the street being in the future?
- Blair said he can't answer in too much detail.
- Whickham said that there is still parking on the north side of the street. The way it interacts at Grant and Fulton. That whole area is like a slow stop area.
- Blair said it was one-way going to Grant. There is a bikeway on Grant. The low-income community is not a high user of cars. We can probably get away with one access point.
- Loversidge said it should go to traffic, he doesn't have a problem with it.
- Bartley said that it will be slower because it is going onto the interstate, not coming off.
- Maniace asked if they couldn't get rid of the Grant entrance, could they move the Fulton entrance to the west, so it isn't in the middle of the façade.
- Blair said they originally did that, but with the new streetscape, they were hesitant to do that. They could investigate it.
- Loversidge said it a great project, he isn't going to fight for the building on it. He is concerned with the Hardi side of the project. It seems like a leftover. It seems it would be stronger if you could pull the design over to make it look like one building. He thought it would be stronger if it didn't have that change in materials.

- Maniace said she agreed. She really liked the brick and black metal elements, and encouraged the applicant to make it more cohesive.
- Rittler said she appreciated how they break up the massing, but agrees with Bob on the design.
- Wittmann said he agrees that the corner begins to look like a low income housing project. He doesn't have a problem with the demolition.

Motion: N/A

Motion by: N/A

E. Staff Approved Applications

- 1) **DC_21-10-009**
123 East Spring Street
Spring Street LLC / Outfront Media
Ad-Mural
- 2) **DC_21-10-010**
8 east Long Street
Long & High Loan / Orange Barrel Media LLC
Ad-Mural
- 3) **DC_21-10-011**
300 Marconi Boulevard
Capitol Equities/Continental Office
Window Sign
- 4) **DC_21-10-012**
51 North High Street
51 North High Street LLC. / Jarrod Norton, Morrison Sign Company
Banner
- 5) **DC_21-10-013**
60 East Spring Street
JDS Spring LLC / Orange Barrel Media
Ad-Mural
- 6) **DC_21-10-014**
51 East Gay Street
Aracri Pizzeria / Oliver Holtsberry
Sign-Resurfacing
- 7) **DC_21-10-015**
518 East Noble Street
Phoenix Tower International / DISH Wireless
Cell Tower Upgrades
- 8) **DC_21-10-016**
333 Nationwide Boulevard
Nations Lending / DaNite, Oliver Holtsberry
Canopy Sign

Motion: To enter the staff approved applications into the formal record.

Motion by: Loversidge / Slanec (9-0-0)

F. New Business

1) N/A

G. Old Business

1) N/A

H. Adjournment 11:40am