

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

**Absent:** Otto Beatty

**Staff Present:** Luis Teba

**Call to Order (8:30)**

- 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:** Slanec/Bartley (8-0-0) APPROVED.

**B. Continued Applications**

- 1) N/A

**C. New Applications**

- 1) **DC\_22-04-002**

390 East Broad Street

Columbus School of Art & Design / Creative Studio Architects

Request for Action

**Graphics**

Installation of window graphics and wall signs.

**Discussion:**

Michael Schulte presented.

- Wittmann asked if it was permanent.
- Schulte replied they would be removable.
- Maniace asked if the text was large enough.
- Schulte answered that the windows are quite large, so the text should be large enough.

**Motion:** To approve the proposal as presented.

**Motion by:** Loversidge/Lusk (8-0-0) APPROVED

- 2) **DC\_22-04-003**

451 East Gay Street

First Congregational Church / Tom Worley

Request for Action

**Graphics**

Installation of a temporary art display at the SW corner of 9<sup>th</sup> and Gay Streets.

**Discussion:**

Tom Worley and Mark Dahnke presented.

- Wittmann stated that the temporary art at the southwest corner of the lot is looking pretty bad. He has concerns that the temporary art being approved won't be adequately maintained.
- Worley stated that the new replacement artwork will be installed next week.
- Maniace asked if anything will be added to help preserve them.

- Dahnke stated that it will weather, but the anti-graffiti should help preserve it.

**Motion: To approve the proposal as presented.**

**Motion by: Loversidge/Maniace (8-0-0) APPROVED**

3) **DC\_22-04-004**

77 Belle Street

RB Scioto LLC / RBHD, Julie Brownfield

Request for Action

**Graphics**

Installation of a brick masonry coursing wall sign.

**Discussion:**

Julie Brownfield presented.

- Slanec asked where the light was mounted.
- Brownfield mentioned that it would be above and below.
- Lusk said he liked using the brick for the sign.
- Maniace said it provided a sense of permanence.

**Motion: To approve the proposal as presented.**

**Motion by: Lusk/Slanec (7-0-0) APPROVED [Steve Wittmann recused]**

4) **DC\_22-04-005**

602 East Town Street

Joe Collins Property, LLC / Shremshock Architects Inc.

Request for Action

**New Construction**

Construction of a 3-story residential building with associated variance.

**Discussion:**

Shane Hawn, David Blair, and Jack Reynolds presented.

- Wittman asked why a variance was needed if there was an existing easement.
- Reynolds said that even though the easement exists, a variance was never approved.
- Loversidge asked if the next door property owner was amenable to the easement.
- Blair stated that they didn't have any objection.
- Maniace asked why they had narrower windows on the first floor.
- Blair said it was probably to provide a secure feeling since it is near an alley.
- Maniace asked if they had considered screening between the rear parking and the building.
- Blair stated that they didn't have space behind the building. They had to eliminate landscaping to the east based off of feedback from the Fire Department.
- Hawn said that due to the density of the site they had to have some trade-offs.
- Loversidge said he was concerned that there was a lack of communication between the neighbors.
- Bartley said she was also concerned that there was a lack of communication between the neighbors. To be a good neighbor you need to talk to your neighbor to let them know what is going to happen. It is about engaging with the property owner next to you.
- Reynolds said they could talk to the neighbors, if we wanted them to.
- Maniace said we could do a recommendation that the applicant contact the property owner to the east to inform them of the project and associated variance.

**Motion 1: To approve the building proposal as presented.**

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

**Motion 2: To recommend approval of the variance with a further recommendation that the applicant contact the neighbor to inform them of the project and associated variance.**

**Motion by: Hardesty/Rittler (8-0-0) RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

5) **DC\_22-04-006**

39-53 South 9<sup>th</sup> Street

Pizzuti 9<sup>th</sup> Oak LLC / Jon Riewald

Request for Action / Conceptual Review

**Demolition, New Construction**

Demolition of an existing building and construction of a 295 unit mixed-use development.

**Discussion:**

Jon Riewald and David Goth presented.

Conceptual Discussion

- Bartley asked if the building was vacant.
- Riewald said it was.
- Lusk asked if the building could be rented.
- Riewald said it was functionally obsolete. The boiler was in poor condition. The windows are in poor shape.
- Bartley asked if it would all be market rate.
- Riewald said it would be.
- Maniace asked about concerns with their courtyard space and the potential redevelopment of the parking to the west.
- Riewald replied that they can only speak about what they control now. It will be very difficult to redevelop that site in the future. They have offset the courtyard in case of potential redevelopment.
- Maniace stated that they should consider how to landscape and make an amenity space of the building services area.
- Riewald said they would definitely be thoughtful of how that addresses the street.
- Lusk said the overall approach seems logical and reasonable.
- Rittler said the massing and views were very helpful.

Demolition and Parking Discussion

- Lusk asked what the need was for parking.
- Riewald said that the intent is to pull some of the existing residential parking off the street. The current site has 36 parking spaces, they want to improve the spaces. The building is falling down.
- Lusk asked who would park there.
- Riewald replied it would serve existing Library Park residents and nearby businesses.
- Maniace said she wished the building were further along in design. We typically do not demolish something unless we have something ready for a COA. It would also provide a comfort level.
- Bartley added that she is at the same point where Jana is. It is a great concept for the neighborhood, and it is sorely needed, but we didn't approve a similar proposal on Broad just recently. She doesn't want to be hypocritical.
- Riewald replied that he would ask them to consider their track record. They are bullish on redevelopment of this area.
- Becky West from Columbus Landmarks stated that the building was constructed in a way that provided light and circulation. This building has provided affordable rent for over 80 years, and its architectural features provide an opportunity for redevelopment which would preserve some of the historic architecture Downtown. Historic tax credits could be used to help with its redevelopment. Landmarks is concerned about the possibility of demolition with no future redevelopment.
- Maniace stated that typically, we approve demolition when we know the new use is better. We really need to see your plan developed enough to feel comfortable to do that. I understand you have a track record, and we have guidelines as well to make sure things don't fall between the cracks. I think this is something that could be tabled in order to explore this more.

**Motion: To approved the proposed demolition and parking as presented.**

**Motion by: Slanec/Lusk (6-0-0) DENIED [Bob Loversidge and Tedd Hardesty recused]**

#### **D. Conceptual Applications**

1) **DC\_22-04-009**

580 East Rich Street

Obrien Development / Columbus Design LLC

Conceptual Review

##### **New Construction**

Construction of 6 new dwelling units in two separate buildings.

##### **Discussion:**

Karrick Sherrill presented.

- Wittmann asked if the non-paneling area was brick.
- Sherrill replied that it was.
- Maniace asked what was meant by the agricultural look.
- Sherrill stated that it was in response to an earlier submission, and the building was largely white.
- Loversidge asked if it was a cement board panel.
- Sherrill said it was.
- Loversidge said he likes the design, but asked why the windows to the sides of the garages were so high up in the air.
- Sherrill said that there was an internal stairwell. He agreed it was off, but it had to function internally.
- Maniace asked what the height of the building was.
- Sherrill replied about a foot taller than the parapet of the other building.
- Wittmann asked if the mansard was completely vertical.
- Sherrill replied that it wasn't.
- Loversidge asked what would happen if the mansard was a little more mansard.
- Sherrill said that the issue was probably the height of the mansard. He could play with it a little bit. He could also pull out the cornice profile.
- Wittmann asked if the brick would be the same.
- Sherrill said it would.
- Rittler stated that she agreed with the mansard roof comments. She would also like to see details on the downspouts.
- Wittmann said the keystones in the lintels didn't look right.
- Loversidge agreed.
- Sherrill asked if it would be better if they were a solid lintel.
- Loversidge said it would be less obvious.
- Lusk said the door entryways seem too shallow.
- Maniace asked if the windows could be incorporated into the east elevation of building A.
- Sherrill said he was trying to avoid a haphazard arrangement in those panels, also he had to consider the proximity of the building to the adjacent property line.
- Maniace said it would be something nice to explore. Are you considering any sustainable type of material for the parking lot? Something more natural?
- Sherrill said they had considered that, but they haven't looked into the economics of it. The pavers are 5 times more expensive. It is a fairly considerable cost. I agree with you. It would soften the area.
- Wittmann asked if the rooftop area would only be the shaded area on the drawings.
- Sherrill replied that it may expand.
- Loversidge said he liked filling in these alley areas.

**Motion: N/A**

**Motion by: N/A**

**E. Staff Approved Applications**

- 1) **DC\_22-04-001**  
34 West Broad Street  
CAPA Properties, LLC / Bob Loversidge, FAIA, Schooley Caldwell  
**Door replacement**
- 2) **DC\_22-04-007**  
145 North High Street  
Brunson Building LLC / Orange Barrel media  
**Ad-Mural**
- 3) **DC\_22-04-008**  
576-578 Franklin Avenue  
Andrew Henn / Megan Smith, Crane Renovation Group  
**Roof**

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

**Motion by: Slanec / Maniace (8-0-0)**

**F. New Business**

- 1) **N/A**

**G. Old Business**

- 1) **N/A**

**H. Adjournment 10:10am**

*Applicants or their representatives must attend this hearing, for new and continued applications for Certificates of Appropriateness. If applicants are absent it is likely that the application will be continued until the Commission's next hearing. Meeting Accommodations: It is the policy of the City of Columbus that all City-sponsored public meetings and events are accessible to people with disabilities. If you need assistance in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA, please call the City's ADA Coordinator at (614) 645-8871, or email [zdjones@columbus.gov](mailto:zdjones@columbus.gov), at least three (3) business days prior to the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.*