

University Area Review Board

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

MEETING SUMMARY

date	March 17, 2016
place	Northwood & High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100
time	6:30pm – 10:02pm
members present	Ted Goodman, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Pasquale Grado, Frank Petruziello, Brian Horne, Bob Mickley (7:25)
members absent	Richard Talbott

- A.**
- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1. | Business of the Board |
| motion by | Approval of Meeting Summary from February 2016
Mr. Horne / Mr. Petruziello |
| motion | To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted. |
| vote | 5-0 to Approve |
- B.**
- | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| 1. | Applications for Certificate of Approval | 15th & High Redevelopment University Residences |
| applicant: | Stephen M. Caplinger (Creative Design + Planning), Ted Musielewicz (Acock Associates)
Ryan Szymanski, Jeff Stone (Edwards Communities), Keith Myers (Campus Partners) | |
| to be reviewed: | building and site review | |
| 6:40 – 7:36 | | |
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
 - Mr. Acock reviewed the modifications to the elevations and sections; changes through a deeper cornice, breakdown of the masses and modified window openings. The important key to the buildings throughout the University is a strong base, a trunk and a cornice. The 6th floor uses a darker brick to set it apart from the rest of the mass.
 - Ms. Deb Stupak (UAC Member) expressed concern over the architecture referencing the University over the neighborhood itself; the project lies outside the University boundary and the CPD for this site stated that the architecture would be consistent with the neighborhood. The alley side is not inviting as was promised in the CPD. This building does not tell me, my people are invited.
 - Ms. Laura Bidwa (University Resident) commented that the proposed building does not express the will of the community as extent through the UDP and other plans; this proposal does not preserve or enhance the urban environment and neighborhood characteristics of the University Area. That the applicants are not listening to the community or the UARB is frustrating.
 - Mr. Bob Singleton stated that the existing buildings are not being referenced in the proposal; we are losing High Street with all of these similar developments.
 - Mr. John Fikias expressed concern for the businesses that can make it work in this location; will they all be national chains?
 - Mr. Grado started with a history of the UCBA and the rent structure in the University District, rent is not an issue. What is possible with this proposal and others is to bring in other demographics to the neighborhood; if the unit mix, amenities and services are right people other than students will seriously consider living in the units proposed (faculty, staff, young professionals and retirees).
 - Mr. Grado continued - the proposed building does look like a 40's or 50's campus building; the building can be a good background building; the building does not need to be contemporary; the building does need to address the massing a bit better but it is going in the right direction. The 17th Avenue segment could be different than the 16th Avenue.
 - Mr. Horne addressed the communities concern that a lot of these buildings are being proposed in a short period of time; we will not know how these buildings are being accepted until they are built, we might learn from each one.
 - Mr. Horne commented that the current proposal does not seem to address the concerns from last month; the changes seem too timid.

- Ms. Uhas-Sauer discussed the context of the buildings of their time; the building that occupies the location of the Wellington was a substantial house that folks would have wanted preserved. Generations and tastes change, but a building should be of its time and we should expect one of the best examples at this location – this building is getting there. Building elements should be present somewhere on the site.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the Applicants are not going to do what the Board has asked, so let's see where we can go from here. He stated that the 5th floor cornice is problematic; it somewhat works on West elevation but not on Pearl Alley, maybe the cornice can modulate.
- Mr. Petruziello indicated that the base on High Street is working well; the ins and outs do help animate the street.
- Mr. Myers expressed some concern that simplicity might be in order for this building.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the details of the windows.
- Mr. Petruziello noted that the East façade will need the most study; the North and South facades have about the right proportions, but can these be translated on the East and West.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the street level along Pearl is monotonous.
- Mr. Goodman commented that job is to manage the bigness of the building; maybe two elements along the East and West with a gap between.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked whether the Pearl Alley frontage can somehow turn itself inside out; think Lynn Alley and Ringside.
- Mr. Musielewicz reviewed and acknowledged the comments from the board
- Mr. Petruziello stated that we are agreed on the language and sentences but not on the paragraphs; the architects should take some risks.

motion

Tabled

Things to consider:

- **A unit mix that may attract people other than students.**
- **Modulate the upper cornice.**
- **The North and South Elevations work, can they inform the East and West elevations.**

2.

1607 North High Street

Pizza Rev

applicant:

Tiffany Griffin-Camerella, Jim Johnson (Technical Group Inc.),

to be reviewed:

storefront, graphics, awnings

7:36 - 7:50

- Mr. Mickley joined the Board to hear the case.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Horne commented that the awning details are not similar to the adjacent storefront as stated.
- Mr. Grado stated that the 'Craft your Own' tag line was inappropriate on the awning; may be appropriate on the glass.
- Mr. Goodman questioned whether the wall sign was halo lit or pan formed.
- Mr. Johnson stated that the sign is composed of can letters mounted on a pan background which is halo lit.
- Mr. Goodman replied that the sign details do not support the text on the elevation drawing.

motion by

Mr. Gardo / Mr. Mickley

To approve the proposed storefront and awning as submitted on the condition:

motion

- **That the storefront is approved as submitted.**
- **That the awning be similar to Five Guys; with no side panels.**
- **That no graphics are applied to the awning; the 'Craft Your Own' graphic may be applied to the storefront glass.**
- **That the sign is not part of this approval.**

vote

6-0 to Approve

C.

Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review

15 East Lane Avenue | 2106-2124 North High Street The Wilson (Mixed Use Redevelopment)

1.
applicant: Karrick Sherrill (Schremshock Architects)
to be reviewed: conceptual | redevelopment
7:50 - 8:20

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Sherrill reviewed modifications to the design; indicated that they would like to get some kind of approval that would allow for a foundation start after next meeting.
- Mr. Joe Motil (UD Resident) expressed concern about the appearance of the garage; it should integrate with the residential character of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Bob Singleton (UD Resident) commented that this proposal would cause the closing in of High Street; the height and density is not right.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer concurred that the garage should be more complimentary to the residential buildings beyond the alley.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the vertical fins should be removed from the north elevation; portions of the corner should be dropped to reveal the corner better; do something with the south elevation to relieve the blank wall (no ad murals); the details need to progress and express the reality of the building components.
- Mr. Horne expressed concern regarding the mix of materials and their related details; stated that he would be uncomfortable issuing a COA on foundation until the details are worked out; the existing building should be shown to see how the new building integrates with the old.
- Mr. Mickley concurred with Mr. Petruziello regarding the north elevation; stated that the garage should remain simple.
- Mr. Grado mentioned that the corner needs to be simplified; the garage should be sympathetic to the residential; the south elevation needs to be dealt with, it's a billboard waiting to happen – we would not support a billboard.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the utility space along the east elevation should be minimized as much as possible.

motion

To consider:

- **The garage should be complimentary of the residential buildings behind.**
- **Remove the accentuated pilasters on the north elevation**
- **Reveal the corner better by dropping the cornice.**
- **Refine the details.**
- **Show the existing building along with new proposal.**
- **Reduce the utility/transformer space along east elevation.**

2.

2247-2289 North High Street

Mixed Use

applicant: Bhakti Bania, Bhrate Baste (BBCO Architects), Mike Balakrishnan (Celmark Development), Jim Maniace (Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP)
to be reviewed: conceptual | redevelopment
8:20 – 9:52

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal and reviewed the proposal in regards to the UDP; still concerns regarding building height and FAR.
- Ms. Bania reviewed the modifications to the proposal; the proposed building would be approx. 55' high from the High Street frontage, though approx. 60' on alley.
- Ms. Delyn Stinziano (UD Resident) expressed concern regarding the traffic pattern around the site; the area devoted to refuse seems too small for the size of the project; stated that the Board should use the UDP (2015) as the guide to approve or not approve this project.
- Ms. Laura Bidwa (UD Resident) commented that the proposal is significantly over the UDP recommendation for FAR that the UARB should not approve it in this form; the UARB should act on behalf of the neighborhood using the UDP as they guidance.
- Mr. Nick Lamatrice (UD Property Owner) stated that the project team has made many concessions and the current proposal is a good project; the land is too valuable to not allow it to be redeveloped; the developers of this project are local and care about the neighborhood.
- Ms. Deborah Supelak (UAC Commissioner) referred to letter from Mr. Maniace to the UAC written in February that stated the proposed development would not result in the loss of any buildings along High Street; there has been no attempt to come into compliance with the UDP (2015); the UARB should us the UDP to deny this project; even at 5

stories the proposed building along Wall Alley is too tall.

- Joe Motil (UD Resident) commented that the proposal is significant departure from the UDP; the height and mass is incompatible with the surrounding buildings; the project does not serve to enhance the neighborhood.
- Mr. John Fisik (UD Resident) the scale of the building is too big.
- Mr. Grado asked for a clarification in regards to a meeting that was held with City Council members and the community.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the Development Director and Planning Administrator reinforced the idea that the UARB should use the UDP (2015) for guidance on determining the appropriateness of the development proposal.
- Mr. Grado commended the applicants on the concession that have been made but it still might not be enough; expressed concern regarding the mechanized parking and that the queuing distance may be a problem ; the corner building is too figural, there are good cues from the Alhambra across the street; the proposal should support the plan including the height.
- Mr. Mickley commented the proposal is good and mechanized parking seems like a good solution for this building; the existing stair going to the Japanese Oriental restaurant is a personal pet peeve.
- Mr. Horne commented that the current proposal is a vast departure from the previous schemes and it is better; the way the building sets back along Wall Alley is good; the activation of the west elevations is good; the back building can be a little less 'historical'; the project may be a good compromise in that it preserves a majority of the buildings on the site and seems to meet the programmatic needs of the owner.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the current proposal is a good starting point, we should almost forget the other iterations; the historic detailing on the proposal is kitsch – it's not what you (BBCO) does; the buildings could be reinterpreted 'historical' similar to what was accomplished on King Avenue; the north and south facades look motel like, don't do motel.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the building fits better in its context than the previous proposals, some of that is because of materials; the height and density of the project still needs to be addressed; asked for clarification of the letter.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the applicants submitted a proposal in February that retained all the buildings on High Street but the rear building was 8 stories; staff directed the applicants to the meeting summary where the board suggested selective removal of buildings on High Street in order to retain some of the existing streetscape; the removal of the two southern most buildings was seen as a compromise as long as every other aspect met the intent of the UDP (2015).
- Mr. Goodman commented that the UDP (2015) allows for a 3 story building along the entire block and the proposal before the board makes great efforts to preserve a majority of the block; the larger building in the back works well as a backdrop to the preserved buildings.
- Mr. Balakrishnan questioned whether the current proposal is the right height, density and massing.
- The Board and Applicants discussed the height of the back building; it was determined that the height would be 55'+/- above grade from the High Street frontage and 60'+/- along the alley; Mr. Grado and Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that they would not support the current proposed height of the building – the other Board Members did.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the site access and auto queuing; Mr. Gardo expressed concern about auto queuing and cross traffic into the building.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the 55' height from High Street is a reasonable compromise to preserve the majority of the building on the block, but would ask for some sort of deed restriction that would not allow for the removal of the front buildings; consider the top story as a soft story.
- The Board and Applicant discussed site access and whether a curb cut would require a zoning variance.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that site access is controlled by Public Service and it would be the developer's obligation to meet their standards; the UAPO was brought up because curb cuts are severely limited by the provisions in the code section for residential buildings.

motion

To consider:

- **Bring the building into compliance with the UDP.**
- **Review the need for mechanized parking and auto queuing.**
- **Tone down the architecture of the larger building.**
- **Reinterpret the historic to be contextual.**
- **Reconsider the north and south elevation.**
- **That the top floor be a 'soft' story or an attic story.**
- **A majority of the board members indicated that the concept's general massing and height were a reasonable compromise in light of the preservation commitment. Two members disagreed.**

D.		Staff Issued Certificates of Approval	
	9:52 – 10:02		items approved
	1.	51 East 13th Avenue	roof
	2.	1556 North High Street	wall sign (Gateway Management)
	3.	1556 North High Street	temporary graphics and exhibits (Gateway March Madness)
	4.	1793-1795 North 4th Street	windows
	5.	1483 North 4th Street	roof, siding & windows
	6.	1995 Waldeck Avenue	roof & windows
	motion by	Mr. Horne / Mr. Petruziello	
	motion	To approve the proposed	
	vote	5-0 to Approve	

E.		Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval	
			approved : items approved
			COA issued
	1.	1817 North High Street (Huntington Bank)	11/19/2015: signs, awning 02/17/2016
	2.	1466 -1516 North High Street (University Residences South)	01/21/2016: building and site 02/25/2016
	3.	1556 North High Street (Gateway Elevator)	02/18/2016: window graphics 02/23/2016

G.		Next Meeting	
	1.	Thursday April 21, 2016 6:30pm 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100)	