

University Area Review Board

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

MEETING SUMMARY

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| date | May 19, 2016 |
| place | Northwood & High Building 2231 North High Street, Room 100 |
| time | 6:30pm – 9:03 pm |
| members present | Ted Goodman, Pasquale Grado, Frank Petruziello, Brian Horne, Stephen Papineau |
| members absent | Richard Talbott, Doreen Uhas-Sauer |

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

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| B. | Applications for Certificate of Approval |
| 1. | 15 East Lane Avenue 2106-2124 North High Street The Wilson (Mixed Use Redevelopment) |
| applicant: | Karrick Sherrill (Schremshock Architects) |
| to be reviewed: | building and site review |
| | 6:30 – 6:55 |

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Ferdelman enquired when the case would be heard by City Council.
- Mr. Sherrill replied that the project would go before City Council on June 6th.
- Mr. Grado questioned the corner of Lane and High, the side elements could be lowered.
- Mr. Horne commented that the design seemed to be at the same level of development as last month and it would be beneficial to see the details advanced and expressed in the elevations.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the transition to Pearl should be a little smoother; the faux windows on the south elevation are not necessary.
- Mr. Goodman remarked that the details need to substantiate the design concept; if in doubt of profile make it more not less – an 8” setback may be better at 12”; stated that he liked how the elements stacked on each other on the west and north elevations.
- Mr. Sherrill commented that the layers were studied.
- Mr. Goodman requested a little more value differentiation between materials.
- Mr. Motil (UD Neighbor) questioned that use of the cornice on the third floor.
- Ms. Supelak (UD Neighbor) asked for reassurance that a digital display at the corner would not reappear in place of the clock.

| | |
|--------|--|
| motion | To consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide good comprehensive drawings of the Plans, Section, Details and Elevations• That the south windows are not a necessary evil. |
|--------|--|

C. **1. Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review**
2247-2289 North High Street **Mixed Use**
applicant: Bhakti Bania (BBCO Architects)
to be reviewed: conceptual | redevelopment
6:55 – 8:28

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Ms. Bania reviewed the modifications to the proposal and the simplification of the elevations.
- Mr. Roger Deal (UD Resident) expressed concern over the removal of the Sycamore trees that are important to the canopy over High Street.
- Ms. Sarah Nocar (UD Resident) voiced concern regarding the leasing rate within the UD based on a recent news article; where are the tenants going to come from; the proposal is taller than the UDP recommends, the rents will be too high for this locale; and the automated parking solution will not work for this project.
- Mr. Evan Davis (UD Resident) commented that the Developers are repurposing the neighborhood without the consent of the residents; the project will necessitate rising rents throughout the local neighborhood; if Developers wait it out they will always get their way.
- Ms. Deb Supelak (UD Resident) refreshed the Board regarding the UARB By-Laws; the current proposal is still 2 times the allowable FAR and at least a story taller than the UDP recommends; the UARB may think this is an appropriate trade off but the neighbors gathered at the meeting do not agree with that assessment.
- Mr. Motil (UD Resident) commented that the architecture is incompatible and does not enhance the neighborhood.
- Mr. Bob Singleton (UD Resident) expressed concern regarding the removal of the red farm house.
- Mr. Grado voiced concern that the Architects did not include any sections in the drawing set; he replied to the concern regarding height and density stating that existing code would allow for said development and the UDP is not a statute, but is a guiding document for future code development; that being said the current proposal is too dense and the unit mix is critical – possibly too many 4 and 5 bedroom units; address other populations important to the city; the required Variances will need to be clarified and recommended by the UAC prior to UARB.
- Ms. Bania commented that the majority of the units the 2 bedroom units.
- Mr. Maniace stated that they are working with BZS to get a clarification on CC 3372.604 – where the principal building must be within 0-10 of the property line; may need variance to allow residential uses on the ground floor in a C-4 district.
- Mr. Horne expressed concern regarding the lack of sections for review; the northwest corner of the building is dead due to the blank undifferentiated elevation.
- The Board and Applicant reviewed some material selections.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the Southeast corner works well; the east elevation works better than the west elevation; the blank wall at the northwest corner is problematic.
- Mr. Goodman remarked that the top ‘soft story’ does not look soft – a lighter color may work; the lower patio/entry space should be well lit.
- Mr. Petruziello enquired about the tool to require preservation of the 6 buildings along High Street.
- Mr. Maniace commented that they are reviewing ways to achieve the affect.
- Mr. Horne expressed concern over the Oakland frontage.
- Mr. Grado expressed concern regarding the demand for student housing in the UD due to the Sophomore Rule and units already being built.
- Mr. Ferdelman reviewed the process to attain Variances prior to COA issuance.

motion

Tabled

To consider:

- **Provide building sections for review.**
- **Reduce the density and height of the building.**
- **Design a product that will allow varying populations, not necessarily students.**
- **Review the articulation of the northwest corner.**
- **Review the ‘soft story’ at the top floor.**
- **Provide sufficient lighting at lower entry area.**
- **Legal tool to preserve buildings along High Street.**
- **Review window sizing.**

2. **East 10th Avenue (APN:010-269255) Multi-Family**
 applicant: Wayne Garland (Owner)
 to be reviewed: conceptual | building and site review
8:28 – 8:50

- Mr. Ferdelman gave a report on the proposal.
- Mr. Garland reviewed the perimeters of the proposal
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the project is an interesting setting.
- Mr. Horne stated that the project should be modern and high tech.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested looking into Dutch Modern architecture.
- Mr. Papineau stated that the concept is an appropriate
- Mr. Garland expressed concern that a Modern
- Ms. Laura Bidwa (UD Resident) commented that the project should not be banal it should be sculptural.

motion **Tabled**
To consider:

- **Clean modern design.**

D.
8:50 – 9:03

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | Staff Issued Certificates of Approval | items approved |
| 1. | 2-18 Clark Place | resurface awnings |
| 2. | 1452 Indianola Avenue | building renovation – like-for-like |
| 3. | 1956-1962 Iuka Avenue | building renovation – like-for-like |
| 4. | 2300-2302 North High Street | HVAC condenser |
| 5. | 61 West 10th Street | roof |

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

motion **To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.**

vote **5-0 to Approve**

E.

| | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval | approved : items approved | COA issued |
| 1. | 165 East 15th Avenue (Beta Theta Pi - Site Compliance) | 02/19/2015: site and building | 04/27/2016 |
| 2. | 67 East 15th Avenue (DTD_Site Compliance) | 01/21/2016: site and addition | 05/03/2016 |
| 3. | 1525 North High Street (Taco Bell) | 01/21/2016: site and building | 04/21/2016 |

motion by **Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Horne**

motion **To approve the Staff Issued COA's as submitted.**

vote **5-0 to Approve**

G.

1. **Next Meeting**
Thursday June 16, 2016 | 6:30pm | 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100)