

# University Area Review Board

50 West Gay Street, Fourth Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9031  
(614) 645-6096 (614) 645-1483 fax

## MEETING SUMMARY

date	<b>August 21, 2014</b>
place	<b>Northwood &amp; High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100</b>
time	<b>6:30pm – 9:15pm</b>
members present	<b>Ted Goodman, Pasquale Grado, Bob Mickley, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Brian Horne, Frank Petruziello</b>
members absent	<b>George Kane</b>

### A.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Approval of Minutes</b>
<b>Meeting Summary from June</b>	
motion by	Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Horne
motion	<b>To approve as submitted.</b>
vote	6-0 to Approve
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Summary from July</b>
motion by	Mr. Kane/ Ms. Uhas-Sauer
motion	<b>To approve as submitted.</b>
vote	6-0 to Approve

### B.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Applications for Certificate of Approval</b>
applicant:	<b>81 East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> <b>Alpha Sigma Phi Fraternity</b>
to be reviewed:	Pat Zollars (Contracting Solutions), John Wejman (Alpha Sigma Phi Fraternity)
<b>6:30 – 6:40</b>	windows

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report and reviewed the modifications to the proposal.
- Mr. Wejman commented that the fraternity decided to take the advice of the Board and chose the Dark Bronze windows from Simonton.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the choice was an appropriate response.

motion by	Mr. Grado/ Mr. Mickley
motion	<b>To approve the proposal as submitted.</b>
vote	6-0 to Approve

**2.** | **1980 North High Street** | **Tom + Chee**  
applicant: Ron Freedman, Dan Tully (Tom + Chee | Owner), Tom Ball (Signs Unlimited)  
to be reviewed: signage  
**6:57 – 7:10**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report and reviewed the sign options.
- Mr. Ball reviewed the sign designs; The Board and Applicant discussed sign details.
- Mr. Horne and Mickley stated their non-support of the sign on the South elevation.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the wall sign on the West and the blade sign.

motion by | Mr. Grado / Mr. Petruziello

**To approve the proposal as submitted on the condition:**

- motion |
- **That the blade sign be a maximum of 30" in diameter.**
  - **That the text grilled cheese be removed.**
  - **That the sign on the south wall is not part of this approval.**

vote | 6-0 to Approve

**3.** | **2590 North High Street** | **Spacebar**  
applicant: Sean Stazen (DaNite Sign), Jennifer Little (Awnings by Jennifer)  
to be reviewed: sign | awning  
**6:40 – 6:57**

- Mr. Stazen reviewed the sign proposal.
- Mr. Goodman inquired about the rules for changeable copy.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the UCO code does not permit new changeable copy signs, but this sign is 'grandfathered', therefore not allowing it would be considered a 'taking'.
- The Board and applicant discussed ways to do opaque backgrounds and translucent copy, including with the changeable copy.

**Sign**  
motion by | Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Mickley

**To approve that sign as submitted on the condition:**

- motion |
- **That the changeable copy be white letters on the black background.**

vote | 6-0 to Approve

- Mr. Goodman questioned the concern regarding the awnings.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the existing awning apparently was not permitted through BZSD; even if it is a reskinning of the awning, it will need a COA and permit.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the options to modify the awnings.
- Mr. Grado inquired whether the awnings would be taken to the shop to get re skinned.
- Ms. Little replied that the awning would be stretched onsite.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that Columbus Awning shall not come to the UARB with premade awnings in the future.

**Awning**  
motion by | Mr. Mickley / Mr. Grado

**To approve the awnings as submitted on the condition:**

- motion |
- **That a color scheme for the facade be presented to staff for approval.**
  - **That Columbus Awning is put on warning for fabricating awnings prior to UARB approval.**

vote | 6-0 to Approve

**4.** | **1453 North High Street** | **Cousins Army Navy**  
applicant: JD Richardson, George Hardgraves (Owner)  
to be reviewed: facade  
**7:10 -7:38**

- Mr. Ferdelman described the scope of the project and the assistance he had given the applicant.
- Mr. Mickley expressed concern that only one face of the building was receiving the stucco.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned the note about painting the stucco.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that he erred in his notes.
- Mr. Richardson commented that they were going to use premixed stucco from the supplier.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that this would be a white elephant with the light stucco.
- Mr. Horne preferred the existing color. He continued by inquiring why did they just not paint the block.
- Mr. Mickley agreed that he would be fine with just painted block.
- Mr. Hardgraves stated that if the stucco is approved he will do as the Board suggests, but the stucco must be approved.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the necessity of moving the sign.
- Mr. Hardgraves stated that the stucco would just go around the sign.
- Mr. Grado suggested that additional darker samples be made available to staff for final approval.
- Mr. Hardgraves stated that he liked the stucco as presented.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that there may be a better tone of stucco than what was presented.
- The Board and Applicant discussed color options.

motion by | Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Uhas-Sauer  
motion | **To approve the proposal as submitted.**  
vote | 2-4 to Approve (Disapproved)

**5.** | **2159 North High Street** | **Restaurant**  
applicant: Brent Racer (New Avenue Architects)  
to be reviewed: storefront  
**7:38 – 7:56**

- Mr. Ferdelman described the new scope of the project.
- Mr. Racer described the condition of the tile and project details.
- Mr. Massimiani commented that the glass could run the length of the center storefront bay.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the ATM should be set into the sidewall, not the storefront system.
- Mr. Horne requested additional drawings. Mr. Goodman concurred.
- The Board and Applicant discussed additional materials and details.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the tile did not have the historic connotation everyone once thought, she presented a news article from the 1920's.

motion by | Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Uhas-Sauer  
motion | **To approve the proposal as submitted on the condition:**

- **That no corrugated metal be used above the entry vestibule.**
- **That the existing tile be removed.**

  
vote | 6-0 to Approve

6. applicant: **1756-1758 North High Street Verizon**  
to be reviewed: Chris Philip (SBA Communications Corporation)  
7:56 – 8:22 cellphone antennas

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report and history of the proposal.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned whether the temporary permit was no longer valid.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that temporary permits are usually valid for less than a year; these antennas have been in place for 5 years.
- Mr. Philip stated that the antennas cannot all move to the center because a loss of coverage.
- Mr. Goodman commented that of all the places along High Street, that location is the worst place due to the visibility and orientation of that particular structure. A taller antenna on the back would be preferred.
- Mr. Petruziello preferred that the antennas be placed on the billboard.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the rights and lack of rights to locate the antennas as built.
- The Applicant presented an option to stealth the antennas in a faux chimney.
- Mr. Grado stated that scenario would be worse and he could not support that proposal.
- Mr. Petruziello reinforced the idea of placing a taller tower at the rear or on the chimney; including the support for a height variance.
- Mr. Grado seconded the support for a variance to allow a taller antenna at the rear.
- Mr. Horne stated that the antenna support could be a cage around the existing the chimney.
- Mr. Grado commented that the antennas should be off white or a light grey to match our Columbus skies.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the proposal should have no shroud, simple structure.

motion

**To table the application.**

- **Consider locating the antennas on the existing chimney at the rear of the building. The Board indicated that they would support a variance if one was required for the height of the antennas if placed on the chimney.**

C. 1. **Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review**  
**East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, East 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Gateway South**  
**North High Street and Section Alley**

applicant: Erin Prosser, Keith Myers, Amanda Hofsis (Campus Partners), Mike Shannon (  
to be reviewed: zoning recommendation | CPD & Development Framework  
8:22 – 9:02

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report and history of the proposal.
- Mr. Rory Krupp (Weinland Park neighbor) stated that the neighborhood supports the revised CPD text based on changes that were recently incorporated.
- Ms. Laura Bidwa (Weinland Park neighbor) commented that the UAC recommended approval of the plan at its meeting the previous night.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that he was aware that the vote from the UAC was 12-2 to approve.
- Mr. Hofsis made a presentation highlighting the original proposal and the many changes in the plan to address community concerns.
- Mr. Myers discussed several Urban Design considerations of the plan.
- Mr. Petruziello expressed concern that the Urban Design Plan cannot be used as part of legislation.
- Mr. Myers replied that if the Plan is referenced in the legislation it is as close to law as possible.
- Ms. Hofsis commented that the document is mentioned in the CPD many times.
- The Board and Applicants discussed the practical use of the setbacks if multiple developers are involved.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned if developers would require future variances.
- Mr. Myers commented that the intention was to allow a development strategy that would minimize the need for modifications. The intent of the CPD and Plan was to have more control of the outcome, rather than be at the whim of developers.

- Mr. Grado expressed gratitude to the Campus Partners team for truly listened to the concerns of the Board and the Community.

motion by	Mr. Grado/ Ms. Uhas- Sauer
motion	<b>To support the proposed CPD Text and Urban Framework Plan as submitted on the condition that the edits suggested by the Planning Division be incorporated and submitted to staff for confirmation.</b>
vote	5-0-1 to Approve (Mr. Mickley abstained)

**D.**

9:02 – 9:10

**Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**

1.	<b>123-125 Chittenden Avenue</b>	items approved
2.	<b>194 East 14th Avenue</b>	roof
3.	<b>233-235 Chittenden Avenue</b>	roof
4.	<b>385 East 14th Avenue</b>	windows
5.	<b>417-419 West 8th Avenue</b>	roof
6.	<b>1519 Neil Avenue</b>	windows
7.	<b>1600 North 4th Street</b>	siding
8.	<b>1610-1612 Summit Street)</b>	roof & siding
9.	<b>1988-1990 Summit Street</b>	porch rebuild
10.	<b>2136 Indiana Avenue</b>	porch rebuild
11.	<b>2165-2171 North High Street</b>	parapet
12.	<b>2590 North High Street</b>	doors
13.	<b>31-33 East Woodruff Avenue</b>	porch roof

motion by	Mr. Grado / Ms. Uhas-Sauer
motion	<b>To approve the proposal as submitted.</b>
vote	6-0 to Approve

**E.**

**Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**

1.	<b>232 East 16th Avenue (Addition)</b>	approved : items approved 03/20/2014: addition	COA issued 07/23/2014
2.	<b>384 King Avenue (Garage)</b>	11/21/2013: garage replacement	07/18/2014
3.	<b>1379 North. High Street (Multi-Family)</b>	03/20/2014: renovation & elevator	08/14/2014
4.	<b>1492 Indianola Avenue (Multi-Family)</b>	07/17/2014: door & window	07/18/2014
5.	<b>1560 North High Street (Campus Parc)</b>	07/17/2014: storefront	08/12/2014
6.	<b>2020 North High Street (Wendy's_Signs)</b>	06/19/2014: signage	08/12/2014
7.	<b>2361 North High Street (New Taj Mahal_Sign)</b>	07/17/2014: sign	07/31/2014

**F.**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1. | <b>Next Meeting<br/>Thursday September 18, 2014 / 6:30pm / 2231 North High Street (Northwood &amp; High Building, Room 100)</b> |
|----|---|