

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8591
(614) 645-6245 (FAX)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664
(614) 645-1483 (FAX)

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

Tuesday, December 16, 2014

50 W. Gay Street, (Beacon Building) Conference Room B – 1st Floor

I. Attendance

Present: : Steve Wittmann, Otto Beatty Jr., Michael Brown, Tedd Hardsy, Kyle Katz, Robert Loversidge, Mike Lusk, Jana Maniace

Absent: Danni Palmore

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Dan Blechschmidt, Christopher Lohr

II. Approval of the November 18, 2014 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve. (8-0)

III. Land Use Approval and Conceptual Review

Case #1 869-14

Address: 195 E. Long Street

Applicant: Brexton Construction, LLC

Property Owner: Gay Street Condominium, LLC

Attorney: Daniel G. Rohletter

Design Professional: MS Consultants, Inc.

Request:

1. Request for Special Use Approval for Storage Facility
2. Conceptual Review of design of storage facility.

Storage facilities are Limited Manufacturing use , which require s Special Use approval from the Downtown Commission in the Downtown District. Property owners within a 125 ft. radius have been notified as recommended by the Commission. part of the approval process.

Discussion

Tim Galvin, Brexton – developer, applicant – partnering with the Edwards Company. Developing another self – storage facility on Trabue, recognizing the need for such facilities. Wasn't able to find any existing facilities downtown. Approached Edwards Company and marketing company from Florida. State of the art facility, good use for an existing small surface parking lot.

KK – talk about exterior materials. A. Thought was to complement and not necessarily match. A lot of surface lots. Wanted to contrast from the Normandy. EIFS wall system with some banding. The lower level will be masonry. There will also be

painted brick in front. We would like to continue the landscaped ban in the front, as was done for the Normandy. We would like to mitigate an ugly light pole in front of our building. Coming from the east you will be able to see the first row of windows. If the site to the west gets developed, you won't see anything. JM – Question about nature of materials of windows. SW – do they have to be spandrel? We really would like to see glass on the first floor. Suggest that transparency be also added on the upper floors. EIFS can be nicely done but it can also be poorly done. What happens on the first floor? Likes the wine storage on the first floor. Transparency would be important. A. Wine to the back. There will be retail area for tape and boxes. SW – could be decent rental space. OB – what about signage, wouldn't want too garish. What would be envisioned? There will be bright colors and well lit. JM – suggestions that the corridors will have windows to promote natural lighting. A – This is already being done. JM – Relate selection of materials, particularly on the first floor to surrounding. Don't have it sterile or institutional. A. Matching the brick on the Normandy has been discussed. KK – this is one of the first building that we've seen that could have a mural' have you thought about this? A. – No, we haven't. Most of the side elevations are not visible. SW – do something interesting on the front. Transparency is important. Most storage facilities around this town are rather perfunctory, better unseen. Downtown location, we don't need to follow that formula. You are also on a prominent road, building should be more prominent. RL – where do the customers park? A. Three spaces on Young St. side. No building on the site.- OB – It's a nice looking building that can be turned into an ugly building if signage is poorly done. RL – will come back for signage. A. – will be back next month.

Results

Move to approve land use (8-0) subject to successful design review.. Conceptual review (input, no vote)

V.Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #2 815 -14 17:30

Address: 390-400 W. Nationwide Boulevard

East Buggy Works

Applicant Kevin Klett - Nationwide Realty Investors

Property Owner: 400 West Nationwide Boulevard LLC

Attorney: Regina Ormond

Design Professional: 360 Architecture Ohio Inc.

Request CC3359.05(C)1)

Certificate of Appropriateness for

- Office conversion on the west, Office on the third floor with interior parking on first and second floors on the east.
- New glass connector – entrance between office and garage
- Capping the office portion of the project with new brick – retaining the interior brick surface, and insulating the office.
- Surface parking, primarily in the rear.
- A small plaza at the corner of Nationwide Blvd. and Huntington Park Ln. Includes a small amount of parking.

This case was heard by the Commission on June 24. The Commission granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish portions of the complex. Salient issues from June (please see attached Results) included resolving views to downtown from the adjacent Buggyworks

Condominiums to the immediate west and maintaining the character of Firestone Alley.

Discussion

Brian Ellis, NRI, presented primarily on the changes between the current and earlier submission. One is keeping the tower in Firestone Alley. Secondly was reconfiguring the mechanical equipment on the roof, this has been completely revised. Much of the exterior system has been removed and much of it has been moved to the north to not obstruct views from the adjacent condominium. The two level parking structure has had an additional office (an additional 45,000 sf of office) floor added to the top. The new office floor will have continuous curtain window offering great views. The tower will be retained- windows will be punched into it and some of it will be used for conferences. The applicant was congratulate for listening to the prior review in June.

Results

Moved for approval.(8-0)

Case 3 870-14

Address: Main Library 96 S. Grant Avenue

Applicant: Brian Pawlowski, AIA – Schooley Caldwell

Property Owner: The Columbus Metropolitan Library

Owner’s Representative: Donald C. Wheat, AIA, LEED AP - Pizzuti

Design Professional: Robert D. Loversidge, Jr., FAIA – Schooley Caldwell Associates
David Zenk, AIA – GUND Partnership

Request CC3359.07 (A)

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovations to the Main Library including opening up the rear of the library to Topiary Park and construction of a plaza / reading area.

This was presented on a conceptual basis to the Downtown Commission on October 21, 2014. Please refer to the meeting results.

Discussion

Robert Loversidge, Here today for final approval of exterior changes – will come back for site. As mentioned in prior presentation, the main impetus with the renovation is to open up the newer wing of the library with the Deaf School Park and connections to the west. The Carnegie entrance has been reintegrated into the library. Marble will kept on the south and north sides of the building. There were some questions regarding the glass, which will be as clear low e glass with a slight tint. (A. We’ll mock up the window selection). Some symbolism of community cohesion (red cladding). The balcony functions as a means of bringing the park closer to the library. OB – Would like to make a motion, these guys have done a tremendous job.

Results

Motion to approve for exterior changes. Will come back for site (lighting, signage) approval. (7-0-1) Loversidge recusing.

Case #4 871-14**Address: 480 East Broad Street****Applicant:** Rod Bouc, Deputy Director of Operations, Columbus Museum of Art**Property Owner:** Columbus Museum of Art**Design Professionals:** Michael Bongiorno, AIA, LEED, AP BD+C Principal, DesignGroup
Darren Meyer, Principal, MKSK**Request** CC3359.27(D)3)

Certificate of Appropriateness for landscape changes related to major addition to Columbus Museum of Art.

The Downtown Commission heard this project on a conceptual basis last month in November. Please refer to the attached results. The Downtown Commission approved the museum addition in May 2013.

Discussion

Presentation will primarily focus on the changes that were made from last month. Chris Kimbrel, MKSK.. This past month has given the design team more time to delve into the issues. The extent of the masonry walls have been pulled in because of expense. The wall was also moved back away from the sycamore trees. Pavement and walls will be limestone. Low profile landscaping around the Moore sculpture. Tight low evergreen hedge around museum (historical precedence) . Stabilized crushed aggregate walkway, an accessible surface, as opposed to concrete. Assessable route is on the west side. The main entrance will still be on the north side. The ramps from last month's application have been modified. A. A budgetary concern. Access will off of Washington for egress. JM – Connections from offsite such as library. Illuminated handrails are proposed on the main steps, which will still be used for events. There will be illuminated (washed) portico and friezes. The CoGo station would be relocated. SW – troubled with walkways that aren't really going anywhere. Lighting will be part of the project. MB – I find some of what you are doing is sterile. Sculpture will be a curatorial matter. M MB – motion to accept, TH – 2ND.

Results

Motion to approve (7-0-1) Loversidge recusing.

Case #5 863 -14**Address: 491 E. Mound Street****Applicant:** Spaulding Demolition & Excavation Inc.**Property Owner. :** Ronk Brothers Properties, Ltd.**Request** CC3359.23

Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 491 E. Mound Street.

At the November 18, 2014 meeting the Commission indicated that demolition would be okay under the condition that a plan be submitted that included landscaping. Please refer to the attached Results.

Discussion

A site plan was submitted. The new I-70 / Mound Street ramp took a lot of Ronk Brothers property. Access to the parking will be provided from the alley. TH – only concern is that it be adequately screened. 7 shrubs not enough – continuous planting. The applicant has no problem with this. OB – give it to him because a lot of parking was taken. JM – need for lighting. Loss of the parking to the freeway is a unique precedence. RL – each case is unique. The area was featured in a Southeast Area Gateway Plan which advocates denser development. RL – I don't see this as a long term solution.

Results

Move for approval with the condition that continuous planting screen be provided and plan submitted to staff. (8-0)

Case #6 872 -14

Address: 330 E. Oak Street.

Applicant: G Andy Patterson, BIRI Capital Improvements Projects

Property Owner: Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane Inc.

Attorney: Erik Barbone

Design Professional: BIRI Management Group – Adam McFaddinn

Request CC3359.07A

Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 330 E. Oak Street, see applicant's letter

The Downtown Commission heard this case on September 23, 2014. The Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to turn down the request for demolition. Please refer to the results from that meeting. The applicant is submitting additional information and will be supplying expert testimony regarding the environmental aspects of the building.

Discussion

Brought by the request of the applicants, with more information. Public opposition has been expresses and has been distributed. RL – question to staff – what is the process for asking the Commission to reconsider, we've already heard and there is no substantive change to what is being presented. MB – it has been filed as a new application. RL It shouldn't have been. It is not a new application. It's exactly the same thing. We should table and bring it to the City Attorney. SW – I don't think it is the same thing, there is more information on the replacement use. We would like to hear as to why you are here.

Applicant – would like to bring to the Commission our challenges. Why there are no prospects for reuse and why we are requesting demolition. What we are proposing to do with the site. Conservations with other parties. Would have to return to the Commission. What has happened between last time and today. We are familiar with the code and guidelines on demolition. All parties that have approached BIRI have talked about parking. BIRI would love to see it redeveloped. The challenges are with the building. Not really remediation but with decontamination. SW = I believe we've had one inquiry for use as a non accessory parking lot – don't bother to apply. Bob Bergen CFO, Roxane Labs – Showed slide about company. Oak St. facility – 100 years old. BI bought company in 1978. High containment

drugs on Oak St. Cancer drugs. Building is not very efficient, built in three phases. New facility on Wilson Rd. Contacted Grant Hospital, CMS and Capital Law to see if they were interested. They said only as employee parking. Capitol has master plan with green area for student. Contacted Waggonbrenner – they went through building and said it wasn't right for development. BI brought it's own experts in, not suitable for transfer to another pharmaceutical company. Dry powders, cancer drugs. Discussions with Capitol Law – interested in green space for students Letter of intent from Capitol. Value of property between 1.3 and 1.5 million. BI will lose money. Have had inquiries since October about use of building – anywhere from dorm rooms, to education center to different mixed use. In reality, no one is going to want to buy that building. Not a very efficient building, even for pharmaceuticals. After explaining to prospects about decontamination, they backed off.

KK – The property has never formally been listed for sale? A. – No. Process of decontamination – “bunnysuits” – incinerating interior materials as well as exterior, including 15 to 20 ft. beneath the ground. KK – cost for remediation? A Value of property 1.2 to 1.5. Remediation over 2. Project doesn't make sense. SW – You are going to remediate if you tear it down or not. George Petroka - engineering. Environmental health and safety. Exposure limits for workers. Other limits for elderly, children. Cross contamination limits. Has done 20 or so decommissioning, demolition, etc. Has not seen one for reuse other than by another pharmaceutical company. Dust an issue. Significant sampling to determine. BI is going well over standards.

RL – we get the efficiency problems, what is the difference between decontamination and remediation. If the building is decontaminated why couldn't be reused? This is a early 20th Century loft building that cities all over the country drool over. Mechanicals would be discarded. A. We still couldn't be assured that the building was clean. There would also be a perception problem. Could be sued. Concrete is porous. ML – Why couldn't you moth ball the building after its brought up to a certain level and wait for the market to decide? Consider a further level of decontamination to use the building. You would be saving the cost of demolition. A. – Heat and mold issues. KK – You just want this in your “rear vie mirror”. BI will be on the hook in terms of liability. A. – If it were to be reused, we would have to continue to test. There's no guarantee, wouldn't want the building to just sit there.

SW – This is a different type case when we see other demolition requests. I 'm not ready to approve, I wish to see what the replacement use would be. We need something better. I can interest in building, but what happens when you go to the bank. JM – I feel the same way – you are trying to do the responsible thing. A. Work with staff? To come up with better solution. RL – If we issue a CoA for green space who is to stop the space from being a parking lot in the future? Would they be willing to put a deed restriction on the property? We would really want a new building on that site. Maybe there can be an interim use – actually the area doesn't need more green space. A. –Letter of intent from Capitol. They are working on a new master plan that would focus on an entrance in the south. SW – that could be interesting. OB - A deed restriction would be an interesting idea. A. Capitol would want green on the next lot. SW – what do you want today? A – to hold it over so we can have further discussions with Capitol. SW – You can request that it be tabled and you can come back. OB – We are still asking for a specific plan. Stay a green space with a deed restriction.

RL – Consistently said that an empty building is better than a parking lot. This is an extenuating circumstance. Is this a good compromise. MB – I’m with Otto, I think the building is toxic. Nancy R. - This will become accessory parking for Capitol Law. Parking stays around forever. Wants a covenant that it never becomes parking. This site needs to be a building. We don’t need green space. (Museum, Topiary Park, Library). Cleve R. – Bay area – refurbishing can be done. ML – can we have contact. Jeff D. – abate to the point possible, leave as a site for a building. Demolish later. Motion to table (MB)

Results

Motion to table (7-0-1) Hardesty abstaining

Case #7 873-14

Nationwide Mural – 285 Front Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: Nationwide Mutual Insurance

Request: Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh mural to be located on the east elevation of 285 Front Street (near the corner of Front Street and Nationwide Boulevard) Two placement options are shown. The proposed mural is for Nationwide Insurance, showing the new logo with slogan “Nationwide is on your side”. This is the first time a banner has been proposed for this side of the parking garage. CC3359.07(D).

Only one of the two banners will be chosen. The banner highlights the new Nationwide logo and the installation coincides with the National Hockey League All Star game taking place on January 25 in Nationwide Arena.

Dimensions of murals: Two dimensional

Banner A: 28.5’H x 31’ W (at corner) **Banner B:** 28.5’ H x 48’ W

Term of installment: Seeking approval from Dec. 15, 2014 through Feb. 9, 2015

Area of mural: A. 1,368 sf B. 883.5 sf **Estimated percentage text:** N/A

Discussion

This banner would be on the Front Street side of the parking garage (285 N Front St.). Nationwide owns the building and is putting their own name up. SW – I don’t have a problem with putting up the brand and doing it while the hockey all-star game is going on but I’m hesitant about establishing a precedence. RL - I object to this, it violates all of our guidelines – on primary façade, on architectural feature, already a lot o Nationwide material in area, first thing that is seen. No possible justification. B Ellis – we will be looking at a redesign of the north face of this building. JM – Preferable than being on the tower.

Results

Motion to approve (7-1) Loversidge

Case #8 874-14

Nationwide Arena Logo – 200 W. Nationwide Boulevard

Applicant: Columbus Sign Company

Property Owner: Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of Nationwide Insurance logo on the east elevation of Nationwide Arena. CC3359.07(D).

The Nationwide logo change was presented to the Commission in September. Staff was authorized to issue certificates for (more or less) straight swaps. The arena has never had a logo on the façade. Installation coincides with the National Hockey League All Star game taking place on January 25 in Nationwide Arena.

Results

Motion to approve (8-0)

VI. Business / Discussion

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last meeting (Nov 18, 2014)

1. 491 Park St. – Cantena Tent
2. 114-118 N High – Sign
3. Huntington Park – Water valve closet
4. 236 E Town St. – Signage
5. 597 Franklin St. – Fire Escape
6. McFerson Commons – NHL Park
7. McFerson Common – Gateway
8. 504 Park St. – Roofing
9. 175 S. Third St. – Temp sign
10. 111 W. Nationwide – Sign

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