

# University Area Review Board

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

## MEETING SUMMARY

date	July 17, 2014
place	Northwood & High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100
time	6:30pm – 8:35pm
members present	Ted Goodman, George Kane, Pasquale Grado, Bob Mickley, Doreen Uhas-Sauer
members absent	Brian Horne, Frank Petruziello

A. 1. **Approval of Minutes**  
**Meeting Summary from June**

motion **No motion. Meeting Summary was submitted to Board the day of the meeting.**

B. 1. **Applications for Certificate of Approval**  
**81 East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue** **Alpha Sigma Phi Fraternity**  
applicant: Pat Zollars (Contracting Solutions)  
to be reviewed: windows  
**6:35 – 6:50**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report and reviewed why the windows were not given staff approval.
- Mr. Zollars commented that the majority of the windows are non-operational.
- Mr. Grado inquired whether the windows were available in a black vinyl to match the existing frame and shutters.
- Mr. Zollars stated that the selected windows did not come in black; the client specifically chose white windows.
- Mr. Grado suggested the applicant provide a proposal that coordinates the windows, window frame, shutters and wall color; the proposal for white windows, black frames, black shutters and white walls is inappropriate.
- Mr. Kane concurred that the current proposal is inappropriate.
- Mr. Zollars commented that he did not feel that he had the authority to make decisions for the his client.

motion by Mr. Kane/ Ms. Uhas-Sauer

motion **To approve the proposal as submitted.**

vote 0-5 to Approve (Disapproved)

2. **1560 North High Street** **Campus Parc**  
applicant: Stephanie Hayward, Dan Hanes (360 Architects)  
to be reviewed: storefront modifications | signage  
**6:50 – 7:10**

- Ms. Hayward explained the proposed storefront and signage.
- Mr. Grado questioned why not align the mullions as suggested.
- Mr. Hanes commented that the storefront on the second floor is not perceived from the ground floor due to the patio deck; one would only see it in a planimetric elevation.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the proposed signage seemed appropriate, but details are required for final approval.

motion by Mr. Mickley/ Mr. Grado

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

- **That the storefront match the proportions and details of the storefront to the West**

vote 5-0 to Approve

**3.** | **2361 North High Street** | **New Taj Mahal**  
applicant: Dick Bigham (Bigham Sign Services)  
to be reviewed: signage  
**7:10 – 7:15**

- Mr. Grado questioned whether the background was opaque.
- Mr. Bigham stated that the sign background was indeed opaque.

motion by | Mr. Mickley / Mr. Kane  
motion | **To approve the proposed sign as submitted.**  
vote | 5-0 to Approve

**4.** | **417-419 West 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue** | **Multi-Family Residence**  
applicant: Mike Eckholt (Owner)  
to be reviewed: roof  
**7:15 – 7:30**

- Mr. Grado questioned whether the metal ridge roll would be used.
- Mr. Eckholt stated that he would use the product and actually preferred the metal ridge roll.
- Mr. Goodman questioned why the applicant did not want to go with the shingle suggested by staff.
- Mr. Eckholt stated that the shingle was two to three times more expensive.
- Mr. Mickley stated that the shingle selected by the Applicant seemed appropriate and was on the pre-selected list.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that he believed the slate shaped shingle was more appropriate than a shake type shingle preferred by the Applicant, when replacing a slate roof. The applicant appealed to the Board because of cost.

motion by | Mr. Grado / Mr. Mickley  
motion | **To approve the proposed roof material, Owens Corning ‘Landmark’ asphalt shingle in the Georgetown Grey color, as submitted.**  
vote | 4-1 to Approve

**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, Amanda Hoffsis, Keith Myers (Campus Partners)  
to be reviewed: conceptual review | Development Framework  
**7:30 – 8:20**

**Neighborhood Comments:**

- Mr. Rory Krupp (Weinland Park resident) commented:
  - The 60 foot height allowance along 9<sup>th</sup> and Section Alley is too high.
  - The Urban Design Framework subverts the neighborhood’s involvement.
  - The development parameters would allow for too much student housing.
- Mss. Laura Koon (Weinland Park resident) commented:
  - The neighborhood needs to be stabilized with more families, less students.
  - The new development should provide enough parking so that it does not overwhelm the remainder of the neighborhood – this area is not a high density neighborhood.
- Ms. Laura Bidwa (Weinland Park resident) commented:
  - Disappointed that the rezoning is going before the University District Plan is completed.
  - The CPD Text and UD Framework do not provide enough control of the design elements and specifically the interface with the residential streets to the South and East.
  - She expressed concern at the transition of the commercial buildings to residential and the parking garages.
- Mr. Joe X (Ohio State Student) expressed concern for enough parking.

- Mr. Mike Milligan (Weinland Park resident) commented:
  - Expressed concern about the size and scale of the new development.
  - The proposed development does not seem to offer anything for young families.
- Mr. William Milligan (Weinland Park resident – 12 year old son of Mike and Elizabeth) commented:
  - Will the new development have spaces for young kids like him, more boys would be good.
  - The area needs more families, maybe professors or people who work at OSU could live in the new buildings.
  - Maybe the new buildings can have yards and gardens.
- Ms. Elizabeth Kloss (Weinland Park resident) commented:
  - Euclid Avenue is a special street with over 70% owner occupied units and a good mix of people, most of which are not students (or at least not young students).
  - The University should try to house a majority of students on campus rather than encouraging the ‘people packers’ out in residential neighborhoods.
  - The University should not try to foster a ‘mono-culture’ in the new development, use Euclid as a template to help grow a stable well-functioning neighborhood.
- Mr. Omar Elhagmusa (Weinland Park resident) thanked Campus Partners for allowing the residents to comment.

#### **Campus Partners Presentation:**

- Ms. Hofsis reviewed the history of acquisitions and the current and future plans for the area. She stated that CP would come back in August with edits to the CPD and Framework with intentions of receiving a Recommendation on the Rezoning.
- Mr. Myers stated that CP chose this route in to help guide the future development, rather than allowing the future developers to dictate the retail and housing mix.

#### **UARB Comments:**

- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that she was encouraged by the outreach and willingness to listen to the community rather than coming forward with a predetermined program. The project should really try to heal the commercial to neighborhood transition.
- Mr. Kane commented that the process seems to be proper and should result in a positive development. He voiced concern regarding the CPD text, in that more of the input from the community needs to be expressed in the language that gets adopted.
- Mr. Goodman stated that it is important to create the architectural transition from High Street into the neighborhood.
- Mr. Grado expressed concern that the rezoning is being done outside of the current planning process.
- Mr. Myers stated that the current land holdings of CP is costing the organization \$300,000 per year; the Plan still needs to be adopted and even when the Plan is adopted, CP would still need to rezone the land.
- Ms. Hofsis commented that the market is ready to move on this land, rather than wait and lose this moment in time when things are being funded and advanced to production. The \$300,000 used for upkeep could be used to renovate more homes in WP.
- Mr. Grado stated that the community needs to be made aware of the need for CP to move forward due to the constraints of current costs and market readiness. He commented that CP should heed the comments regarding the current mix of residents in the contiguous blocks and try to build on that progress.

<b>2.</b>	<b>1483 North High Street</b>	<b>Cousins Army Navy</b>
applicant:	JD Richardson (Owner)	
to be reviewed:	exterior finish	
<b>8:20 – 8:35</b>		

- Mr. Ferdelman requested the Board grant the ability to staff approve of stucco to replace the T-111 on the store facade.
- Mr. Grado commented that the Applicant should prepare drawings that show details and control joints.
- Mr. Goodman stated that he was not comfortable allowing a COA issued without drawings and for a significant change in materials.

**D.**

**Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**

●	17 West Oakland Avenue	items approved
●	97-99 East 11th Avenue	windows
●	87 McMillen Avenue	fascia
●	199 East 15th Avenue	stairs
●	261-265 East Northwood Avenue	parking
●	2470 North High Street	porch
●	172 East Lane Ave	windows
●	2351-2357 North High Street	addition   concur with HRC
●	2141 Indianola Avenue	windows
●	Mr. Kane / Mr. Mickley	roof
motion by		
motion	<b>To approve as submitted.</b>	
vote	5-0 to Approve	

**E.**

**Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**

●	1988 North High Street (Pita Pit-Sign)	approved : items approved	COA issued
		11/15/2013: garage	05/20/2014
●	55 East 15th Avenue (KKG Site Compliance Plan)	03/20/2014: building and site	07/01/2014

**F.**

**Next Meeting**

- Thursday August 21, 2014 / 6:30pm / 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100)