

University Area Review Board

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

MEETING SUMMARY

date	June 16, 2016
place	Northwood & High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100
time	6:30pm – 9:58pm
members present	Ted Goodman, Pasquale Grado, Frank Petruziello, Brian Horne, Stephen Papineau
members absent	Richard Talbott, Doreen Uhas-Sauer

A.

1.	Business of the Board
6:30 – 6:32	Approval of Meeting Summary from May 2016
motion by	Mr. Papineau / Mr. Horne
motion	To approve as submitted.
vote	5-0 to Approve

B.

1.	Applications for Certificate of Approval
applicant:	15 East Lane Avenue 2106-2124 North High Street The Wilson (Mixed Use Redevelopment)
to be reviewed:	Karrick Sherrill (Schremshock Architects) building and site review
6:32 – 7:07	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.• Mr. Karrick reviewed how the design was modified to address the Board's concerns.• Mr. Petruziello questioned the use of split face block and requested that the block be ground face.• Mr. Grado concurred that the walls needed to be ground face block.• Mr. Petruziello questioned the material of the vent louvers.• Mr. Sherrill provided the cut sheet on the louvers.• The Board and Applicant discussed the location of the HVAC condensers.
motion by	Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Grado
	To approve the proposed five story mixed use development on the condition:
motion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• That the Concrete Masonry Units shall be ground face block.• That the HVAC condensers shall be moved behind the higher parapet at the corner of Lane and High.• That the signage shall be reviewed at a future date.
vote	5-0 to Approve

2. | **195 Chittenden Avenue** | **Rooks Tavern**
applicant: CJ Andrews (Mode Architects), Dustin Braun (Building Owner), John Havens (Business Owner)
to be reviewed: patio and signage review
7:07 - 7:33

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Andrews reviewed the proposed sign and patio; the sign is an adhered vinyl to the brick.
- Mr. Goodman expressed concern regarding the proposed conduit.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the conduit and how it should be routed.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the conduit should be allowed but painted black; warned about the placement of the gooseneck lights, maximum of 4' apart; planters need to level at the top.

motion by | **Mr. Papineau / Mr. Petruziello**

To approve the proposed sign and patio on the condition:

- motion |
- **That the junction boxes and conduit be located lower on the elevation and paint conduit black.**
 - **That the tops of the planters need to be level, not run with the grade of the patio.**

vote | **5-0 to Approve**

3. | **128 East 11th Avenue** | **Multi-Family**
applicant: Jason Stults (dkb Architects), Wayne Garland (Buckeye Realty)
to be reviewed: Addition and site
7:33 - 7:54

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Horne requested 8" posts; the roof should have a parapet at the rear.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the railing needs to be inset from the edge.
- Ms. D'lyn Stinziano (UD Neighbor) questioned the use of the realty sign; the sign is ugly and detracts from the architecture.
- Mr. Grado recalled the history and requirement for realty signs on the building.
- Ms. Deb Supelak (UD Neighbor) expressed a concern regarding the inclusion of more beds at this location.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the plan indicates that the building will go from 10 beds in two units to 8 beds in one unit.

motion by | **Mr. Horne / Mr. Grado**

To approve the proposed addition and remodel as submitted on the condition:

- motion |
- **That the front porch columns be 8" in width.**
 - **That the railings be set 12" in from the outside edge.**
 - **That the parapet be added at the rear addition and that the parapet shall be set level.**
 - **That the site plan shall meet the standards set forth in the UAPO.**

vote | **5-0 to Approve**

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

1. applicant: Wayne Garland (Buckeye Realty)
to be reviewed: conceptual | building and site review
7:54 – 8:15

77 East 10th Avenue (APN:010-269255) Multi-Family

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Garland reviewed the material selections to date; raw concrete and metal panels.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned where the HVAC condensers would be located.
- Mr. Garland stated that the condensers will be placed on the roof.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the condensers will be visible, but could be an element of the design.
- Ms. Laura Bidwa (UD Resident) commented that she liked the proposal but suggested that color could be introduced.
- Mr. Horne suggested that the base could be more open; the base should be sensed as lighter.
- Mr. Petruziello indicated that the base should be less austere; be cognizant of graffiti; a bold pattern may help on the ground floor.
- Mr. Papineau commented that the concept is a good use of the property.
- Mr. Grado commented that the applicant has more freedom on building height and should take advantage of that opportunity; 9 to 12 foot floor to ceiling are possible.
- Mr. Goodman expressed concern that the pedestrian access to the site.
- Mr. Garland stated that he is trying to work with the property owners along 9th avenue to install a sidewalk along the alley.

motion

Tabled

To consider:

- **Lighter ground floor treatment.**
- **Use HVAC condensers as design elements on roof.**
- **Bold patterns and/or colors as part of design.**
- **Take advantage of the ability to have greater floor to ceiling heights.**
- **Make pedestrian access to site a priority.**

2. applicant: Bhakti Bania, Baharat Baste (BBCO Architects), Mike Balakrishnan
to be reviewed: conceptual | redevelopment
8:15 – 9:38

2247-2289 North High Street Mixed Use

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Bania reviewed the modifications to the proposal since last meeting; she stated that 80% of the units are one and two bedrooms - the total beds are 310; the proposal has additional parking from last month.
- Mr. Krupp (UD Neighbor) stated that a National Historic Questionnaire was submitted for the Pavey Block and the staff suggested that the entire block be considered a district and focus on the activities of Mr. Pavey in the Conservative Movement.
- Mr. Paul Newkirk (UCA) recommended that the Board follow the guidance of the UDP; open balconies are problematic.
- Mr. Bob Singleton (UD Neighbor) expressed concern regarding lighting and trash in the plaza area.
- Mr. Joe Motil (UD Neighbor) commented that the buildings are inconsistent and incompatible with the neighboring buildings and the UDP.
- Mr. Aaron Marshall (UD Neighbor) stated that the buildings are too dense and too tall, it is not at all, what was agreed to in the UDP.
- Ms. Laura Bidwa (UD Neighbor) expressed dismay that after six months of review the proposal still does not adhere to the UDP guidelines.
- Ms. Deb Supelak (UD Neighbor) reviewed the duties of the UARB and the importance of the UDP as a guide to review proposals.
- Mr. John Fisik (UD Neighbor) expressed concern regarding the location and size of the back-up generator.

- Mr. Grado thanked the applicants for providing additional information, but stated that the project is still too dense and tall for the site; if the project were to get built what measures are in place to guarantee the exact unit count of the buildings and how will the remaining buildings be preserved.
- Mr. Balakrishnan stated that they would agree to the conditions.
- Mr. Horne questioned the height determination of the highest point.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the height should be measured from the average height along the High Street frontage measured from the curb/sidewalk.
- Mr. Horne asked for clarification whether the height concession was 5 to 10 feet or higher than 10 feet.
- Ms. Bania replied that the height from the curb at the midpoint measures 59' or 14' above the UDP recommendation.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that exact measurements are not as important as getting the right building; the 7th and High project ground floor retail will suffer because 72 feet was the magic number; this proposed project is not as simple as the UDP envisioned; the Board has discretion to approve proposals that meet the zoning code with guidance from plans.
- Mr. Ferdelman replied that the height recommendations came from a point of compromise between the community and commercial property owners.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that he is reacting to the current proposal and has a history with the area; the applicants could level the entire block and build to the 45 foot recommended height; he stated that he would hate to see that type development here ... this particular proposal preserves six homes; the current proposal is a vast improvement over the previous schemes and includes more parking and less bedrooms; one way to deal with the massing and height would be to recess the sixth floor from the lower floor; all the other agreements need to be in place to allow for support.
- Mr. Papineau stated that the project is significantly improved; the lighting will need to be considered for the breezeway.
- Mr. Goodman indicated that design of the proposal is probably as good as it can be based on the program; he stated that he wished that the proposal could be 20% less dense but even at that it would be a big building; a two or three story building would probably not be feasible; this design is as good as we are going to get from the Applicants, whatever reluctance is weighted against a proposal that could redevelop the entire block including the 6 remaining buildings.
- Mr. Horne stated the sixth floor is the catch point; he requested that the Applicants review whether removing the sixth floor would be financially feasible; he commented that removing units/beds would reduce the expense to construct and the need for some of the underground parking; Mr. Gardo concurred.
- Mr. Maniace stated that he is working on an agreement with Columbus Landmarks Foundation on a Preservation Easement in which CLF would be the guarantor.
- The Board indicated that the Preservation Easement sounded appropriate.
- Mr. Balakrishnan stated they would work out a unit matrix.
- Ms. Bania enquired as to what would be required to achieve a CAO and Zoning Recommendation at the July meeting.
- Mr. Petruziello quantified that material, sections and details would be required.
- Mr. Grado asked Staff for an interpretation of a Neighbor's comment regarding the UARB legal obligation.
- Mr. Ferdelman replied that the UARB is obligated to strictly uphold the Zoning Code but use Plans and other policies as guidance that can be varied.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the process forward.

motion

Tabled

To consider:

- **A legal tool to specify the preservation of the remaining buildings.**
- **A guarantee of final unit count.**
- **Recess the sixth floor.**
- **Review if removing a floor would be feasible.**
- **Zoning recommendation in July; Final COA in August (after BZA).**

D.

9:38 – 9:50

Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

items approved

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. | 49 West 9th Avenue | Roof |
| 2. | 244 King Avenue | Ramp |
| 3. | 320-322 East 12th Avenue | Porch |
| 4. | 1230 North High Street | Out of the Closet |
| 5. | 1244 North High Street | Storefront |
| 6. | 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue | Doors &Roof |
| 7. | 1515 Indianola Avenue | Roof |
| 8. | 1918 Indianola Avenue | Patio Replacement |
| 9. | 2591 North High | Door |
| 10. | 98 East 18th Avenue | Roof & Windows |
| 11. | 1469 Summit Street | Windows |
| 12. | 1539 Summit Street | Renovation |
| 13. | 1645 North 4th Street | Roof |
| 14. | NECKO & North of King | Gas Meters |
| 15. | 1556 North High Street | Gateway-Mural |

motion by

Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Horne

motion

To approve as submitted.

vote

5-0 to Approve

E.

Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval

approved : items approved

COA issued

- | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | 1555-1563 North 4 th Street
(Mixed Use Storefronts) | 04/21/2015: storefronts | 06/10/2016 |
|----|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|

F.

Next Meeting

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Thursday July 21, 2016 6:30pm 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100) |
|----|---|