

# 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>December 17, 2015</b>
place	<b>Northwood &amp; High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100</b>
time	<b>6:30pm – 10:05pm</b>
members present	<b>Ted Goodman, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Bob Mickley, Pasquale Grado, Frank Petruziello, Brian Horne, Richard Talbott (6:55)</b>
members absent	

<b>A.</b>	<b>Business of the Board</b>
1.	<b>Approval of Meeting Summary from November 2015</b>
motion by	<b>Ms. Uhas-Sauer/ Mr. Grado</b>
motion	<b>To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.</b>
vote	<b>6-0 to Approve</b>

<b>B.</b>	<b>Applications for Certificate of Approval</b>
1.	<b>1445 Neil Avenue Multi-Family</b>
applicant:	Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barret Jardine Design), Wayne Garland (Owner)
to be reviewed:	building and site review
<b>6:32 – 6:45</b>	

- Mr. Mickley recused himself from the consideration of this case.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the modifications to the design.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the path of rain water off the roof.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned the pitch on the connector roof; Mr. Blumensheid responded that it would be 2% slope.
- Mr. Goodman questioned the two story porch details, expressed that platform should read not posts.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the balcony details.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the overhangs are out of character.
- Mr. Blumensheid replied that the sun angles were seen as a problem.
- 

motion by	<b>Mr. Grado / Mr. Horne</b>
motion	<b>To approve the proposed addition and modifications on the condition:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>That the dormer overhangs be reduced in depth to be more similar to the overhangs at the front of the building.</b></li></ul>
vote	<b>5-0 to Approve</b>

**2.** | **34 West 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue** | **Mixed-Use**  
applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barret Jardine Design),  
Wayne Garland (Owner)  
to be reviewed: building and site review  
**6:45 – 6:54**

- Mr. Mickley recused himself from the consideration of this case.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the modifications to the proposal and showed the DD drawings to the Board.
- Mr. Petruziello remarked that the North Elevation could use some relief.

**motion by** | **Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Horne**  
**motion** | **To approve the proposed mixed use development on the condition:**

- **That an opening on the North Elevation be consider at the balcony of the end unit.**

**vote** | **5-0 to Approve**

**3.** | **109 West 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue** | **Single Family**  
applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barret Jardine Design),  
Wayne Garland (Owner)  
to be reviewed: building and site review  
**6:54 -7:10**

- Mr. Mickley recused himself from the consideration of this case.
- Mr. Garland commented that the proposal is as a SFR not a MFR.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Garland commented that the addition is a bathroom over the porch.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue façade and requested a window in the bathroom.
- Mr. Goodman requested a few of the details be added to the newer portion of the building.

**motion by** | **Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Uhas-Sauer**  
**motion** | **To approve the addition and other exterior modifications to the existing residence on the condition:**

- **That the roof over the entry shed to the front.**
- **That a square window be installed in the addition over the entry.**
- **That the two dormer roofs be lowered a minimum of 1'-0".**
- **That the dormers be painted darker than the rest of the building.**
- **That the fascia be returned and match the existing gable.**
- **That the additions reuse many of the details of the existing structure.**

**vote** | **6-0 to Approve**

**4.** | **North High Street, East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue,** | **Building 1 - SCG South Mixed Use | Gateway II**  
**East 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Pearl Alley**  
applicant: Stephen M. Caplinger (Creative Design + Planning), Yao Hua Yu, Bobby Finta (Humphreys Partners),  
to be reviewed: building and site review  
**7:10 – 7:35**

- Mr. Mickley returned to the table to review cases.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Grado complimented the Applicants' for a vastly improved design and for removing the balconies.
- Mr. Petruziello requested some modification below the cornice; a belt course would help delineate that portion of the elevation.
- Mr. Goodman asked for additional details regarding the spandrel metal. Mr. Yu reviewed the use of materials on several sections of the elevations.
- The Board and Applicants' discussed the pedestrian walkway; no sections or details were provided.

- Mr. Horne questioned whether the bridge would be designed by the architects or the fabricator?
- Mr. Finta stated that they would design the bridge, but it will be fabricated by specialty shop.

**motion by** | **Mr. Mickley / Mr. Talbott**

**motion** | **To approve the proposed new building and site arrangement on the condition:**

- **That the white stone be used on the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue elevation in a similar fashion as the High Street elevation.**
- **That a belt course of brick be used just below the cornice.**
- **That the pedestrian bridge is not part of this approval.**

**vote** | **7-0 to Approve**

**5.** | **1288 North High Street** | **North High Street Brewing**  
applicant: Gavin Meyers (Owner), Doug Tarlow (Designer)  
to be reviewed: sign  
**7:30 – 7:45**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Tarlow reviewed the modification to the sign design; he stated that the owners prefer the rectangular sign.
- Mr. Horne suggested that the oval sign was preferred; a majority of the Board concurred.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the lighting scheme.
- Mr. Petruziello made an argument for the rectangular sign based on the scale and location of the sign graphic.

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

**motion** | **To approve the proposed signage and graphics on the condition:**

- **That the rectangular sign design is used (Option 1).**

**vote** | **7-0 to Approve**

**6.** | **1247 North High Street** | **Elana's Specialty Cakes**  
applicant: Svetlana Stoltz (Owner)  
to be reviewed: window graphic  
**7:45 – 7:50**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Stoltz reviewed several window graphics.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the removal of a flood light above the storefront.

**motion** | **To grant Staff the authority to approve an appropriate graphic.**

**7.** | **1497 North 4th Street** | **Single Family Residence**  
applicant: Lee J. Rumora (RUMORA ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS L.L.C.), Don Pritchard (Owner)  
to be reviewed: building and site review  
**7:50 - 8:00**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Mickley stated that the porch should not be on a slab, it should be pulled up approximately 24" off of grade.
- Mr. Ferdelman confirmed that the guidelines within the code do reference the need to have the 1<sup>st</sup> floor 24" to 30" above grade.
- Mr. Pritchard stated that they intend to use a slab because of concern regarding the previous foundation and walls.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that there is no technical reason why one could not elevate the 1<sup>st</sup> floor; the foundation still needs to be a certain distance below grade.
- Mr. Horne stated that the window proportions are inappropriate; they need to be narrow and tall; consider using horizontal siding. Use adjacent house as a guide.

- Mr. Petruziello remarked that the upper windows should be double ganged windows; consider deeper soffit overhang and fascia.

motion

**Tabled**

**To consider:**

- **That the porch and first floor be brought out of the ground 24" to 30".**
- 

**8.**

applicant:

to be reviewed:

**8:00 – 8:12**

**1550 North High Street**

**Gateway Film Center**

Steven Schwope, Brent Racer (New Avenue Architects)

digital display system

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Racer reviewed the proposal; the one display would replace tree film poster panels.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that
- Mr. Talbott asked whether trailers would be shown; they will add life.
- Mr. Racer stated that the display will most likely will show trailers between moments of static ads.

motion by

**Mr. Talbott / Mr. Mickley**

motion

**To approve the proposed digital display and graphics as submitted.**

vote

**7-0 to Approve**

**C.**

**1.**

applicant:

to be reviewed:

**8:12 - 8:30**

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

**1474 Worthington Avenue**

**Multi-Family Residential**

Jeff Tyndall (Owner)

zoning recommendation | CV15-051 | building modifications

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Tyndall reviewed the proposal and stated the hardships related to the commercial use and no parking.
- Mr. Petruziello asked for the particulars of the zoning case.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that they are seeking to allow residential on the ground floor of a C4 zoned parcel and to allow a reduction of parking from 2 spaces to 0. He corrected his previous statement that the underlying zoning is AR4.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that he did not have a problem with the use, but the building itself will always be a commercial building. He commented that to gain his support the storefront would need to be reconstructed with period correct details and then the residential aspect will need to be considered properly.
- Mr. Grado commented that if the zoning is approved, the building will never be used for a commercial purpose.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that he would not support reusing the aluminum storefront.
- Mr. Grado stated that he does not support the conversion of the use to residential; the small commercial nodes throughout the neighborhood can be vital if done properly and in this case the laundry mat is a much needed use.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that the UAC did not support the change of use.
- Mr. Talbott stated that conversion of commercial spaces look bad.
- The Board and Applicant discussed car versus foot traffic.
- Mr. Goodman reviewed the requested variances.

motion by

**Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Grado**

motion

**To support the requested variances to advance the project as proposed.**

vote

**0-7 to Approve (Motion did not carry)**

2.

applicant:  
to be reviewed:  
8:30 – 9:55

**2247-2289 North High Street**

**Mixed Use**

Bhakti Bania, Bharat Baste (BBCO Architects), Mike Balikrishnan (Cemark development)  
conceptual | redevelopment

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal and specifically the University District Plan recommendations.
- Ms. Bania reviewed the history of the site and development proposal. Points of interest – Pavey Square, urban park, colonnade and new building distinctly different than existing remaining buildings.
- Mr. John Fisik (Neighbor) stated that the traffic should be studied; a building with 145 units/418 beds will have a dramatic effect on traffic in this area.
- Mr. Steward McIntyre (Neighbor) commented that it is a good project but in the wrong neighborhood; is more appropriate for downtown.
- Ms. Xenia Paulous (Neighbor) remarked that a recent NYT Article reviewed the failure of mechanized parking systems.
- Mr. Devan Quinn (Neighbor) the height of the building is completely out of character.
- Ms. Francesca Fleming (Neighbor/Art Teacher) commented that the building looks like 16<sup>th</sup> Century with Danish Modern devouring the old.
- Mr. Thomas Lee (Neighbor) Old North Columbus is not the Short North and even the developments in the SN are probably wrong for that neighborhood.
- Mr. Sam Whitmore (Neighbor/Student) these luxury developments are for the extreme minority of OSU students.
- Mr. John Marshall (Neighbor) the design is a radical change and architecture of the moment, not of this neighborhood.
- Ms. Enid Quinn (Neighbor) the main issue is that the proposal does not truly save any of the buildings, just the facades.
- Mr. Ferdelman enquired whether the Chief Zoning Official (Mr. Chris Presutti) was shown all that the Board was reviewing.
- Ms. Bania stated that some of the visuals were used but not the entirety.
- Mr. Ferdelman clarified that the trellis would not meet the UCO provisions for frontage along High Street and would require a Variance.
- Ms. Bania stated that the trellis is viewed by the Building Code as a building.
- Mr. Talbott stated that the stair stepping from High Street cannot achieve a 10 story building.
- Ms. Bania stated that the building is 10 stories plus the podium or 125 feet and that there is no setback requirement from the alley.
- Mr. Talbott replied that even with the stair step it does not seem possible to go that high.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that she agreed with the Neighbors; density, traffic and the design details are clashing.
- Mr. Petruziello replied that there is proof that “you can dance the mambo”, but do you have a building? You have responded to outside conditions and zoning but this is a Rube Goldberg device. This needs to be brought together to make architecture. The contrast between old and new is a good device, but there is not enough of the old remaining to make this interesting and the new looks like dormitories (better dormitories than OSU are building but dormitories non-the-less). This building will require serious study and serious modifications that may require Variances.
- Mr. Grado stated that the Development Team has worked well with this Board in the past and was responsive to critiques. However, how is this building a benefit to the Community? This development does not respond to the University District Plan at all. The proposal does not react to the physical reality of High Street from Norwich to Blake. Additionally the concentration of population will have a severe adverse effect on the traffic on this portion of High Street and the side streets. The height along Wall Alley and the arcade on High Street are completely inappropriate.
- Mr. Mickley concurred with the previous statements and expressed concern that the existing buildings are not being conserved. The idea that the building extends to 125’ at Wall Alley is insane in this District.
- Mr. Horne stated that the colonnade is not appropriate; if buildings are to be preserved, the majority of the building needs to remain intact.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the proposal has just way too much volume that dwarfs everything around it; the colonnade is inappropriate.
- Mr. Grado commented that the proposal is a creative manipulation of the zoning code; it is not a building and certainly not architecture.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that to get this project under control the Applicants will need to get some Variances. The proposal needs to open more to the street; consider keeping the building at the corner of Oakland and High as punctuation, rather than the buildings in the middle.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer concurred the Variances should be pursued; preservation should not be a game of where’s Waldo. The building behind the remnants of the block looks sterile, almost like the Cleveland Clinic.
- Mr. Grado referred to the UDP and suggested that Eventide/Pavey look at the properties to the West of Wall for

opportunities to redevelop to meet the needs of the investment group.

- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that it is ironic that this is being considered; the UAC and Dr. Pavey work together 35+ years ago to downzone the area just behind this proposal.
- Ms. Bania replied that the two buildings that remain are kept intact.
- Mr. Balakrishnan enquired whether it was the aim of the Board to preserve all the buildings.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that he did see it as overly important to preserve all.
- Mr. Grado suggested that the development could start from the corner of Northwood and High and wrap around the back the High Street buildings in an effort to keep the existing rhythm of the High Street.

motion

**Tabled**

**To consider:**

- **Reduce the height and volume.**
- **Remove the colonnade.**
- **Preserve more of the High Street buildings. (Oakland and High rather than in the middle of the block).**
- **Adhere to the spirit of the University District Plan.**
- **Retain the rhythm of buildings on High Street, including setback.**

**D.**

**9:55 – 10:05**

**Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**

		items approved
1.	45 East 13th Avenue	<b>windows</b>
2.	82 East 16th Avenue	<b>roof</b>
3.	220 E. Lane Avenue	<b>windows-concur with HRC</b>
4.	288 East 12th Avenue	<b>door</b>
5.	1292 Courtland Avenue	<b>address sign</b>
6.	1704-1706 Summit Street	<b>like-for-like replacement of balcony</b>
7.	2240 North High Street (Buckeye Express)	<b>awning and graphic</b>
8.	1646 North 4th Street	<b>rebuild box gutter</b>
9.	1918 Indianola Avenue (AGS)	<b>Reface sign</b>
<b>motion by</b>	<b>Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Talbott</b>	
<b>motion</b>	<b>To approve as submitted.</b>	
<b>vote</b>	<b>7-0 to Approve</b>	

**E.**

**Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	21 Smith Place (Mango's Cafe_Panels)	<b>11/19/2015: enclosure panels</b>	<b>11/27/2015</b>
2.	61 East 8th Avenue (Multi-Family)	<b>10/15/2015: building and site</b>	<b>11/25/2015</b>
3.	77 East 16th Avenue (Oxford House_Site)	<b>09/17/2015: building and site</b>	<b>11/19/2015</b>
4.	348 King Avenue (Porch Rev1)	<b>07/16/2015: porch replacement</b>	<b>12/01/2015</b>
5.	1452 Indianola Avenue (Multi-Family II)	<b>08/20/2015: exterior modifications</b>	<b>12/4/2015</b>
6.	1572 North High Street (Tervis)	<b>11/19/2015: signs</b>	<b>12/01/2015</b>
7.	1778 North High Street (BIBIBOP)	<b>11/19/2015: signs, canopies</b>	<b>11/27/2015</b>
8.	2209 North High Street (Insomnia Cookies)	<b>11/19/2015: signs</b>	<b>12/07/2015</b>

**F.**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1. | <b>Next Meeting</b><br><b>Thursday January 21, 2016   6:30pm   2231 North High Street (Northwood &amp; High Building, Room 100)</b> |
|----|---|