# **University Area Review Board**

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



MEETING SUMMARY

date February 16, 2017

place **Northwood & High Building** 

2231 North High Street, Room 100

time 6:30pm - 8:25pm

members present members absent Ted Goodman, Frank Petruziello, Stephen Papineau, Pasquale Grado, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Brian Horne

**Abby Kravitz** 

A.

1.

6:28 - 6:30 motion by

Ms. Uhas-Sauer / Mr. Grado

**Business of the Board** 

motion

To approve as submitted

vote

6-0 to Approve

В.

1. applicant: to be reviewed: 6:30 - 6:46 **Applications for Certificate of Approval** 

**Approval of Meeting Summary from January 2017** 

1552 North High Street

**Gateway Kiosk** 

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.

**Tabled** 

To consider:

motion

- That the screens should be 16x9 and oriented vertically.
- That the LED output should be monitored and not overly bright. 2.
- That detailed and engineered drawings be provided for review.

2. applicant: 1567 North High Street

First Watch

to be reviewed:

6:46 - 6:52

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

vote

6-0 to Approve

# applicant: to be reviewed: 6:52 – 7:05

# 1980 North High Street

**PNC Bank** 

Tracey Diehl, Pete Hatcher (Expedite The Diehl) signage

- 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. applicant: to be reviewed: 7:05 – 7:30

# 1444 North High Street

**Multi-Family Residence** 

Todd Latham, Bill Woods (Hometeam Properties) exterior modification, signage

- 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.

# applicant: to be

motion

# **1812 North High Street**

**Fraternity Managers Association** 

David Keyser (dkb Architects), Kyle Albert (Campus Partners) exterior modification, signage

reviewed:

7:30 - 7:50

- 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. applicant: to be reviewed: 7:50 – 8:15

# **2595 North High Street** Benjamin Morgan (Owner)

exterior modification

**Old North Arcade** 

- 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 irregardless 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:

motion

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

applicant: to be reviewed: 8:15 - 8:35

C.

257 East 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue Derrick Haber (Owner) conceptual review | building and site

Residence

- 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**

motion

### 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	
1.	40 McMillen Avenue	items approved
1. 2.	41 McMillen Avenue	property management sign
	45 McMillen Avenue	property management sign
3.		property management sign
4.	51 McMillen Avenue	property management sign
5.	57 McMillen Avenue	property management sign
6.	61 McMillen Avenue	property management sign
7.	71 West 8th Avenue	property management sign
8.	72 King Avenue	property management sign
9.	78 - 86 East Norwich Avenue	property management sign
10.	81 - 83 East Norwich Avenue	property management sign
11.	90 King Avenue	property management sign
12.	105 West 8th Avenue	property management sign
13.	113 West 8th Avenue	property management sign
14.	125 East Norwich Avenue	property management sign
15.	145-147 West 9th Avenue	property management sign
16.	173-177 East 11th Avenue	property management sign
17.	186 Chittenden Avenue	property management sign
18.	191 Chittenden Avenue	property management sign
19.	196 West 8th Avenue	property management sign
20.	202 West 8th Avenue	property management sign
21.	204 Chittenden Avenue	property management sign
22.	206-208 West 8th Avenue	property management sign
23.	230- 232 Chittenden Avenue	property management sign
24.	252 West 8th Avenue	property management sign
25.	286 - 288 East13th Avenue	property management sign
26.	311 – 315 East 17th Avenue	property management sign
27.	319 East 17th Avenue	property management sign
28.	1432 - 1434 Hunter Avenue	property management sign
29.	1490 Indianola Avenue	property management sign
30.	1492 Indianola Avenue	property management sign
31.	1515-1517 Worthington Avenue	property management sign
32.	1528 - 1530 Summit Street	property management sign
33.	1603 Summit Street	property management sign
34.	1621 North 4th Street	property management sign
35.	1638 North 4th Street	property management sign
36.	1644 North High Street	property management sign
37.	1739 - 1741 North 4th Street	property management sign
38.	1871 North 4th Street	property management sign
39.	1956 Summit Street	property management sign
40.	2105 Indiana Avenue	property management sign
41.	2133 Indiana Avenue	property management sign
42.	2337 - 2339 North High Street	property management sign
motion by	Mr. Papineau/Ms. Uhas-Sauer	
motion	To approve as submitted	
vote	6-0 to Approve	

University Area Review Board February 16, 2017

		approved: items approved	COA issued
1.	1497 North 4th Street (Residence)	1/21/2016: building and site	1/23/2017
2.	1636 North High Street (Trism	10/20/2016: storefront, patio and signs	2/7/2017
3.	2247-2289 North High Street (View at	10/20/2016: building and site	1/31/2017
	Pavey Square - Permit)	10/20/2010. Dulluling and Site	1/31/201/
4.	1497 Perry Street (Carriage House)	8//2016: carriage house	1/23/2017

# G. Next Meeting

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