

University Area Review Board

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

MEETING SUMMARY

date	November 20, 2014
place	Northwood & High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100
time	6:30pm – 12:10am

- A.**
- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 1. | Approval of Minutes |
| motion by | Meeting Summary from October
Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Uhas-Sauer |
| motion | To approve as submitted. |
| vote | 7-0 to Approve |
-
- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 2. | Meeting Summary from November Special Meeting |
| motion | Tabled |
-
- B.**
- | | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. | Applications for Certificate of Approval | |
| applicant: | 142-176 King Avenue | King Avenue Apartments |
| to be reviewed: | Bhakti Bania (BBCO Design) | |
| 6:30 – 7:15 | site and building design | |

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Ms. Bania discussed the changes to the plans and details based on comments from the Board.
- Mr. Baste discussed the use of different materials and the form of the buildings.
- Ms. Bania addressed the issue of using steel on the stairs rather than stone – the lower area would be dark, the steel helps lighten up the area and helps with storm water management.
- Mr. Goodman commented regarding a letter from the neighbors and their objections to the project. He took comments from the audience.
- Mr. Ethan Hanson (King Avenue neighbor) read the letter aloud to the Board and audience. The neighbors are concerned with density, parking and neighborhood composition. The neighbors are appealing the decision of Columbus City Council to the Franklin County Courts. Mr. David Murchie, Ms. Alexis Hanson, Ms. Wendy Vinson and Mr. Robert Vinson concurred.
- Mr. Kane commented that the issues of the neighbors are density and design; the density issue is not the purview of the UARB, but the design is pertinent to the duties of the Board. On the design issues the Applicants have addressed the concerns of the Board through the six meetings that they were on the agenda.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that while the design has come a long way she does not support the virtual wall created on King Avenue or the architectural treatment of the panel facades with a glass box – it is not sensitive to the neighborhood architecture.
- Mr. Petruziello thanked the Applicants for the samples, stating that the yellow panel looks awful but the ochre panel looks good.
- The Board and Applicant discussed construction details of the cementitious panels and then materials.
- Mr. Petruziello expressed concern regarding the concrete details – have you found a contractor that can produce architectural concrete?
- Mr. Baste commented that the planters may be use split faced bloc.
- Mr. Petruziello stated an emphatic no to split face, if the material is to change from poured concrete the material must

be reviewed by the Board.

- Mr. Petruziello expressed concern regarding the faux cementitious wood product.
- Mr. Horne concurred regarding the faux wood product; it may work at a smaller scale; he suggested taller skinnier windows may be more appropriate.
- Mr. Horne commented that the stairs look like gang planks – a more conventional rail system may be more appropriate.
- Mr. Mickley expressed concern about the faux wood product; Mr. Grado concurred.
- Mr. Grado questioned the composition of the unit types. the unit types speak to a student market.
- Mr. Baste stated that the units are 25 – 2 bedroom units and 25 – 4 bedroom units; Mr. Grado replied that the unit types speak to a student market.
- Mr. Grado commented that even though the project received the variances to allow the density that is proposed, it does not mean that the development needs to be built out to that fullest extent. He stated that he could not vote in favor of the proposal due to the density.
- Mr. Goodman stated that should any of the materials change in development of the project, then the desired changes need to come to the Board.
- Mr. Goodman questioned the lighting plan for the development; those items need to be reviewed at a future date.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned whether the faux wood came in a smaller exposure? Ms. Bania stated that the Allura Board comes in a 6” exposure.

motion by	Mr. Grado/ Ms. Uhas-Sauer
motion	To approve the proposal as submitted on the condition: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• That the Allura Cedar siding be reduced to the 5 ¼” exposure.• That a Lighting Plan shall come back to the Board for review, including a photometric diagram.• That a Landscaping Plan shall come back to the Board for review, with all plant materials called out.
vote	5-2 to Approve (Mr. Uhas- Sauer, Mr. Grado)

2.	1708 North High Street	Blaze Pizza
applicant:	Bill Beckett (DK Design Group)	
to be reviewed:	storefront signage	
7:15 – 7:32		

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the revised proposal.
- Mr. Grado commented that the title block on the drawing is a more appropriate sign than the one proposed.
- Mr. Beckett stated that the owners chose the most recent sign design.
- Mr. Goodman concurred regarding the realignment of the sign copy.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that maybe the Fast Fire’d could be placed under the Blaze Pizza.
- Mr. Horne concurred that the current sign proposal was out of balance.

motion by	Mr. Petruziello/ Mr. Kane
motion	To approve the proposal as submitted on the condition: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• That the red box back ground shall be no larger than 2’-5” in length.• That the sign is centered on the storefronts.• That the text and graphics are similar to the title block presented at the meeting – Fast Fire’d is centered and placed over Blaze Pizza.
vote	7-0 to Approve

3.
applicant: **2020 North High Street**
to be reviewed: Andrew Bacher (DaNite Sign Co.)
7:32 – 7:50 signage

View on High

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the mounting of the sign on what is essentially a sign is clumsy.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the sign does not fit well on the vertical.

motion by **Mr. Kane/ Mr. Petruziello**

motion **To approve the proposed parking signs as submitted on the condition:**

- **That one projecting space counter and one parking arrow are approved as indicated on the drawing provided.**
- **That the View on High sign be brought back to the Board for review.**

vote **7-0 to Approve**

4.
applicant: **1434 North High Street**
to be reviewed: Andrew Bacher (DaNite Sign Co.)
7:50 – 8:00 signage

High Up

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Grado commented that the building already has too many graphics; the colors on the building are inappropriate.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the lights on the previously approved sign are inappropriate.
- Mr. Horne stated that the signs and the building need to be considered together.

motion **Tabled**

To consider:

- **Reduce the amount of graphics**
- **Remove non-conforming lights.**
- **Comprehensive plan for exterior improvements.**

5.
applicant: **2159 North High Street**
to be reviewed: Sean Stazen (DaNite Sign Co.)
8:00 – 8:15 signage

Chop Shop

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Grado asked how the brick would be cleaned on the South elevation.
- Mr. Kastelic stated that they would chemically clean the brick.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the sign should be centered under the center window.

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

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

- **That the graphics shall be centered over the middle window.**
- **That the west elevation shall be resolved to staff's satisfaction.**

vote **7-0 to Approve**

6. | **2140 North 4th Street** | **Iuka Park Commons**
applicant: Stan Young (Trinity Sign Group), Dick Talbot (Owner)
to be reviewed: monument sign
8:45 – 8:45

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Grado questioned why the arrow was necessary.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the extra lines of text are inappropriate.
- Mr. Grado concurred that the sign copy was effectively advertisement not a sign.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested that the sign text could be moved around to eliminate the advertising aspect of the copy.

motion by | **Mr. Grado/ Ms. Uhas-Sauer**

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

- **That the sign be amended as –**
Updated | Iuka Park Commons | Arrow | Apartments | Logo | Phone

vote | **7-0 to Approve**

7. | **2591 North High Street** | **Old North Arcade**
applicant: Ben Morgan (Owner)
to be reviewed: signage and awnings
8:45 – 8:54

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Morgan reviewed the graphics and the rear modifications to the building.
- Mr. Mickley asked for the details of the rear of the building. Mr. Petruziello and Mr. Grado concurred.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the graphics seemed okay, but measured drawings would be needed.
- Mr. Grado commented that the Board cannot grant a COA until there are measured and detail drawings of modifications to the building and graphics.

motion | **Tabled**
To consider:

- **Drawings sufficient for review of proposed changes.**

8. | **2060 North High Street** | **Dunkin Donuts**
applicant: Tushar Patel (Owner)
to be reviewed: signage and storefront
8:54 -9:26

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Goodman stated that there are too many proposed signs. Mr. Petruziello, Mr. Grado, Mr. Mickley, Mr. Horne, Mr. Kane and Ms. Uhas-Sauer concurred.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested picking to signs out of the 9 for use with the business.
- Mr. Patel stated that the wall sign and pole sign were most important, but the other sign were needed.
- Mr. Horne commented that the background of each sign needs to be opaque.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the storefront system details.

motion by | Mr. Kane/ Mr. Grado

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

- **That the storefronts are approved as submitted.**
- **That the existing wall sign and pole sign are the only two allowable signs, should the applicant want additional signs they will need to come back to the Board for additional review.**

vote | **7-0 to Approve**

9. | **1871 North 4th Street** | **Multi-Family Residence**
applicant: Julie Bullock (Julie Bullock Architects)
to be reviewed: deck and stairs
9:26 -9:50

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Mickley commented that the deck and railings seem fine.
- Mr. Horne stated that the gable roof is out of place with the architecture of the rest of the structure.
- Mr. Kane suggested the use of metal railings; Mr. Petruziello concurred.
- Mr. Grado suggested using the existing lines of the existing structure.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer suggested using darker colors for the renovated building.

motion | **Tabled**
To consider:

- **Drawings sufficient for review of proposed changes.**

10. | **1566 North High Street** | **World of Beer**
applicant: Erin Prosser (Campus Partners), Mark Pottschmidt (World of Beer)
to be reviewed: storefront and patio
9:50 – 10:34

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Kane expressed concern that the alley is now too restricted by the patio expansion.
- Mr. Grado suggested a trellis type structure; the shed awning does not work. He expressed concern regarding the layout of the patio to the West of the WOB patio – it seems to be designed around solely based on the egress codes.
- Ms. Prosser explained the reason for the expanded patios – to enliven the alley beyond the WOB patrons.
- Mr. Goodman stated that he was sympathetic to the ideas expressed by the proposal.
- Mr. Pottschmidt explained the different layers of the proposal.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the space has been a failure from the beginning and this proposal may turn the alley around. He stated that the proposal is hard to discern because the drawings are incomplete.
- Ms. Prosser and Mr. Pottschmidt commented that they need approval of the storefront at a minimum.
- Mr. Goodman concurred with Mr. Grado regarding the shed roof; a flat roof or near flat roof would be more appropriate at this location.
- Mr. Grado expressed concern regarding the stage idea – Mr. Goodman stated that the idea of the stage was fine but needs to be detailed correctly.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the details regarding the storefront modifications and roll up doors.

motion by | **Mr. Grado/ Mr. Mickley**
motion | **To approve the proposal as submitted on the condition:**

- **That the modifications to the existing façade are approved as submitted.**
- **That the exterior bars and patio shall come back to the Board for review.**

vote | **7-0 to Approve**

C. **Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review**

1. University District Plan

applicant: Mark Dravillas (City of Columbus | Development Department | Planning Division)
to be reviewed: reconsideration of the University District Plan
10:34 – 10:42

- Mr. Mark Dravillas made a presentation about the plan edits. He stated that the height and parking ratios would negate the need for FAR standards. For preservation a policy of a further reduced parking ratio or no additional parking should one keep a building is an incentive to not demo buildings.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that both policies are a tool to preserve contributing buildings.
- Mr. Rory Krupp and Ms. Laura Bidwa expressed support for the plan with the amendments.

motion by **Mr. Grado/ Mr. Petruziello**
motion **To support the proposed University District Plan as amended.**
vote **7-0 to Approve**

2. 1509 North High Street Mixed Use | Garage

applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barret Jardine Design),
Wayne Garland (Owner)
to be reviewed: zoning variance | conceptual review | building and site
10:42 – 10:55

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Blumensheid commented that the fourth floor was removed because the fourth floor because they could not get the details to work properly.
- Mr. Grado commented that he liked the direction that the design has taken and would support the zoning when it is ready.
- The Board and Applicant discussed materials on the existing structure and the additions.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the building most likely had a more substantial balcony system on the High Street elevation. He suggested that the lower floor should have 3 panes instead of 4.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer expressed concern that the UAC has not had a chance to contemplate the Zoning before the UARB makes their recommendation. She stated her support for the project.

motion by **Mr. Horne/ Mr. Kane**
motion **To give conceptual approval to the current design.**
vote **7-0 to Approve**

3. 32-44 West 9th Avenue Multi-Family Residences | Garage

applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barret Jardine Design),
Wayne Garland (Owner)
to be reviewed: zoning variance | conceptual review | building and site
10:55 – 11:30

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal; he reviewed the proposed variances: 16 units with reduced landscape area, reduced setbacks, exceeding FAR (1.1) and exceeding height.
- Mr. Petruziello asked why? Mr. Garland stated that the target audience is not necessarily students, but young professionals and students in conjunction with Campus Partners. Mr. Petruziello asked what about this project requires the Variances. Mr. Garland commented that the Overlay requires these variances, most specifically the parking.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the building on Wall Street should be more contemporary.
- Mr. Kane suggested that the UAC gets this proposal before the UARB and that staff has a chance to review.
- Mr. Garland expressed the necessity of approving the High Street project before the Wall Street project.
- Mr. Goodman suggested that he is influenced by good design

- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the UARB can influence aspects of the design that may influence the zoning.
- Mr. Kane expressed concern about the density of the proposal.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that he had issues with the proposed elevations – pick one architectural language and do it well.
-

motion

Tabled

To consider:

- **Reduce the unit count.**
- **Pick one architectural language.**

4.

applicant:

1756 North High Street

Verizon

to be reviewed:

Chris Philip (SBA Communications Corporation)

11:30 – 11:52

conceptual review | cell antennas

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the proposed tower and issues with radio signals up and down High Street.
- Mr. Grado stated that the proposed solution is worse than the existing condition.

motion by

Mr. Grado/ Mr. Mickley

motion

To approve the cell antennas as installed.

vote

7-0 to Approve

5.

applicant:

1555-1563 North 4th Street

Mixed Use

to be reviewed:

Steve Love (Owner)

11:52 – 12:25

code enforcement | windows, exterior modifications without COA

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report of the proposal.
- Mr. Grado commented that the windows were inappropriate and should be removed and done correctly with a plan.
- Mr. Love stated that he intended to finish out the dormers with trim and button up the building.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that he would not accept the windows as they are currently installed.
- Mr. Love showed a photo of one of the steel windows that had been removed.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the permit that was issued to Mr. Love – roof and window repair, not replacement.
- Mr. Kane stated that windows as installed are inappropriate.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the existing windows could be used but a drawing must be produced to show how they are integrated into the building design.

motion by

Mr. Grado/ Mr. Mickley

motion

That the applicant shall retain a design professional to fully document the proposed changes to the building.

vote

7-0 to Approve

D. 12:25 -12:30

Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

		items approved
1.	31 East Lane Avenue	addition concur with HRC
2.	50 East Lane Avenue	addition concur with HRC
3.	109-111 East Woodruff Ave	windows
4.	124 East 14th Avenue	roof
5.	163 East Norwich Avenue	stairs
6.	172 Chittenden Avenue	roof
7.	184 East 15th Avenue	porch deck and railing
8.	195 West 9th Avenue	siding
9.	240 East 15 th Avenue	windows
10.	252 East 17th Avenue	roof
11.	340 East 19th Avenue	windows
12.	369-375 East 17th Avenue	roof
13.	1227 North High Street	sign
14.	1524-1526 Summit Street	rear deck
15.	1777 Summit Street	windows
16.	2130-2132 Indiana Avenue	roof
17.	2154 Indianola Avenue	windows
18.	2209-2011 Summit Street	roof

motion by Mr. Grado/ Mr. Kane

motion **To approve as submitted.**

vote 7-0 to Approve

E. **Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	195 Chittenden Avenue (Mixed Use)	10/16/2014: storefront, upper windows	10/23/2014
2.	1708 North High Street (Blaze Pizza)	10/16/2014: storefront, blade sign	10/23/2014
3.	1980 North High Street (Tom+Chee)	08/21/2014: wall sign and blade sign	10/20/2014
4.	2409 North High Street (Queen Bee)	05/15/2014: wall sign	10/14/2014
5.	2480 North High Street (Auto Matic)	09/18/2014: signage and site design	10/27/2014
6.	435-441 East 16th Avenue (3-Family)	09/22/2011 : multi-family residence	11/07/2014
7.	2657 N. High St. (Hounddog's Pizza)	10/16/2014 : cooler and hood system	10/23/2014

F. **Next Meeting**

1. **Thursday December 18, 2014 | 6:30pm | 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100)**