

# 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>June 18, 2015</b>
place	<b>Northwood &amp; High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100</b>
time	<b>6:30pm – 9:30pm</b>
members present	<b>Ted Goodman, Bob Mickley, Pasquale Grado, Richard Talbott, Doreen Uhas-Sauer</b>
members absent	<b>Frank Petruziello, Brian Horne</b>

**A.**

**1.**

**Business of the Board**  
**Approval of Meeting Summary from May 2015**

motion **Tabled**

**B.**

**1.**

**Applications for Certificate of Approval**  
**1393 North High Street** **Bio-Blood Components**

applicant: James Cox (Vic Art Masonry), Don Santucci, Jan Hancock, Nisha Patel (Bio Blood Components)

to be reviewed: sign

**6:30 – 6:46**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Hancock reviewed the project scope and options to achieve their proposed sign.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the sign itself is appropriate, but the way in which it related to the stone relief is problematic.
- Mr. Grado stated that grinding the stone is fraught with problems.
- Ms. Hancock reviewed the option of covering the stone with stucco.
- Mr. Grado offered that the sign company could fabricate a cabinet that the sign is mounted.
- Mr. Goodman stated that grinding may be appropriate if the company can do it professionally.
- Mr. Mickley commented that it is unlikely that the mason could get a smooth surface because the stone is vertical.
- Mr. Grado concurred on the difficulty of routing out the vertical surface.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the details should be worked out before the Board.
- Mr. Santucci questioned whether the panel can be offset from the face of the stone.
- Mr. Goodman commented that a cabinet with the channel letters applied to would be appropriate.
- Mr. Hancock questioned the size of the lettering.
- Mr. Grado commented that 16" sign letters would secure approval, larger may be okay but could be problematic to a Board Member.

motion **Tabled**

**Things to Consider:**

- **Metal Panel to cover stone, use as wireway.**
- **New projecting sign without phone number and better design.**

**2.** | **1624 North High Street (SCG)** | **Yoga Six**  
applicant: Jim Driess (JG Driess Architect, LLC), Justin Pavlin (Owner)  
to be reviewed: storefront, signage  
**6:46 – 7:09**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Grado suggested that the awnings have no apron or side panels.
- Mr. Dreiss and Mr. Pavlin stated that they were open to the modification.
- The Board and Applicants discussed the need to screen the yoga participants.
- The Board was supportive of screening if it was done on the interior space.
- Mr. Goodman commented that movable/shoji screens could be used between the piers.

motion by | **Mr. Talbott / Mr. Mickley**  
motion | **To approve the proposed signs and awnings as submitted on the condition:**

- **That the awnings are modified to a flat angled panel, no valance and open ends.**

vote | **5-0 to Approve**

**3.** | **1725 Summit Street** | **Multi-Family Residential**  
applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture & Design), Wayne Garland (Owner)  
to be reviewed: addition  
**7:09 – 7:15**

- Mr. Mickley recused himself from the deliberation and vote on this item.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the modifications in the design.
- Mr. Ferdelman clarified that the shade tree was not currently on the site plan.

motion by | **Mr. Grado / Ms. Uhas-Sauer**  
motion | **To approve the proposed addition and site modification as submitted on the condition:**

- **That one shade tree be provided at the rear of the lot.**

vote | **4-0 to Approve**

**4.** | **14-24 West 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue** | **Multi-Family Residential**  
applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture & Design), Wayne Garland (Owner)  
to be reviewed: exterior modifications  
**7:15 - 7:20**

- Mr. Mickley recused himself from the deliberation and vote on this item.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the scope of the project and details.
- Mr. Goodman requested a sample of the metal siding. He questioned how the brick was going to be handled.
- Mr. Garland stated that they are sanding and pointing the brick.

motion by | **Mr. Grado / Ms. Uhas-Sauer**  
motion | **To approve the proposed rehabilitation as submitted on the condition:**

- **That a sample of the metal wall panel be submitted to staff for review and approval.**
- **That a mortar sample be provided to staff for review and approval.**

vote | **4-0 to Approve**

5. | **1509 North High Street** | **Multi-Family**  
applicant: | Bradley Blumensheid (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barret Jardine Design),  
Wayne Garland (Owner)  
to be reviewed: | building and site review  
**7:20 – 7:40**

- Mr. Mickley recused himself from the deliberation and vote on this item.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the scope of the project and details.
- The Board and Applicants discussed the storefront entry ways and inaccessible corner.
- Mr. Ferdelman clarified that the door must be an out swing due to the building code.
- Mr. Goodman commented that all surfaces in the alcove should be glass, in order to be properly integrated.
- Mr. Grado concurred regarding the alcove details.
- Mr. Garland expressed concern regarding the expense of glass system, when the existing walls are brick with several window openings.
- The Board and Applicants discussed the rear and sides of the building.

motion | **Tabled**  
**To be considered:**

- **That the entry doors be resolved.**
- **That all surfaces in the alcove should be clear and spandrel glass or insert windows in each opening in the alcove and repair brick.**

6. | **2620 North High Street** | **Secret Vessel**  
applicant: | Logan Dilts (DaNite Sign Co.)  
to be reviewed: | sign  
**7:40 – 7:50**

- Mr. Mickley returned to deliberation and vote on items.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Dilts described the wall and blade sign.
- Mr. Grado stated that the blade sign was too large and hanging with a chain will be problematic.

motion by | **Mr. Grado / Ms. Uhas-Sauer**  
**To approve the proposed wall sign and projecting sign as submitted, on the condition:**

- **That the wall sign is approved as submitted.**
- **That the projecting sign be reduced in size to be approximately 6sf, though final size to be negotiated with staff.**
- **That the sign be fixed in place and able to accommodate an appropriate wind load per code.**

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

7. | **2020 North High Street** | **GNC Live Well**  
applicant: | Jill Waddell, Robert Schorr (DaNite Sign Co.)  
to be reviewed: | sign  
**7:50 – 7:55**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Schorr described the details of the wall sign.

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

8. | **262 East 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue** | **Single Family Residential**  
applicant: | Pete Greene (Owner)  
to be reviewed: | front deck and stairs  
7:55

- Applicant did not show

motion | **Tabled**  
**To be considered:**

- **Replace like-for-like.**
- **Design a new porch.**

9. | **1689 North High Street** | **Jersey Mike's Subs**  
applicant: | Jami Gray (Sign Vision Co., Inc.)  
to be reviewed: | sign  
7:55 – 8:06

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Gray reviewed the sign details.
- Mr. Goodman questioned the width of the blade sign, 6" width rather than 10"
- Mr. Grado expressed concern regarding the size of the blade sign.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the blade sign should be centered on the height of the wall sign.

motion by | **Mr. Grado / Mr. Talbott**  
motion | **To approve the proposed wall sign and blade sign as submitted on the condition:**

- **That the wall sign shall have a raceway no deeper than six inches.**
- **That the blade sign be no larger than four feet in depth**
- **That the blade sign be perpendicular to High Street and be centered on brick pier and to wall sign to the South.**
- **That the existing exterior conduit and gooseneck lights be removed.**

  
vote | **5-0 to Approve**

C. | **Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review**  
1. | **1423 North High Street** | **Northside Library**  
applicant: | Wendy Tressler, Nikki Scrapetti (CML), Tracy Perry (NBBJ Architects)  
to be reviewed: | variance recommendation | building and site review  
8:06 – 8:15

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Scarpetti reviewed the Variances and the result of the UAC meeting.

motion by | **Mr. Grado / Mr. Talbott**  
motion | **To support the requested variances in order to advance the proposed building and site design.**  
vote | **5-0 to Approve**

2. | **66 East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue** | **Mixed Use**  
applicant: | Erin Prosser, Keith Myers (Campus Partners), Joe Sullivan (Sullivan Bruck Architects)  
to be reviewed: | conceptual review | building and site design  
8:15 – 8:50

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Prosser explained the reasoning and purpose of the project.
- Mr. Myers spoke to the timing of projects of the master plan.
- Mr. Sullivan described the program and details of the building and site.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented about the trim, color should be considered.
- Mr. Talbott expressed his gratitude regarding the parking ratio.
- Mr. Goodman expressed concern regarding the building and its orientation to the street ... curved, stair step.
- Mr. Myers confirmed that the Zoning should go to City Council on July 13<sup>th</sup> (Grado's birthday).

motion

**Tabled**

**To be considered:**

- **Use color other than white on the building trim.**
- **Review how building addresses the curve of the street.**

3. | **1706-1708 Summit Street** | **Multi-Family Residential**  
applicant: | Tony Colosimo (3D Group Architects), Rick Rader, Nick Jervey (Contractors)  
to be reviewed: | code enforcement | building alteration  
8:50 – 9:30

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the code issues and proposed exterior changes.
- Mr. Rader stated that the previous layout included 3 beds per unit for a total of 12 beds; the living spaces were used for bedrooms. Mr. Ferdelman clarified that the extra beds were illegal from the standpoint of the City.
- Mr. Colosimo described the program and explained the rationale for the exterior changes.
- Mr. Grado commented that repairing the fire damage is proper but the scope and changes to this property are inappropriate. He continued that the blocked over windows, removal of the brick railing, removal of the central entry and the proposed stucco/stone cladding are at odds with the Code and other Board policies.
- Mr. Colosimo commented that they were under time constraints imposed by the owner.
- Mr. Grado stated that if a matter of time; why not just return the building to its original state rather than expanding the program.
- Mr. Colosimo stated that the owner got ahead of design and instructed his mason to make changes; the stop Work order spoke loudly to the owner.
- Mr. Ferdelman questioned why the project was routed as a Fire Replacement/Repair Permit when the drawings clearly indicate that the entire interior was being modified and expanded; based on the program it should have been routed as a Commercial Building Plan and Zoning/UARB would have been in the loop.
- Mr. Colosimo stated that he submitted plans based the original layout with units in the basements.
- Mr. Ferdelman replied that based on the drawings and field observation; there were no walls and there were no units in the basement.
- Mr. Colosimo commented that he was not in the basement prior to the fire; I documented what I saw.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the photos indicate no interior walls or services to the basement, only the furnaces; the plans submitted indicate interior walls and services – it's a change (change and expansion of use).
- Mr. Colosimo agreed.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the changes to the basement are not repair.
- Mr. Goodman questioned whether the changes to the basement were couched in the request for the fire damage repair.
- Mr. Colosimo stated that he did include them in the drawings at the client's request; he informed his client that any exterior change would require review by the UARB. Mr. Colosimo produced a document that the building had been a four family since at least 1954.

- Mr. Ferdelman replied that the building was built as a four family, only on the first and second floor. It's not a matter of the number of units (more important is Floor Area Ratio).
- Mr. Colosimo stated that he proceed under the authorization of a Fire Order and submitted plans as a FRDM (Fire Damage Repair) Permit. The plans required corrections (plumbing riser diagram, energy calculation) and at no point did the Building Department raise an issue about expansion of use (the drawings had not been routed to the Zoning). He commented that he did as his client directed.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that the law must be upheld.
- Mr. Grado stated that Mr. Colosimo is liable by law to adhere to the Codes (Building and Zoning).
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer proposed that the Board should vote that the building be returned to its original configuration as is the spirit of the permit that was issued (FRDM Fire damage Repair).
- Mr. Goodman commented that if the Applicants return the building to its original state, they would not need the Board's approval.
- Mr. Ferdelman agreed - a like-for-like replacement does not require the Board's action; the doors, windows, roof and railing could be Staff Approved. The stucco/stone, metal railing and relocated entrances cannot be Staff Approved.
- Mr. Rader expressed concern regarding repairing the brick.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that correcting the issues with the brick is minor compared to the changes proposed.
- Mr. Goodman commented that it is important to maintain the original character of the buildings; it is/was a very sharp building.
- Mr. Ferdelman questioned whether the new stairs had been built (as a factor in the proposed versus previous unit arrangement).
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that their needs to be some guarantees that the building is returned to its former state.
- Mr. Talbott questioned what the Board is being asked to vote on.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the Applicant is requesting the Board to approve what was issued a Building (FRDM) Permit; which includes moving doorways, stucco and windows.
- Mr. Colosimo stated that the Client is requesting UARB approval of the submitted drawings.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented after the vote that there may be some compromise on some of the details, but the stucco painting the brick and basement units (expansion of use) are not approvable.
- Mr. Mickley stated that he could support the modified entries at the front and rear of the building, but not the expansion of use.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the brick work is a very important detail.

motion by	<b>Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Grado</b>
motion	<b>To approve the proposed modification of windows, use of lower level, porch, entry, stucco and stone exterior as submitted.</b>
vote	<b>0-5 to Approve (Disapproved)</b>

**D.**

**Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**

		items approved	
1.	29-35 West 9th Avenue	like-for-like replacement of deck and stairs	
2.	43 East 15th Avenue	fraternity sign replacement	
3.	55-57 West 9th Avenue	like-for-like replacement of stairs	
4.	122 West 9th Avenue	roof	
5.	348 King Avenue	roof and windows	
6.	352 - 354 King Avenue	roof and windows	
7.	1345 Neil Avenue	roof and windows	
8.	1452 Indianola Avenue	roof, windows on exiting units of building	
9.	1490 Indianola Avenue	windows	
10.	1845 Indianola Avenue	fraternity sign replacement	
11.	1871 North 4th Street	site arrangement	
12.	2148 Indianola Ave (Siding)	siding	
13.	2160-2162 Indianola (Windows)	windows	
14.	2166 Indianola (Windows)	windows	
15.			
motion by	<b>Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Grado</b>		
motion	<b>To approve as submitted.</b>		
vote	<b>5-0 to Approve</b>		

**E.**

**Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	44 West 9th Avenue (Multi-Family)	05/21/2015: site and building	05/26/2015
2.	1562 North High Street (90 Lab)	05/21/2015: sign	06/08/2015

**F.**

1. **Next Meeting**  
**Thursday July 16, 2015 | 6:30pm | 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100)**