MEETING SUMMARY

February 16, 2017
Northwood & High Building
2231 North High Street, Room 100
6:30pm – 8:25pm

Ted Goodman, Frank Petruziello, Stephen Papineau, Pasquale Grado, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Brian Horne
Abby Kravitz

A. Business of the Board

1. Approval of Meeting Summary from January 2017

   motion by Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Grado
   motion To approve as submitted
   vote 6-0 to Approve

B. Applications for Certificate of Approval

1. 1552 North High Street

   Gateway Kiosk

   applicant: Erin Prosser (Campus Partners) Aaron Conroy (Orange Barrel Media)
   signage

   • Ms. Prosser reviewed the proposal; Mr. Conway reviewed the details of the sign design.
   • Mr. Petruziello stated that technical drawings are still needed.
   • Mr. Grado stated that the screens where too large.
   • Mr. Petruziello stated that the screens should be 16x9 not the 4x3 screens as shown.
   • Mr. Grado stated that the screens should be oriented vertically.

   motion Tabled
   To consider:
   1. That the screens should be 16x9 and oriented vertically.
   2. That the LED output should be monitored and not overly bright.
   3. That detailed and engineered drawings be provided for review.

2. 1567 North High Street

   First Watch

   applicant: Amanda Williams (AGI), Dave Nichols (First Watch)
   storefront, signage, graphics

   • Ms. Williams reviewed the modifications in the proposal.
   • Mr. Grado commented that the changes were appropriate.

   motion by motion
   Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Horne
To approve as submitted

6-0 to Approve

3. 1980 North High Street  PNC Bank
applicant:       Tracey Diehl, Pete Hatcher (Expedite The Diehl)
signage

to be reviewed:
6:52 – 7:05

- Mr. Hatcher reviewed the proposed signage.
- Mr. Grado stated that the brick behind the sign needs to be rectified before any sign is approved.
- Mr. Petruziello enquired whether the storefront would be modified and would require the review of an ATM location.
- Mr. Goodman and Mr. Petruziello concurred that the wall needs to be improved.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the signs themselves seem appropriate but the conditions of the building need to be addressed; several Board members concurred.
- Mr. Grado expressed the concern that all the work on this building has been piecemeal; the building needs a comprehensive approach to the coordination of signage and improvements.

Tabled

motion
To consider:
1. That no signs will be approved on the building until the sign band is improved.

4. 1444 North High Street  Multi-Family Residence
applicant:       Todd Latham, Bill Woods (Hometeam Properties)
exterior modification, signage

to be reviewed:
7:05 – 7:30

- Mr. Latham reviewed the proposed design.
- Mr. Grado commented that the sign over the canopy is inappropriate.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the use of signage to advertise the business versus the property itself. Several Board members expressed concern regarding naming the building for the business (Hometeam Properties)
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the grand gesture may be appropriate but the details need to be worked out; the space will be quite dark due to the opaque roof.
- Mr. Grado stated that the roof should be translucent.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that she was not opposed to the concept; other safety concerns should be addressed including the parking.
- Mr. Horne stated that the concept seemed fine, but the canopy should set off the existing roofs; the roof should be set back from the existing building so that they read as the main masses.
- Mr. Latham commented that the proposal includes a patio that comes off the front of the building ten feet.
- Mr. Papineau and Mr. Goodman concurred that the concept is fine but should be refined.
- Mr. Goodman added that the landscape should be integrated with the design; the roof should be translucent to not create a cave like space.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the use of signage to advertise the business versus the property itself.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the improvements to the building and site should act as the signifier of the quality of the company.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned whether the building could extend to High Street with a retail space.
• Mr. Latham stated if it could be leased.
• Mr. Ferdelman remarked that the sign should be reviewed by the Zoning Office for compliance to the Code.
• Ms. Laura Bidwa (UD Neighbor) concurred with the Board regarding the loss of the tree; raised concerns regarding a proposed retaining wall along the High Street frontage; the buildings have their own integrity and should be enhanced not negated; the sign does not enhance the building or site.
• Mr. Latham stated that raising the grade was an attempt to have some level landscaped area for the benefit of the tenants.
• Mr. Petruziello stated that the cord of the arch needs to be flattened or a shed.

Tabled
To consider:
1. That canopy should be translucent; that it should extend over the existing roofs; that the roof cord should be flattened or a shed roof.
2. That the lanterns should be more modern/industrial.
3. The sign should advertise the property not the company.
4. That the landscaping should be integrated with the site and building; retaining wall was not seen as favorable.

5. 1812 North High Street Fraternity Managers Association
applicant: David Keyser (dkb Architects), Kyle Albert (Campus Partners)
to be reviewed:
7:30 – 7:50 exterior modification, signage

• Ms. Keyser reviewed the program of the renovation.
• Mr. Alberts commented that the space will be occupied for two years prior to demolition.
• Mr. Grado commented that the changes were appropriate.
• Mr. Petruziello stated that the storefronts can vary as long as the other elements are consistent in material and color.
• The Board and Applicant discussed the condition and possible condition of the existing storefront, piers and friezes.

motion by Mr. Papineau / Ms. Uhas-Sauer
motion To approve as submitted on condition of providing final drawings to staff for approval.
vote 6-0 to Approve

5. 2595 North High Street Old North Arcade
applicant: Benjamin Morgan (Owner)
to be reviewed:
7:50 – 8:15 exterior modification

• Mr. Morgan reviewed the proposed overhead door.
• Mr. Grado asked for clarification regarding the business.
• Mr. Morgan explained the business expansion from bar to repair and sales of video games; he stated that permits were attained to expand and liquor license is for all three storefronts.
• Mr. Grado commented that the expansion should have been filed as a Change of Use; the area that may be retail; during the day is being used as part of the bar in the evening, especially the fenced off “patio” between the buildings.
Mr. Morgan replied that there was no Change of Use.
Mr. Grado and Ms. Uhas-Sauer replied that the fact that patrons can walk between one business and the other with their beers is an expansion of the bar use.
Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that several noise complaints have come from the bar at night.
Mr. Grado commented that he was opposed to the installation of a larger opening at this location.
Mr. Morgan stated that a permit for 2593 and 2595 North High Street was obtained March/April of 2016.
Mr. Ferdelman stated that a Building Permit was issued, but he could not speak to whether that project had been routed to Zoning and received Zoning Clearance.
Mr. Uhas-Sauer replied that regardless if the expansion was permitted as retail, at night those spaces are being used as part of the bar; the bar was generated numerous (10-12) complaints; the number of complaints may warrant action to label the business a nuisance.
Mr. Morgan has stated that he has corresponded with one complainant and has seemed to resolve her issues.
Mr. Goodman clarified that staff cannot determine the zoning status, but a proposed door opening is the topic for consideration.
Mr. Grado commented that the fenced in area did not get approval; the fenced in area and patio require Zoning Approval regardless of the interior expansion.
Mr. Petruziello commented that the submitted material was insufficient to approve concerning the design and implementation; it is not a complete application.
Mr. Ferdelman stated that the Zoning question is the biggest hurdle for this application; the UARB is not a zoning authority, but Zoning Clearance must be attainable to allow the project to proceed; the patio will most likely require additional parking variances even if the interior work was approved by Building and Zoning.
The Board and Applicant discussed the difference between Building, Zoning and the Mercantile designation.

Tabled
To consider:
1. Clarification that the expansion of the bar use is indeed legal and permitted.
2. That the patio be removed until reviewed and approved for Zoning Clearance.
3. That additional detailed drawings and specifications be provided regarding the door.

Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review

1. 257 East 11th Avenue Residence
Applicant: Derrick Haber (Owner)
conceptual review | building and site

Mr. Haber reviewed the proposed single-family residential development; he reviewed a previous design done elsewhere in Weinland Park
Mr. Petruziello commented that the previous building design would not have gotten approval by this Board.
Mr. Haber showed several photos of the as-built house in Weinland Park.
Mr. Petruziello commented that the building in the photos is better than the drawings presented; document that building and you may get approval.
Mr. Ferdelman commented that the proposal would require a Zoning Variance to allow residential use on the ground floor for a commercially zoned parcel.

Tabled
To consider:
1. Document the building that was previously built; plans, elevations, sections and site plan.
2. No shutters.

D. Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 40 McMillen Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 41 McMillen Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 45 McMillen Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 51 McMillen Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 57 McMillen Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 61 McMillen Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 71 West 8th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 72 King Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 78 - 86 East Norwich Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 81 - 83 East Norwich Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 90 King Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 105 West 8th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 113 West 8th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 125 East Norwich Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 145-147 West 9th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 173-177 East 11th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 186 Chittenden Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 191 Chittenden Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 196 West 8th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 202 West 8th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 204 Chittenden Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 206-208 West 8th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 230-232 Chittenden Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 252 West 8th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 286 - 288 East 13th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 311 – 315 East 17th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 319 East 17th Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 1432 - 1434 Hunter Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 1490 Indianola Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 1492 Indianola Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 1515-1517 Worthington Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 1528 - 1530 Summit Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 1603 Summit Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 1621 North 4th Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 1638 North 4th Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. 1644 North High Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. 1739 - 1741 North 4th Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 1871 North 4th Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. 1956 Summit Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. 2105 Indiana Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. 2133 Indiana Avenue property management sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. 2337 - 2339 North High Street property management sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion by Mr. Papineau/Ms. Uhas-Sauer

Motion

To approve as submitted

Vote: 6-0 to Approve
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed Address</th>
<th>Date of Proposal</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1497 North 4th Street (Residence)</td>
<td>1/21/2016: building and site</td>
<td>1/23/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1636 North High Street (Trism)</td>
<td>10/20/2016: storefront, patio and signs</td>
<td>2/7/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2247-2289 North High Street (View at Pavey Square - Permit)</td>
<td>10/20/2016: building and site</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1497 Perry Street (Carriage House)</td>
<td>8/1/2016: carriage house</td>
<td>1/23/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Next Meeting

1. Thursday March 16, 2017 | 6:30pm | 2231 North High Street (Northwood & High Building, Room 100)