MEETING SUMMARY
July 21, 2016
Northwood & High Building
2231 North High Street, Room 100
6:30pm

A. Business of the Board
1. Approval of Meeting Summary from May 2016
   motion by Mr. Papineau / Mr. Horne
   motion To approve as submitted.
   vote 5-0 to Approve

B. Applications for Certificate of Approval
1. 1980 North High Street
   applicant: Philip Radke (PR Signs & Services), Dori North, Matt Van Buren (Charlies)
   to be reviewed: 6:30 – 7:05
   building and site review

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Radke described the construction of the signs.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that the proposal has too many graphics.
- Mr. Grado stated that the graphics are busy and confusing.
- Mr. Horne suggested two signs over each other.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the signs should stay within the brick area and not project into the terracotta.
- Ms. North suggested that sign graphics be stacked.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the sign should not go over the vertical limit between the brick and terracotta; the orange panels around the entry are disruptive.
- Mr. Van Buren expressed concern that the brand identity will not be expressed.
- Mr. Horne suggested a blade sign over the entry.
- Mr. Van Buren commented that a blade sign would not read from across the street.
- Mr. Grado replied that a blade sign would read at oblique angles; rarely is the view directly perpendicular to elevation; vinyl graphics in the window could read from across the street.
- Mr. Van Buren stated that a wall sign is preferred, but a blade may work.
- Mr. Grado enquired about the height of the sign band; Mr. Van Buren stated that the band is 5'-4”.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the orange colored panel around the entry and window.

Tabled
To consider:
- Sign should not go across line between brick and terracotta
- A larger blade/projecting sign over the entry door.
- Limit the orange panels to the window frame or entry alcove but not both.
2. 1980 North High Street

Building Modifications

applicant: Brandon Doherty (Bass Studio Architects), Scott Solomon (Owner)

to be reviewed: 7:05 – 7:25

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Doherty reviewed the scope of the project; 72’ of building will be removed at rear.
- Mr. Grado expressed concern that the demising wall with McDonalds is not a smooth surface.
- Mr. Solomon stated that he did not know what that wall will be until it is uncovered.
- Mr. Horne suggested stuccoing the surface of the revealed wall.
- Mr. Solomon replied that he is ok with stuccoing the exposed wall.
- Mr. Goodman stated that a mason could tool the wall properly.
- Mr. Grado questioned the treatment of the ends of the walls as they are cut.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that they could tooth in new block then finish the ends with a pier.
- Mr. Solomon suggested a metal cap; because the walls are constructed of a structural clay tile.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the finish materials on the exposed walls.
- Mr. Doherty stated that an elastomeric paint will be used on the exposed walls.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer suggested a mural be done on the East wall; expressed how the alley is used by a large population of the area.
- Mr. Solomon expressed concerns regarding graffiti all along Pearl Alley.
- Mr. Grado concurred with Ms. Uhas-Sauer regarding the mural.

motion by Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Horne

To approve as submitted on the condition:
- That cut off light fixtures are used
- That the party wall with McDonalds will have a smooth clean surface; the wall shall be retooled or a new stucco surface applied.
- That the wall ends be capped properly.
- That the Applicant should consider a mural on the East wall at some future date.

vote 5-1 to Approve

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

1. 2247-2289 North High Street

Mixed Use | View at Pavey Square

applicant: Bhakti Bania, Baharat Baste (BBCO Architects), Mike Balakrishnan (Celmark), Jim Maniace (Taft)

to be reviewed: 7:25 – 8:05

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Maniace reviewed the requested variance and the reason behind the need.
- Mr. Goodman questioned why the variance was needed when the buildings are ‘grandfathered’
- Mr. Maniace replied that the parcels will be joined, therefore any building that is removed and replaced will be considered a primary building and would need to be place 0-10’ from the property line according to the UCO. The variance is to allow the existing buildings to remain and be recognized in the site’s zoning.
- Mr. Stuart Macintyre (UD Neighbor) stated that the proposed development will create upward pressure on rents in neighborhood.
- Ms. Sarah Nocar (UD Neighbor) why is variance needed if front buildings are being preserved?
- Mr. David Swiftly (UD Property Owner) commented that the proposed development is a good solution; all property owner and resident will benefit.
- Ms. D’lynn Stinziano (UD Neighbor) stated that once the variance is granted the buildings can be demolished.
• Mr. Thomas Wade (UD Neighbor) commented that the proposed development is too much and the UARB should advocate for the community.
• Mr. Evan Davis (UD Neighbor) observed that the proposed development is the antithesis of neighborhood.
• Ms. Deb Supelak (UAC Commissioner) remarked that the UAC voted 15-1 to oppose the proposed development and variance; the maximal economic benefit to the property owner is not guaranteed in law; the UARB should consider that neighborhood is people.
• Mr. Maniace replied to the question regarding the need of variance - the parcels will be combined, therefore all the buildings are considered primary; the buildings that remain will have a protective covenant.
• Mr. Petruziello questioned when the covenant would be put in place; stated that he would condition approval on having covenant recorded prior to building permit being issued.
• Mr. Grado clarified that he is (has been) opposed to the height and density of the proposed project, but is supportive of the Variance to preserve the 6 buildings that front High Street.
• Mr. Horne stated that he supports the variance to allow the preservation of the 6 buildings but is still troubled by the height/scale of the rear building.

motion by Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Horne

To support the requested variance to allow the preservation of the existing structures on High Street, on the condition:

• That a legally binding Preservation Easement or other legal covenant be recorded prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

vote 5-0-1 to Approve

D. Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Item Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>30-32 East 10th Avenue</td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>33 East 14th Avenue</td>
<td>windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>46 East 10th Avenue</td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>67 Chittenden Avenue</td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>180 East 12th Avenue</td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>182 East 14th Avenue</td>
<td>siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>244 King Avenue</td>
<td>siding, roof, ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1706-1708 Summit Street</td>
<td>balcony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1842 Indianola Avenue</td>
<td>sign (Kappa Sigma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1857 North 4th Street</td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2157 Summit Street</td>
<td>windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>18 East 13th Avenue</td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>115 East 12th Avenue</td>
<td>windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1343 Highland Avenue</td>
<td>windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1552 North High Street</td>
<td>reface sign (Fig Leaf Boutique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1846 Summit Street</td>
<td>windows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date Approved:</th>
<th>Date Issued:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>34 West 9th Avenue (Mixed Use – Permit)</td>
<td>12/15/2015: building &amp; site</td>
<td>06/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>165 East 15th Avenue (Beta Theta Pi - Site Compliance)</td>
<td>02/19/2015: building &amp; site</td>
<td>07/05/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>195 Chittenden Avenue (Rooks Tavern)</td>
<td>06/15/2016: sign &amp; patio</td>
<td>06/20/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1555-1563 North 4th Street (Storefronts)</td>
<td>04/21/2016: storefronts</td>
<td>06/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1892-1928 North High Street (University Residences - Phase 1)</td>
<td>04/21/2016: building &amp; site</td>
<td>06/14/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8:05 – 8:11 motion by Mr. Papineau / Mr. Grado

To approve as submitted. vote 5-0 to Approve

### F. Next Meeting

1. Thursday August 18, 2016 | 6:30pm | 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100)