

# 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>September 17, 2015</b>
place	<b>Northwood &amp; High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100</b>
time	<b>6:40pm – 9:30</b>
members present	<b>Ted Goodman, Bob Mickley, Pasquale Grado, Frank Petruziello, Brian Horne (7:45)</b>
members absent	<b>Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Richard Talbott</b>

<b>A.</b>	<b>Business of the Board</b>
1.	<b>Approval of Meeting Summary from August 2015</b>
motion by	<b>Mr. Mickley / Mr. Grado</b>
motion	<b>To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.</b>
vote	<b>4-0 to Approve</b>

<b>B.</b>	<b>Applications for Certificate of Approval</b>
1.	<b>2471 North High Street</b> <b>Catch A Fire</b>
applicant:	Dina Cherney (Sign Glo)
to be reviewed:	sign
<b>6:40 – 6:52</b>	

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Cherney reviewed the sign design.
- Mr. Petruziello requested that the channel letters are less than 5", 3" is preferred.
- The Board and applicant discussed the location of the sign.

motion by	<b>Mr. Grado / Mr. Mickley</b>
motion	<b>To approve the proposed wall sign on the condition:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>That the can letters are less than 5" deep.</b></li></ul>
vote	<b>4-0 to Approve</b>

2.	<b>10 East 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> <b>Raising Cane's</b>
applicant:	Drew Gatliff (M+A Architects), Amanda Zuck (Raising Cane)
to be reviewed:	exterior modifications, signage
<b>6:52 -7:02</b>	

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Gatliff reviewed the modifications to the design.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned the need to paint versus vinyl.
- Ms. Zuck stated that the hand painting was a brand standard.

motion by	<b>Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Mickley</b>
motion	<b>To approve the proposed storefronts, canopies and signage as submitted.</b>
vote	<b>4-0 to Approve</b>

**3.** | **1778 North High Street** | **BIBIBOP**  
applicant: Stan Young (Trinity Sign Co.)  
to be reviewed: signs  
**7:02 – 7:11**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the temporary graphics and interior vinyls.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the entire graphics package will need to be considered.

**motion** | **Tabled.**  
**To Consider:**

- **A complete graphics package for this location**

**4.** | **2020 North High Street** | **GNC**  
applicant: Jill Waddell, Robert Schorr (DaNite Sign Co.)  
to be reviewed: sign  
**7:11 – 7:15**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Schorr reviewed the details of the projecting sign.
- Mr. Grado stated that the sign was in the wrong location.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the sign is an off-premise graphic.

**motion by** | **Mr. Grado / Mr. Petruziello**  
**motion** | **To approve the proposed sign as submitted.**  
**vote** | **1-3 to Approve (Disapproved)**

**5.** | **1565 North 4<sup>th</sup> Street** | **Star Carryout**  
applicant: Jeff Dalrymple (Custom Sign Center), Sukhbir Choudhary (Owner),  
to be reviewed: sign  
**8:52 – 9:04**

- The Applicant did not show.
- The Board considered the project due to the fact that the Applicant had taken into account the concerns from the previous meeting and produced a proposal that could garner support.
- Mr. Grado suggested removal of the hand painted wall sign.
- Mr. Mickley stated that the exterior light should remain, due to the neighborhood.
- The Board and Applicants discussed the details of the sign.

**motion by** | **Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Horne**  
**motion** | **To approve the proposed sign as submitted on the condition:**

- **That the size of the sign should align with the rendering, not the measured drawing.**
- **Remove the wall pack light.**
- **Consider new down lighting on edge of sign.**
- **Remove surface conduit.**
- **Red must be opaque.**
- **Remove existing wall sign; consider window graphics.**

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

6. **1288 North High Street** **North High Street Brewing**  
applicant: Gavin Meyers (Owner), Doug Tyler (Sign Designer)  
to be reviewed: sign  
**7:58 – 8:12**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Meyers reviewed the proposal.
- Mr. Mickley questioned whether they could do the existing sign but illuminate it as requested.
- Mr. Meyers stated that the company is modifying its branding and a square or rectangle shape is the direction they wanted to go.
- Mr. Goodman stated that he was not opposed to a square sign, but the size may be too large.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the graphic seemed fine but the sign needs to narrow and grow taller; square or near square.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the construction of the sign.
- Mr. Goodman requested that the drawings show all the details at the next meeting.
- Mr. Petruziello requested that the drawings show how it is hung and powered.

motion

**Tabled.**

**To Consider:**

- **Square sign with proper graphics.**
- **Show how sign is hung on wall.**
- **Show how sign is powered.**

7. **61 East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue** **Multi-Family**  
applicant: Bradley Blumensheid, Jason Stults (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barrett Jardine Design),  
Wayne Garland (Owner)  
to be reviewed: building and site review  
**8:12 – 8:35**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Stults reviewed the modifications to the plan.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the North elevation is awkward due to the posts from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> story balcony rests on the 1<sup>st</sup> story roof.
- Mr. Grado suggested using a gable end on the North elevation rather than a hip.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the east and West elevations seemed appropriate.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the upper story windows should be taller.
- Mr. Horne suggested removing the windows on the left side and allows the balcony to extend across the face; make the façade asymmetrical.
- Mr. Petruziello discussed rearrangement of the roofs on the East and West elevation, remove the rockets.
- The Board and Applicant discussed variations on the roof and balconies.
- Mr. Horne suggested simplicity; the balcony could be a flat roof

motion

**Tabled.**

**To Consider:**

- **Modify the posts to visually connect to ground.**
- **Taller upper windows.**
- **Gable end roof on the North elevation.**
- **Extend roof on East and West in the laundry rooms.**
- **Widen the front porch/balconies.**
- **Balcony roof flat.**

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

**1. 30 West 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue Multi-Family**

applicant: Bradley Blumensheid, Jason Stults (Rhythm Architecture), Barrett Jardine (Barret Jardine Design), Wayne Garland (Owner), Dave Perry (Dave Perry Co.)

to be reviewed: conceptual review | building and site review

8:35 – 8:52

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal and discussed Staff’s concerns regarding the landscaping requirements.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested the use of pervious pavers as a compromise.
- Mr. Grado expressed concern regarding the refuse dumpsters; loss of one space and reconfigured trash layout may free up land for landscaping.
- Mr. Garland asked the Board to bless the building, the site still needs work.
- Mr. Petruziello indicated that the buildings seem appropriate.
- Mr. Horne suggested that the railing on the alley side should be metal; wood may be fine on the inward facing elements.
- Mr. Garland stated that they will replicate the railings that are found on the High Street building.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the canopy and sign band.

motion

**Tabled**

**To consider:**

- **Pervious pavers in the parking area.**
- **Metal railings similar to the High Street building.**
- **Introduce landscaping on the edge of property.**

**2. 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), Ryan Szymanski, Jeff Stone (Edwards Communities)

to be reviewed: conceptual review | building and site review

7:24 – 7:58

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Petruziello asked whether the proposal was ‘as-of-right’.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that proposal is part of the CPD that was approved last year and is ‘as-of-right’.
- Mr. Szymanski reviewed the proposal. Parking demand would be met by the garage to the East and 300 spaces available in the South Campus Gateway garage.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned whether the HVAC in the retail was split systems? Mr. Szymanski stated that they are and would be placed on the roof. Mr. Petruziello reviewed the needs of retail/commercial space.
- Mr. Szymanski commented that Humphreys Partners have the experience necessary.
- Mr. Mickley stated that the architecture seemed fine.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the building is very bland. The retail should be played up; the area between the storefront head and sills of the residential windows is an area they could hold more attention. The building looks like a strip center with a hotel on top of it.
- Mr. Finta questioned whether some more relief was warranted. Mr. Petruziello stated that some separation side to side and/or grouping of storefronts and their uses above.
- Mr. Szymanski questioned whether it was a matter of colors. Mr. Petruziello stated that color is not important at this moment; what will be important is how you administer the rules for each tenant, they will want to differentiate themselves. Rules will need to be established to allow for vitality, not banality. The upper levels should be more contemporary in aesthetic.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the ubiquitous 3x6 windows placed in semi-symmetry; maybe they could be differentiated across the elevation. How does the building meet the sky? Now the profile is not exciting. A tall building should be lighter as it goes up; the brick has too much mass at top.
- Mr. Finta asked whether the center section was better articulated. Mr. Goodman stated that the center was a little better.

- Mr. Petruziello commented that the entry to the units above is not evident on the High Street façade. Consider balconies in the recesses and making bay windows on the front surface. He questioned the aesthetic of the corner.
- Mr. Yu commented that the rhythm of the façade dictated the response to the corner. Mr. Petruziello stated that the rhythm of the facade does not work, it is too ridged.
- Mr. Goodman questioned detailing facades on the North and South; they are not provided in this packet.
- Mr. Szymanski questioned how to detail the upper portion to reduce the heaviness.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that they could use the same pallet of materials as was used at the SCG.
- Mr. Goodman commented that brick does not necessarily equate with heavy; many brick hews and patterns can be used that would work.
- Mr. Horne stated that there are other brick modules that could be used.
- Mr. Petruziello noted that the building is reminiscent of Hotels built between the world wars.
- Mr. Horne suggested removing the fin walls on the balconies; they are a distracting element in the design and seem to be deep enough for their intended use.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the implied symmetry in the façade does not work on this building.
- Mr. Szymanski questioned the Board’s stance on the siting of the building and other aspects.
- Mr. Goodman and Mr. Petruziello stated that the site arrangement seemed appropriate.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the parking ratio for the building.

motion

**Tabled**

**To consider:**

- **Play up the retail storefront.**
- **Cornice needs to hold some attention.**
- **Reduce the heaviness of the upper portion of the building.**
- **Remove the fin wall on the balconies.**
- **Differentiate the entrance to the residential from the retail.**
- **Building does not need to be traditional**

D.

**Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**

		items approved
1.	1656 Summit Street	<b>window</b>
2.	10 East 12th Avenue	<b>sign</b>
3.	54 West 8th Avenue	<b>roof</b>
4.	102-104 East 16th Avenue	<b>roof</b>
5.	131 East Norwich Ave (Windows)	<b>windows</b>
6.	161 Chittenden Avenue	<b>doors</b>
7.	208-214 East 13th Avenue	<b>roof</b>
8.	225 East 16th Avenue	<b>doors</b>
9.	249 East 16th Avenue	<b>windows</b>
10.	1827-1829 Summit Street	<b>windows</b>
11.	1871 North 4th Street	<b>addition</b>
12.	1956-1962 Iuka Avenue	<b>building renovate/rehabilitate</b>

9:04 – 9:20

motion by

**Mr. Grado / Mr. Mickley**

motion

**To approve as submitted.**

vote

**5-0 to Approve**

E.

**Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	14-24 West 9th Avenue (Multi-Family – Site Compliance)	<b>06/18/2015: Site and Building</b>	<b>08/18/2015</b>
2.	55 East 9th Avenue (SCG South - Building 2_Permit)	<b>05/21/2015: Site and Building</b>	<b>08/19/2015</b>

- |    |   |                               |            |
|----|---|-------------------------------|------------|
| 3. | 77 East 16th Avenue<br>(Oxford House)     | 07/16/2015: Site and Building | 08/13/2015 |
| 4. | 97-105 East 9th Avenue<br>(Terrace Place) | 02/19/2015: Site and Building | 08/13/2015 |
| 5. | 1509 North High Street<br>(Multi-Family)  | 07/16/2015: Site and Building | 08/19/2015 |

**F.**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1. | Next Meeting<br>Thursday October 15, 2015   6:30pm   2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100) |
|----|---|