University Area Review Board

50 West Gay Street, Fourth Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-9031 (614) 645-6096 (614) 645-6675 fax



MEETING SUMMARY

date **January 21, 2016**

place Northwood & High Building

2231 North High Street, Room 100

time **6:30pm**

members present

Ted Goodman, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Pasquale Grado, Frank Petruziello, Brian Horne

members absent Bob Mickley, Richard Talbott

A. Business of the Board

1. Approval of Meeting Summary from December 2015

motion by Mr. Horne / Ms. Uhas-Sauer

motion To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.

vote 5-0 to Approve

B. Applications for Certificate of Approval

1466 -1516 North High Street, Building 1 - SCG South Mixed Use | Gateway II East 8th Avenue, East 9th Avenue and

Pearl Alley

applicant: to be reviewed:

1.

Stephen M. Caplinger (Creative Design + Planning), Ryan Szymanski, Jeff Stone (Edwards Communities) elevated walkway

6:30 - 6:50

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Szymanski reviewed the program; Mr. Stone reviewed the structure.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned whether the rendering or the elevation was the correct in detailing of the bridge; are there triangular trusses and is the mullions full height.
- Mr. Stone commented that the structural drawings are the correct drawings. The metal panels are set
- The Board and Applicants discussed the color of the metal panels; prefinished panels to color match SW 7016 (Mindful Gray).
- Mr. Petruziello enquired where the bridge meets Building 2.
- Mr. Szymanski explained how the bridge will attach where currently is shown a window; the window is in a hallway that is present on all floors.
- Mr. Stone explained that the floor levels are off by ¼" even though they are effectively different floor levels 3rd on Building 1 and 4th on Building 2.
- Mr. Szymanski commented that they intentionally placed a lobby on the 4th floor of Building 2 but did not provide the structure internal to the building, thus the use of posts just on one side.
- Mt. Goodman expressed concern regarding the first 5 to 6 feet at the base of the posts, due to abuse.

motion by Mr. Grado / Mr. Horne

To approve the proposed addition and modifications on the condition:

That architectural drawings of the bridge are reviewed and approved by Staff.

That the color of the metal is verified to match the building metal of the attached structures.

vote 5-0 to Approve

motion

2. 1892-1928 North High Street 15th & High Redevelopment | University Residences

Stephen M. Caplinger (Creative Design + Planning), Ryan Szymanski, Jeff Stone (Edwards Communities),

George Acock (Acock Associates), Keith Myers (Campus Partners)

building and site review

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Myers gave an overview on the planning for 15th and High on the West and East sides of High Street. The Campus side will concentrate the Arts Departments (performance and other media) around Mershon/Wexner; a new entrance to the south of Mershon; Performance theaters north of Mershon. The west side of the street will involve a lot of infrastructure work; Hotel and garage beyond Pearl; most of the buildings at 15th & High would have limestone facades; brick on Pearl and granite curbs throughout.
- Mr. Szymanski reviewed the program of the proposal; the development would include 5 stories above 46,000sf of commercial space and 170 units (456 beds) of residential. The building will need various floor plates along High Street to accommodate the change in grade.
- Mr. Acock reviewed the building design and details; stated that a traditional base, middle and top type architecture is
 most appropriate at this location along High Street; 17th avenue is an important nexus, a view is terminated at the
 building from campus; the building has a rhythm
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that the biggest concern is the scale of the building and quality of materials; this proposal has some quality in the materials proposed. She noted that this block of High Street encapsulates the evolution of commercial buildings on this street; storefront additions to existing residences, a 1920's commercial building, the Sigma Nu Fraternity, some 60's and 70's and one from the 1980's.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer questioned whether there is a lost opportunity to preserve the fine buildings or elements of the buildings on the south end of the block; she reviewed the history of (Wellington Fahlen builder and Sigma Nu -Sims Architect). The scale and quality of the elements could be studied to help inform the new building; the two buildings were open to great fanfare in the 1920's due to the quality and program of the buildings. Change is part of High Street development, but scale and quality of materials are important.
- Mr. Petruziello concurred regarding the archeological aspect of the block; the block has a lot of vitality, many different things at different scales; the block is decidedly not campus unifying the two sides should not be what this block is about. He commented that the architecture of the block is going from Honky-Tonk (think Star Wars bar scene) to a Dirge; the correct response is somewhere in between; the façade is too homogenized. He indicated that the Board has worked through the years to allow some spontaneity in the proposals as to not make architecture that is cold or lifeless.
- Mr. Horne stated that the proposal comes off as a big block of apartments; this block may call for something much more contemporary.
- Mr. Grado commented that the proposal lacks detail on how Pearl Street will be inhabited; the pedestrian experience is important, often Pearl is has more foot traffic than High Street. He mentioned that elements from Sigma Nu and/or Wellington could be incorporated into the development.
- Mr. Goodman stated that the first floor should be much more transparent; the Gym and Activity Center is in the bowels of the building, maybe they can be brought to the High Street frontage to give more life to that portion of the façade. Regarding the institutional look, he indicated that the windows were too regular, too many punched openings; there might be a better way to do less of them but they take different shapes.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that thought should be given to the mix of uses and allow for the local or incubator; bigger and/or shinier is not always what students are looking for, often they are looking for an experience or a connection to a place; additionally we should be concerned that density at some point may be counterproductive.
- Ms. Deb Supelak (UAC Member) stated that the originally CPD zoning allowed for some preservation of buildings and some of the bohemian culture that is important; this proposal is homogenized/corporate and would not accommodate the full breadth of the community found in the University District. She commented that this area is not just full of upper middle class students; they all need a place to congregate.
- Mr. Thomas Lee (OSU Alum) remarked that the proposal removes all the character of this neighborhood unique.

Tabled

To consider:

 That particular emphasis should be placed on quality of materials and scale of elements on the building(s).

motion

- That the block of 16th to 17th should be differentiated from the Campus/Institutional architectural language, may be fine for the "room" at 15th and High but less so toward 17th.
- An architecture that is more contemporary in nature.
- More attention and detail as to how Pearl Street will function, pedestrian experience is important for proposed incubator businesses.
- More transparent first floor.

- Move Activity Center/Gym to High Street in order to animate the façade.
- Reduce and vary the upper story openings.

applicant: to be reviewed: 7:37 - 7:46

1497 North 4th Street Single Family Residence

Lee J. Rumora (RUMORA ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS L.L.C.), Don Pritchard (Owner) building and site review

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Pritchard reviewed the modifications in the proposal to address Board concerns.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the split faced block is not a preferred material.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer requested a landscape plan.
- Mr. Horne expressed concern regarding the details on the handrails and porch posts; he suggested eyebrow returns at the gable eaves; a 1x6 head trim; a 1x6 trim across at the 3rd floor window sill the upper portion of the gable should receive fish scale.

motion by

motion

Mr. Horne / Ms. Uhas-Sauer

To approve the proposed new residential building on the condition:

- · That an eyebrow return be included at the eave.
- That a 1x6 be used as the trim for the heads of the windows.
- That a 1x6 trim be placed across the building at the height of the 3rd floor window sill.
- That fish scale siding be used above the 1x6 trim in the gable.

vote

5-0 to Approve

applicant: to be reviewed:

1525 North High Street Mixed Use (Taco Bell)

David Ruma (Virginia Homes), Skip Weiler (Weiler Real Estate), George Berardi (Berardi Partners) building and site design

7:46 - 8:10

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Berardi reviewed the modifications to the plans based on Board comments.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned the unit size of the brick.
- Mr. Berardi stated that the units are standard size; the other masonry units are white split face block.
- Mr. Grado stated that the design overall is good, but the vertical glass element is inappropriate.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the vertical element could use a little more study, but the current proposal is a result of previous comments.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked for a review of the location of the building and what is to be replaced.
- Mr. Ferdelman showed slides and described the review process to date.

motion by

Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Horne

motion

To approve the proposed new mixed use building as submitted on the condition:

· That permit level drawings are submitted to staff

vote

5-0 to Approve

5. applicant: to be reviewed:

67 East 15th Avenue

Delta Tau Delta Fraternity

Nick Cavalaris (Attorney), Joe Segna (Segna Architects) building and site design

8:10 - 8:30

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Cavalaris reviewed the zoning; Mr. Segna reviewed the modifications to the plans based on Board comments.
- Mr. Goodman requested a section through the entry pediment.
- Mr. Segna stated that they had not yet developed that section but will draw it for the CD set.
- Mr. Grado expressed concerns regarding the shutters, they are not appropriate for the building.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that 'if' shutters are used they should appear as real shutters that could fill the window opening.
- Mr. Segna stated that the shutters are not a must.
- Mr. Horne questioned the proportions of the windows on the North Elevation.
- Mr. Petruziello requested that the piers have more substance, maybe two columns at the center; the arch on the east and west can be narrowed.
- Mr. Horne stated that as flat as the arches are, they should just be flat.

•

motion by

Mr. Grado / Mr. Petruziello

To approve the proposed addition and exterior modifications at 67 East 15th Avenue on the condition:

motion • That the shutters be removed from the proposal.

That pediment details be presented to staff prior to issuance for permit.

vote

5-0 to Approve

6. applicant: to be reviewed:

1567 North High Street

Starbucks

Jill Waddell, Robert Schorr (DaNite Signs Inc.) storefront and signage

8:30 - 8:43

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Schorr reviewed the details of the signs.
- Mr. Petruziello requested details of the storefront; stated that there are too many signs.
- Mr. Grado stated that the corner sign cannot be seen, it is recessed.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested mounting a bigger sign at the corner just above the storefront, but the storefront has to come to the Board prior to this signage.

Tabled

To consider:

motion

- Reduce the number of signs.
- One projecting sign (not 3) at the corner above storefront along with the wall signs.
- Drawings for the design and construction of the storefront.

7. applicant: to be reviewed:

8:43 - 8:55

1558 North High StreetJill Waddell (DaNite Signs Inc.) storefront and signage

Jimmy Johns

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Schorr reviewed the details of the signs and awnings.
- Mr. Grado stated that the upper lighting will need to be removed; the drop and side panels on the awnings are

inappropriate.

- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that have the sign on both bays and graphics on the drops are excessive.
- Mr. Goodman replied that additional graphics at this location may be warranted based on its location.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the graphics could be on the glass; the projecting sign could be placed on the corner.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that if the business depends on delivery, then the additional graphics make less sense.
- Mr. Schorr offered a different sign proposal to mollify the concern of too many graphics.

motion by Mr. Horne / Mr. Petruziello To approve the proposed sign, graphics and awning on the condition: • That the projecting sign be placed at the corner as proposed. • That only one wall sign be approved and be placed over the entry or East end storefront. • That the existing awnings be resurfaced with black canvas with no drop valiance or ends. • That the flood lights set in the sign band be removed.

vote 5-0 to Approve

C.

Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review
15 East Lane Avenue The Wilson (Mixed Use Redevelopment)
2106-2124 North High Street

applicant:

Karrick Sherrill (Schremshock Architects), Zack Schiff (Owner), Michael Shannon (Crabbe, Brown & James LLP)

to be reviewed:

conceptual | redevelopment

8:55 - 9:35

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Sherrill reviewed the program and design of the program.
- Mr. Grado commended the Applicants for responding to the Guidelines and responding to comments from the UAC.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned the use of the second floor.
- Mr. Sherrill stated that the second floor will be used for mercantile.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the he likes most of the forms; the architecture is reminiscent of Vienna Secessionist and Czech Cubism; the Lane Avenue façade may be too fussy; look at Joseph Hoffman and Otto Wagner.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that the corner articulation is a departure from all the other proposals the Board has seen over the years; where did the name come from?
- Mr. Schiff stated that it is his paternal grandmother's maiden name.
- Mr. Goodman congratulated the Architect for making a bold statement at Lane and High corner; the elements should be refined though.
- Mr. Sherrill informed that Board that he took cues from Michigan Avenue in Chicago; explained a problem with a low wall along the West elevation to allow for a continuous floor platform.
- Mr. Horne stated that the grade change should be addressed inside, so no wall on the outside.
- Mr. Will Smeltzer (UD Resident) expressed concern regarding the additional amount of traffic that will enter and exit from Pearl Alley.
- Mr. Shannon stated that they are working with the City of Columbus Public Service Department to assess the needs in terms of traffic control for this development.
- Ms. Jane Murphy (Northwood Park Resident) expressed concern that the several developments reviewed at the meeting are not consistent with the FAR recommendations of the University District Plan.
- Mr. Ferdelman replied that the Lane & High proposal was within the spirit of the Plan because it is located in the Regional Mixed Use area that recommends a minimum of 1.0 FAR with no upper limit except for height.
- Ms. Delyn Stinzianno (UD Resident) asked who would pay for and execute the changes in traffic and the Right of Way.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the UARB does not have purview over the ROW or of Zoning.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that modifications to the ROW would be at the Developer's expense.
- Mr. Joe Motil (UD Resident) commented that the clock seems like and odd focus for the corner façade.
- Mr. Sherrill stated that the clock has taken on a life of its own and seems to be appropriate to the building and location.

Tabled

To consider:

motion

- Simplify the North Elevation
- Good bold statement at corner, though refine the details.
- Grade change along High Street should be addressed on the interior.

applicant:
to be reviewed:
9:35 - 11:00

2247-2289 North High StreetBhakti Bania (BBCO Architects) conceptual | redevelopment

Mixed Use

- Mr. Goodman explained the rules for 10 speakers to comment on the project.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Bania reviewed the revised proposal and program; the proposed development keeps the Pavey office as a community center for the complex, it is flanked by 3 and 4 story buildings and an 8 story building at the rear.
- Mr. Aaron Marshall (UD Resident) expressed concern that a 402 bed development is just too much for this area.
- Mr. Roger Deal (UD Resident) stated that the proposal would have an enormous impact on traffic, trash and sewer.
- Mr. Mike Polker (UD Resident) commented that the proposed building is wrong for the neighborhood; it is out of character and is not in demand in this market.
- Mr. Evan Davis (UD Resident) quantified the proposal as an involuntary repurposing of the neighborhood, exacting what the zoning laws and the overlay are there to protect us from; this proposal would unnecessarily increase the rent throughout the neighborhood; their mandate is not our destiny that the original proposal met zoning necessitates that the Zoning Code be corrected to eliminate the provision that would allow that much height and density in a predominately residential neighborhood.
- Ms. Jenny Bell (UDO Member) remarked that she was offended by the drawings that show a fiction of how tall the building really is; an 8 story building anywhere along High Street would be shocking but more so in this area
- Ms. Lauren Levers (UD Resident) stated that the owners and developers do not care and are disrespectful of this
 neighborhood; the other projects made use of vacant or underutilized land, this proposal removes well maintained and
 occupied residences.
- Ms. Deborah Supelak (UAC Member) exclaimed that the proposal does not address the pedestrian experience of the adjacent neighbors.
- Mr. Will Hughen (UD Resident) read from the University District Plan and focused on language about preservation and density on High Street north of Lane Avenue; the proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the Northwood Park Historic District across the street; the proposal is entirely out of context.
- Mr. John Massimiani (UD Business Owner) remarked that the proposal will be a good thing for the neighborhood, the owners and developer will work with the Board and are good operators; the Wendy's development is a good project.
- Mr. Joe Motil (UD Resident) reviewed the history of the UD and why demolition moratoriums were put in place in the late 80's and early 90's; he helped create the Northwood Park Historic District about 26 years ago; this 3 block stretch of High Street is one of the most unique in the city of Columbus; the loss of this streetscape would be nearly as destructive as the loss of Union Station.
- Mr. Grado stated that the project is overly ambitious for the site; the fact that the UDP recommendations have not been codified in zoning text is working against the neighborhood; the loss of the historic context is problematic; the concentration of density is more troubling in that the proposal would require 3 curb cuts not 1 like all the other projects for review, in fact the Applicants will need confirmation from Public Service or Zoning whether curb cuts are allowed on Northwood or Oakland without requiring a Variance; 8 stories is inconsistent with the UDP; the building should be setback above the 3rd story; 'if' development has to occur here, maybe all of the buildings on High Street remain and a smaller 4 story building be built behind all of the structures.
- Mr. Horne agreed with the majority of the comments; the proposal of should preserve more buildings, Northwood and High could be redeveloped though Oakland and High should be saved; any proposal should respect FAR and height requirements from the UDP.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that all access should be from Northwood; whatever is built along Wall Street should the
 'deadliness' of the straight line the building should have some relief, not flat and planar; concurred that Northwood
 and High should be redeveloped and Oakland and High preserved, he reviewed three reasons why keeping Oakland and
 High was important; the Pavey building as community resource not important, maybe they become the restaurants;
 lowering the density is very important.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer 'reluctantly' concurred that the greatest opportunity for redevelopment is for the corner of Northwood
 and High and the red farm house; from Pavey house to Oakland are more important to save; she recounted the history
 of Rep. Stinzianno lecturing local developers about the parable of the 'goose the laid the golden eggs'; she
 acknowledged the applicants right to redeveloped the site but questioned the principle of using the zoning code in a
 manner that it was most likely not intended in regards to a 11 or 8 story building in a residential neighborhood.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the 3 story mixed use building is possibly a good example of neighborhood mixed use if not for the larger building lurking from behind, but the context of the adjacent blocks is not storefronts up to the street; it makes more sense to preserve the buildings on High and build behind.

- Ms. Uhas-Sauer observed that there has been progress in the current proposal versus what was reviewed the previous month
- Ms. Bania expressed their concern in preserving the buildings on High Street and wanting to build in the back, how is that achieved without the need for zoning variances.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned the need for so much office.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer enlightened the Applicants regarding the bomb shelter in the building along Wall Street.
- The Board and Applicants discussed an allowable FAR for the development.

Tabled

motion

To consider:

- Reduce the height of building to within the parameters of the UDP.
- Reduce the number of curb cuts; clarify if curb cuts are permitted on Oakland and/or Northwood.
- Setback the upper stories along Wall Street above 35' or 3rd floor.
- Keep all High Street buildings and build a less than 45' high building in back.
- Redevelop Northwood and High; save Oakland and High
- Respect height limits and FAR
- All automobile access should be from Northwood

D.	1	Staff Issued Certificates of Approval		
υ.	11:00 - 11:05	Stail issued Certificates of Approval	items approved	
	1.	1656 Summit Street	window	
	2.	34 East 13th Avenue	windows	
	3.	54 East 13th Avenue	windows	
	4.	190-192 East Norwich Avenue	windows	
	5.	198 East Norwich Avenue	windows	
	6.	275 East 15th Avenue	roof	
	7.	398-400 King Avenue	windows	
	8.	404-406 King Avenue	windows	
	9.	410 King Avenue	windows	
	10.	1704-1706 Summit Street	balcony	
	11.	2173 Indianola Avenue	windows	
	12.	2404 North High Street (Pizza Fresca)	sign reface	
	13.	132-140 East 12th Avenue	roof	
	14.	1990 North High Street (Sbarro)	temporary banner (30 day)	
	motion by	Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Horne		
	motion	To approve as submitted		
	vote	5-0 to Approve		
E.	1.	Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval approved: items approved COA issued 1. 34 West 9th Avenue (Mixed Use) 12/15/2015: site and building 12/24/2015		
	2.	61 East 8th Avenue (Multi-Family	10/15/2015: addition	01/04/2016
	3.	352-354 King Avenue (Porch)	07/16/2015: replacement porch	01/08/2016
	4.	1247 North High Street (Elana's Cakes)	12/15/2015: sign and graphic	12/24/2015
	5.	1452 Indianola Avenue (Multi-Family)	08/20/2015: building renovation and	12/15/2015
			convert commercial to residential	
F.	11:05 – 11:30	Annual Meeting		
	1.	Review 2015 Stats		
	2.	Review By-Laws		
	3.	Elect Officers: Chair, Secretary	Chair: Mr. Goodman Sect: Mr. Horne	
		,		
G.		Next Meeting		
	1.	_	2231 North High Street (Northwood & High	Building, Room 100)
	1. Thursday February 18, 2016 6:30pm 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 10			