Steven R. Schoeny
Director

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
MICHAEL B. COLEMAN, MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8591
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, August 25, 2015

77 N. Front Street, Stat Room (Lower Level)

I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair), Michael Brown, Tedd Hardesty, Robert Loversidge, Mike Lusk, Jana Maniace,

Absent: Otto Beatty, Jr., Kyle Katz, Danni Palmore

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Dan Bletchschmidt, , Bud Braughton, Kelly Scocco, Dan McCann

II. Approval of the July 28, 2015 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve (5-0)

III. Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #1 15-8-1

Address: 300 S. Fourth Street Grismer Tire
Applicant: Grismer Tire Company
Property Owner: Wellesley-Fourth St., LLC
Design Professional: Wilson Sign Company

Request CC3359.07
Certificate of Appropriateness for signage. Install new signs on west elevation. CC3359.07D)

The Commission authorized the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation in August 2014. At that time signage across the fascia, showing different tire companies was being considered. The Commission requested that the applicant return for signage approval.

Discussion
Staff presented case. Earlier signage thoughts from a year ago were to incorporate signage logos from various tire companies on the fascia. Current revised submission simplified the signage on the fascia to "Grismer – Tire and Auto Service" only. Commission felt this was much better.

Results
Motion to approve. (6-0)

Case #2 15-8-2
Address: 99 E. Main Street
Applicant: Unispace Kyle Bickle
Property Owner: Skilken / Karlsberger
Design Professional: Unispace Kyle Bickle

Request CC3359.07
Certificate of Appropriateness for signage, patio and door to patio. CC3359.05C)1), 3359.07D)

Discussion
Staff condensed the application into its PowerPoint presentation. The sign will be at a 45 degree angle and will be illuminated. The Commission had difficulty in reading the submission. Commission asked questions clarifying details of the proposal. JM – there were questions regarding the fence – it should be more contemporary, perhaps made of glass. A. - The fence is proposed to be 4 ft. tall. Q. - What will the new wall be made of (A.- gypsum), will it be painted? (yes). RL - What is the ceiling? (A. – a continuation of the existing). RL - spec sheet of door doesn't look like the drawings' door, which looks like a frameless double door. A. – the elevation on the left is of the western wall and fire place. JM – the general concept is good, but the fence detail is just off the shelf – it doesn't follow the integrity of either the original Ford Building or the Karlsberger addition. The new fence needs to integrate better. Glass, metal? SW – you wouldn't want it flush, push it back some. SW – Time schedule? A. Concentration is now on the interior. This is separate. Company would like to move in in the coming month. SW – you make it a lot easier for us to say you're approved if we can see exactly what you're proposing. We're having trouble understanding. Get two or three people.

Suggestions was made to submit details clarifying:

- The fence – color, height, design, material
- The glass double door and the glass wall
- The west facing wall – color and detail of sign (material)
- Ceiling plan and material
- Floor material and color

Results
Motion to approve pending subcommittee's (Hardesty, Loversidge and Maniace) review and acceptance of details listed above. Move to approve the sign at the corner. (6-0)

V. Conceptual Reviews

Case #3 15-8-3C
Address: 382-404 East Main Street
Applicant and Architect: M&A Architects Jamie Oberschlake
Property Ownership (current): 382 E. Main – KF Limited Partnership
404 E. Main – Kleen-A-Car Inc.
(future): Grant Hotel Partners< LLC

Request:
Conceptual review for a mixed use project comprised of hotel, ground floor retail fronting Main Street and structured parking behind. CC3359.05(C)1), 3359.23

Two buildings will be demolished (382 E. Main and 404 E. Main) in order to undertake this proposal.

Discussion
Description of project was given. SW – Clarification on the windows on the second level was sought. RL – clarification of what happens on the second level (lobby, recreation room, hotel rooms). SW – ceiling height on the first floor? (12 -13 ft.) Looks value engineered, kind of cheap. Needs more mass, looks too thin. Raise the floor height a little. Likes the large windows. A. – there is a 2 ft. overhang of the second floor on the Main St. side. The upper floor windows look very small. Thinks that EIFS is unfortunate, brick might be more appropriate. I think this building needs help. More and bigger windows are needed. JM – general massing and design is fine but the materials should be upgraded.. Windows should be enlarged. ML – this is a suburban expression. MB – almost airport. TH – likes lobby on second floor, reserves ground floor for retail. Question about curb cuts. Functional alley works. Curb cut on left is for drive thru. RL – programmatically, this is terrific, it fills a big hole at street level. But the building looks a though it should be at the airport. Not the quality of development that we are trying to do downtown.

RL – problems with entrance to the hotel off of Main St. SW – presence on sidewalk. A. New brand that Hilton is launching all over the country – an extended stay product. At least four nights or more. Retail component is very important – to have retail component that is part of their stay. Primary entrance and lobby space is on the second floor, removed from street. Quiet space. Meeting space for possible training. Access off of highway important, will use signage to guide them to second floor parking. Canopy will be on the rear on second floor deck. RL – how would they get to the restaurant? A. – there are two restaurants. RL – still don't buy pedestrian entrance competing with cars on the side. Create some type of portal for people to unload and come and go. JM – whole corner needs to be looked at. A. – people are focusing too much that this is the main drop off. It is actually secondary, the primary drop off is on the second level deck under the canopy. You get there from the ramp. ML – location of the handicapped spaces is problematic. RL - Meeting the minimum is not necessarily good design.

Results
Conceptual review only

Case #4 15-8-4C

Address: 223 E. Town Street
Applicant and Property Owner: Bluestone Brothers, US, Inc.
Attorney: Scott Benjamin Birrer, Esq.
Design Professional : Berardi + Partners

Request:
Conceptual review for the construction of new building with ground floor retail and four stories of apartments above. Parking in the rear with amenity deck above. CC3359.05(C)1), 3359.23

Would necessitate the demolition of two buildings (current 223 E. Town St. and 185 S. Fifth St.).

Discussion
George Berardi – combines two sites, each with an existing building, 223 E. Town St. and 185 S. Fifth St. 199 S. Fifth St. is immediately to the south. 165 feet along East Town Street. Parking will be accessed solely from S. Fifth St. The garage will be naturally ventilated but screened from the street. Services are off of Fifth St. There is also an entrance lobby on Fifth St. closer to the corner. There will be an amenity deck with a fitness pavilion on the second level. Refinement to the deck will be coming, the space should be beautiful. There will be large expanses of windows or balconies along Town and Fifth. The building will be brick. The corners will be accentuated. Town St. at grade will be commercial. Three garage entrances will be provided on the Fifth St. side, one primarily for services. The mansard materials on the top will be a cementious product.

JM – Fifth St. with numerous vehicular entrances, have you looked at any schemes that would consolidate so it would be a little more pedestrian friendly. A. – we wanted to provide at least one parking space per dwelling unit. Eliminating a lane on the back allowed us to make this number. There will be no commercial parking spaces. JM – building is very close to the condo to the south, have you thought of any mitigating measures? A. – Have spoken with adjacent property, and are considering measures, i.e. glazing. Lintels will be cast stone. SW – likes façade. MB – only concern is too monolithic (too flat), add some depth. A. – there has been an evolution in design, with more Julian balconies. Brick colors can be varied. JM – Upper floors could be recessed. TH – concerned about three curb cuts on Fifth. Maybe there will be a time when you can go under one car per unit. Could one or two curb cuts be eliminated. SW – Fifth is a side street, this is maybe one place this could happen. TH – dealing also with street trees as mitigating factor. A. – some recesses might be an option. Trash, which will be next to the commercial uses, will be wheeled out for pick up. RL – I don't see an issue with taking the two existing buildings.

SW – entries are important, particularly there are multiple uses and streets. Make sure there is enough emphasis for the entrances to the apartments. Presence is needed. A. – The perspective drawings somewhat obscure the true nature of the entrance. RL – maybe provide a canopy. SW – perhaps expand the lobby.

RL – questions from 199 S. Fifth St.? Nathan Caplan – an owner of one the units at 199 S. Fifth St. Excited about new development but seriously concerned about some of the design's impact in terms of blockage of views by six or seven owners. Solid wall just feet from units. Values of property effects (hundreds of thousands). Views shown from units. Request that the Commission condition its approval of the design on modifying the setback of the new apartment building in relation to the existing condos to the south.

RL – Does your building sit right on the property line? George, does your building set on the property line? A. The new building would be 6 ft. from the property line. NC – 199 S. Fifth is within a foot or so from the property line. It was originally built in 1972 as an office building. In 2007 it was a total gut conversion to condos. RL – I'm pretty sure that wasn't brought before the Commission (staff verified this). At the time of conversion, Building and Fire required extensive fire systems. RL – neighbors should get along, but this is downtown after all. NC – the building is what it is. Downtown Commission should promote the neighborhood. JM – Your building is a very attractive building, an asset on the street. The buildings should have a symbiotic relationship.

GB – we can look at this. The glass on this side was added later (Patrick Plus). We are also within code. RL – the Downtown Commission never reviewed this conversion and we probably would have taken into account these things. Drawings need to indicate what happens with adjacent property. NC - 199 has a two level parking garage, one underground and one above. What happens at the lower levels of the new building is less important. Why not do a two level parking garage. SW – look at the big picture, don't do something that is negative to the neighbor.

Results
Conceptual review only.

VI.Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness for Advertising Mural

Case #5 15-8-5M

Riunite ad mural
265 Neil Avenue (Northbank Condos) – facing southbound Neil Ave. traffic
Applicant: Orange Barrel Media
Property Owner: NWD 300 Spring LLC

Request:
Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the north elevation of 265 Neil Avenue. Proposed mural – Riunite Lambrusco – "This is R moment to make some noise". The Downtown Commission has previously approved numerous murals at this location, the latest being for Central Michigan." CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 70'W x 31'H Two dimensional, non lit
Term of installation: Seeking approval from September 10 through December 10, 2015.
Area of mural: 2,170 sf
Approximate % of area that is text: 4.7%

Discussion
Jeff Brown – product to the right, text and activity to the left, as per suggestion. Under 5%. RL – move for approval.

Results
Motion to approve (6-0)

Case #6 15-8-6M

Tim Horton's ad mural
Address: 64 E. Broad Street
Applicant: Orange Barrel Media
Property Owner: KT Partners LLC
Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:
Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 64 E. Broad Street. Proposed mural — Tim Horton's – "*Limited Batch Coffee – from the people who love coffee*". There have been numerous murals at this site, the last being The

New James. CC3359.07(D)3).

Dimensions of mural: 20'W x 32'H, two dimensional, non lit
Term of installation: Seeking approval from September 10 through October 15, 2015
Area of mural: 640 sf **Approximate % of area that is text:** 3.3%

Discussion
JB – Tim Hortons has a coffee / donut place at the corner of Broad and High. RL – looks like a billboard. SW – could the cup be made slightly smaller? JM – there are three separate design elements making it look more commercial, especially the "limited batch" being so big. RL – isn't this a location where we have had culture, not blatant ads? A. – there have been product ads here before. RL – its Capitol Square. Don't like product placement here. Are there windows at his location? A. – there are one or two. It will be up about a month. JM – I don't like this at this location. I don't think it is strong enough. A. - There are many examples around the Square. TH – at least the logo is on a cup, I would be comfortable if the cup was reduced. MB – motion to accept with changes (reduction in cup) as discussed. ML – 2nd. SW – future thoughts about this location. Content is important, especially because of Capitol Square. Special cultural things.

Results
Motion to approved with conditions. (5-1) Loversidge

Case #7 15-8-7M

Tim Horton's ad mural
Address: 260 S. Fourth Street
Applicant: Orange Barrel Media
Property Owner: Stoddart Block LP
Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:
Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the south elevation of 260 S. Fourth St. Proposed mural – Tim Horton's– "Limited Batch – From the people who love coffee." There have been numerous ad murals at this location, the current being for AT&T – The New LGG4 CC3359.07(D)

Dimensions of mural: 113'W x 31'-6"H, non lit vinyl mesh banner
Term of installation: Seeking approval from September 10 through October 15, 2015
Area of mural: 3,559.5 sf **Approximate % of area that is text:** 3.4%

Discussion

Results
Motion to approve (6-0)

Case #8 15-8-8M

Tim Horton's ad mural
Address: 100 E. Gay Street (oriented to southbound on Third St.)

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media
Property Owner: Caplin Enterprises
Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:
Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl adhesive advertising mural to be located on the north elevation of 100 E. Gay Street. Proposed mural – Tim Horton's *"Limited Batch – from the people who love coffee"*. .There have been numerous murals at this location, the latest being – GNC – "PUREDGE – Super Natural Performance". CC3359.07(D)

Dimensions of mural: 15'W x 38'H, three dimensional, lit
Term of installation: Seeking approval from September 10 through October 15, 2015
Area of mural: 570 sf **Approximate % of area that is text:** 5%

Discussion
JM – Our guidelines state that murals should not be on a primary or important secondary façade and I regard this as such. It is a prominent secondary façade. I would vote no. A. - The Commission has approved murals at this location. A.- I appreciate what you say, I always know where you are coming from. SW – I agree with Jana.

Results
Motion to approve (2-3-1) Wittmann, Loversidge, Maniace. – No. Brown – abstain. Motion fails.

VII. Business / Discussion

Staff approvals was discussed.

Downtown Streetscape
Draft Distribution
Tedd Hardesty

August 21 edition distributed. Process is nearing its completion for R.O.W. standards. Organization of documents discussed. Formal recommendation will be sought by the Commission before this is sent to City Council. Pay particular attention to Section 6.2 which talks of deviations from standards. Special streetlights, customized fences, benches, treatments at building entrances. Note substantial deviations. When do standards come into place? What triggers the Downtown Standards? 150 linear feet of new project or half of a block. Not just private but also public projects. MB – timeline of project and listing of participants would be desirable. TH - Lighting standard exist. LED? That's a hot topic. We can replace fixtures at the locations they are in.

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last meeting (July 28, 2015)
1. 495 E. Mound St. – Monument sign
2. 250 S. High St. – Leasing banners
3. 444 N. Front St. – Graphics and awning – Battleship Bldg.
4. 243 N. Fifth St. – Sign

5. 177 E Naghten St. – Children's Theater
6. 60 E Long- Apple iPhone 6 – ad mural
7. 43 W Long - Apple iPhone 6– ad mural
8. 285 N Front OB - Apple iPhone 6– ad mural
9. 15 W Cherry St. - Apple iPhone 6 – ad mural
10. 35 W Spring- Apple iPhone 6 – ad mural
11. 80 S Sixth - Lamar - Get Outdoors ad mural – pre approved by Dt Comm as fall back
12. 360 E Long St - Door to nowhere
13. 181 E Broad - Columbus Club – parking lot striping
14. 360 S Third St. – United Way banner
15. 262 Neil Ave. -- Eye Center – sign
16. 329-331 E Long St. – Café Brioso – graphics
17. 175 Third St. - Sprint – antennas
18. 600 High St.- I-670 Cap – sign
19. 36-42 E Gay St. – Marriott – chimney removal

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 645-8404.