

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

Absent: Tedd Hardesty

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: Maniace/Slanec (8-0-0) APPROVED.

B. Continued Applications

- 1) N/A

C. New Applications

- 1) **DC_22-06-001**

330 Rush Alley

SP Office LLC, Cushman & Wakefield / Signcom, Incorporated

Request for Action

Graphics

Installation of a corporate tower/skyline wall sign.

Discussion:

Bruce Summerfelt presented.

- Wittmann asked if the sign was on the north
- Summerfelt replied that it was.

Motion: To approve the proposal as presented

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

- 2) **DC_22-06-014**

39-53 South 9th Street

Pizzuti 9th 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:

[Loversidge Recused]

Jon Riewald and David Goth presented.

- Wittmann asked what happened if they don't build the building. What happens after 24 months?
- Riewald stated they would have to turn it into a park or not use it as a parking lot.
- Bartley asked if there was an affordability component.
- Riewald said there is no mandated affordability, but some would be between 80-100 AMI.

- Bartley said she has concerns that the project will push people out of the neighborhood.
- Riewald said that they have done a lot of redeveloped lots in this area, which has helped created housing options.
- Maniace said it would be good if they had smaller units to create additional diversity. She asked how the building got in such disrepair.
- Riewald stated they acquired the building 2-3 months ago. The building has been neglected over the years.
- Maniace asked about the 9th street façade. It looks like you have landscaping covering up the mechanical space.
- Goth stated that they carved out the commercial space at the corner, and they are looking at promoting some greenery and growth along 9th street. The 5 punches north of that would be air entries into the garage. They could do pattern screening.
- Maniace stated that the wall underneath the landscaping should be architecturally interesting in case the vines failed to grow.
- Lusk asked if they own the northwest parcel.
- Riewald said they did not.
- Beatty asked if the coffee shop would be open to the public.
- Riewald said they are looking into it. They want to have an indoor outdoor connection there.
- Lusk asked when they would start construction.
- Riewald said they were looking at 12 months.
- Maniace asked what the graphic on the west side of the building would be.
- Riewald said it was yet to be determined. It could be art.
- Rittler asked if there were any rooftop amenities proposed.
- Riewald said the roof would be mechanical space.
- Bartley asked if there was precedent for demolishing buildings for parking lots at conceptual.
- Teba replied that there wasn't much precedent since he joined the commission.
- Beatty asked about the building at the corner of Broad and Grant, didn't Wittman say the applicant had to show financial wherewithal?
- Wittmann replied that the project should be feasible.
- Lusk stated that in the past didn't they approve some demolitions in the arena district?
- Wittmann said they may have been as part of a master plan.
- Bartley said she is concerned about setting a precedent.
- Lusk asked when they would come back.
- Riewald replied in the fall.
- Wittmann stated that they have to consider if what replaces the existing building is better. I think the commission would be willing to do the demolition, but the issue is do we tear it down right now, and have a parking lot.
- Maniace said that the drawings seem pretty far along, what would keep you from starting sooner rather than later?
- Riewald replied they were full speed ahead, but the building is a liability for them. Would there be a scenario where they could demo the building and just seed the lot.
- Bartley asked if the building was a hazard.
- Riewald replied there are break-ins, and that is the primary concern.
- Wittmann said we are better off sticking with the existing policy.
- Maniace asked when they could come in with final drawings.
- Riewald replied it would probably be final quarter in the fall.
- Rittler stated that demoing a building that has an issue will just move the issues somewhere nearby. What is the financial incentive of providing surface parking?
- Riewald said that there is a lot of activity in the neighborhood, they want to provide them with a clean safe space to park their vehicles.

- Wittmann asked how the applicant wanted to move forward.
- Riewald said they will withdraw their current application, and return at a later date for final approval.

Motion: Proposal withdrawn by applicant

Motion by: N/A

3) **DC_22-05-018**

266 East Main Street

NCJC Downtown Campus LLC / George Berardi, Berardi+Partners

Request for Action

New Construction

Construction of two 60 unit mixed-use buildings and a two story training facility.

Discussion:

Jonathan Leonard and Steve Gagliardi presented.

- Maniace said that the circular turnaround area was an opportunity for additional landscaping, or height.
- Loversidge asked what was going to take place in that circle.
- Gagliardi replied that perhaps a pergola, and some landscaping could be added, as well as additional landscape islands in the parking lot
- Wittman said they should see it in the drawings.
- Lusk agreed.
- Maniace stated that the lower level could be improved facing north.
- Loversidge stated that the drawings were still conceptual in nature.
- Wittmann asked them to come back with more refined drawings. They need to improve the north elevations, and provide details on the amenity deck and a landscaping plan.
- Lusk said he is having a hard time understanding the materials of the building.
- Gagliardi said that it was brick on the first two floors, fiber cement above, aluminum banding above that.
- Slanec said that the two buildings could also be broken up so that they are not so symmetrical.
- Maniace asked to make the culinary school more open, and engaging to the street.

Motion: To table the proposal until more details are provided.

Motion by: Loversidge/Lusk (8-0-0) TABLED

D. Conceptual Applications

1) **DC_22-06-013**

517 Park Street North

Park & Spruce Acquisitions LLC / Orange Barrel Media LLC

Conceptual Review

Graphics

Installation of a 1,200sf digital LED video screen.

Discussion:

Mark Thompson, Michael Coleman, Randy Black presented.

Scott Thomas (resident).

- Loversidge said that making it narrower and pushing it down works better with the architecture.
- Lusk asked if the sign extended below the dark band.
- Thompson said only the Orange Barrel Media portion would extend below the band.
- Loversidge said that they were also proposing another sign facing east.
- Thompson replied that the east sign had a different design and content parameters.
- Loversidge asked if the sign was 500' from the exit.
- Thompson said that was up for discussion.
- Coleman said that ODOT stated they had to come to the city first.

- Maniace asked if they could go over the percentages of the content again.
- Thompson said they expect vacancy of up to 50% the first year which could be dedicated to art.
- Wittmann asked what was considered art in this context.
- Thompson said that it could be reproductions of art in digital forms.
- Wittmann asked them to discuss the brightness.
- Thompson said it would commit to code section 3378.06.
- Thomas stated that he has concerns at the Vine Street exit. It is already a dangerous intersection. Residents also have a concern with the number of LED displays that have advertising. This is not the direction we should be going in.
- Wittmann asked why this would be the only one of its kind in the Downtown District.
- Coleman said it would be unique Downtown due to its shape, location, and intention.
- Thompson said that they need buildings that would have blank walls, and exposure to traffic, and the physical site conditions. OBM identified two other locations, the jail and the newer development around Crew Stadium.
- Wittmann asked why the NRI proposal was different.
- Thompson said it wouldn't be as viable because it is parallel to the interstate.
- Maniace said she was concerned about the safety, and the off-premises advertising. The majority will be off-premise advertising. How will it affect Park Street and Goodale Park? I think there is potential here, but those things should be looked at. She would like the artwork to be the focus. As presented, up to 75% could be off-premises.
- Wittmann asked if HRC was reviewing this.
- Black said that it would be reviewed by both.
- Rittler asked about the no-cost screen time for art. 10% unsold time. How hard is it to get artist content onto the sign?
- Thompson said they project what the cost will be over a 20 year period. They will pay a fee for the artwork itself. In 2021 they spent 2.1 million on art commissions.
- Slanec asked if they could furnish a memorandum for the HOA.
- Coleman said they would.

Motion: N/A

Motion by: N/A

2) **DC_22-06-020**

116 Spruce Street

Darryl Tanner / Darryl Tanner

Conceptual Review

New Construction

Construction of a seven story, 6 unit building, with a partially enclosed rooftop patio.

Discussion:

Daryl Tanner presented.

- Loversidge asked how you would get in.
- Tanner replied that there would be a large curb cut to the west
- Maniace said that they should incorporate metal panels on the south elevation.
- Rittler agreed and said it could be done cost effectively.
- Slanec asked about the east side of the building.
- Tanner replied that he would be open to some form of artwork.
- Lusk agreed and said some sort of pattern such as bricked in windows could help.
- Loversidge asked if the garage would remain open.
- Tanner said that it would remain open.
- Loversidge asked if they have talked to the city about the access.
- Tanner stated that he had not.

- Teba added that he could put them in contact with the ROW permit section.
- Loversidge said it was quirky and interesting.
- Wittmann said he liked all the windows and materials.
- Slanec asked if the building was oriented incorrectly, shouldn't the balconies be on the south facing the city?
- Loversidge, Maniace and Wittmann agreed.
- Tanner said he would explore that option.

Motion: N/A

Motion by: N/A

E. Staff Approved Applications

- 1) **DC_22-06-002**
300 Marconi Boulevard
Capitol Equities / Steve Moore, Moore Sign
Window Sign
- 2) **DC_22-06-003**
152 East State Street
Crawford Hoying, Liliun Partners Ltd / Charles Goodwin
Sidewalk Dining
- 3) **DC_22-06-004**
15 West Cherry Street
15 West Cherry LLC / Outfront Media
Ad-mural
- 4) **DC_22-06-005**
88 West Mound Street
Kemp, Schaeffer & Rowe / Outfront Media
Ad-Mural
- 5) **DC_22-06-006**
142-144 North Third
Third & Lafayette SSR LLC / John Ingwersen
Storefront Louvers
- 6) **DC_22-06-007**
15 West Cherry Street
15 West Cherry LLC / Signcom
Projecting Sign
- 7) **DC_22-06-008**
171 North Fourth Street
Art Oestrike / Matt Todd
Solar Array and service window
- 8) **DC_22-06-009**
89 East Nationwide Boulevard
Philip J. Fulton / Matt Toddy
Valet Booth
- 9) **DC_22-06-010**
402-404 North High Street

Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority / Meyers + Associates, Chris Meyers
Wall Sign, Projecting Sign

- 10) **DC_22-06-011**
375 West State Street
Mode Architects / Capital South Community Urban Redevelopment Corp.
Elevator Landing enclosure
- 11) **DC_22-06-012**
55 East Spring Street
Nationwide Realty Investors / Outfront Media
Ad-Mural
- 12) **DC_22-06-015**
586 East Town Street
Kelton House Properties, LLC / Sarah Richardt, Executive Director
Shed
- 13) **DC_22-06-016**
78-80 East Long Street
56 Long Street LLC / Orange Barrel Media LLC
Ad-Mural
- 14) **DC_22-06-017**
34 North High Street
34 Corp / Orange Barrel Media LLC
Ad-Mural
- 15) **DC_22-06-018**
34 North 4th Street
Brei Johannes-Lund / Colin Brinkman
Projecting Sign Refacing
- 16) **DC_22-06-019**
280 North High Street
Kelly Goetz / Gregory P. Briya
Revolving door replacement
- 17) **DC_22-06-021**
475 North High Street
Josh Greenberg / Astra Studios
Rooftop patio expansion
- 18) **DC_20-08-004 (Revisions2)**
366 East Broad Street
366 East Broad LLC / Brad Parish
Screen wall, colors, batten design.

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

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

F. New Business

- 1) N/A

G. Old Business

- 1) N/A

H. Adjournment 10:30am

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, at least three (3) business days prior to the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.