

University Impact District Review Board

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

MEETING SUMMARY

date **October 19, 2017**
place **Northwood & High Building**
2231 North High Street, Room 100
time **6:30pm**

members present **Ted Goodman, Keoni Fleming, Frank Petruziello, Pasquale Grado, Doreen Uhas-Sauer**
members absent **Abby Kravitz, Stephen Papineau**

A.

1.

Business of the Board
Approval of Meeting Summary from September 2017

6:30– 6:32

- **Mr. Ferdelman commented that the proper Meeting Summary was posted to the web but the printed version was incorrect**

motion

Tabled

B.

1.

applicant:
to be reviewed:
6:30 – 6:40

Applications for Certificate of Approval
1506 North High Street **Knobu**
Oliver Holtsberry | DāNite Sign Co.
signage, awning

- **Mr. Holtsberry reviewed the proposed sign. Wall sign to have letters that are 20" in height. The projecting sign similar in size and dimensions as Popeye's sign.**
- **Mr. Grado remarked that the awning type and style should be consistent along the entire façade on this building.**
- **Mr. Fleming concurred that the shape of the awnings need to be consistent; the panel material could be different but changeable in the future.**
- **Mr. Goodman requested that the blade sign have the narrowest depth possible.**

motion by

Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Grado

To approve the signs as submitted on the condition:

motion

- 1. That the top of the sign align with the bed course of the stone.**
- 2. That the blade sign be the same size and placement as the blade to the North (Popeye's).**
- 3. That the awnings will be reviewed at a future Review Board meeting.**

vote

5-0 to Approve

2.

applicant:
to be reviewed:
6:40 – 7:05

1466 -1516 North High Street **Highline at Nine**
Stephen M. Caplinger (Creative Design + Planning), Ryan Szymanski (Edwards Communities)
façade

- **Mr. Ferdelman reviewed the inconsistencies between approved drawings and as-built.**
 - a. The cast stone portions of the façade were clad with running bond stone rather than rusticated piers and vertical stone pieces between the piers.**
 - b. The upper cornice was set lower on the façade than as designed and parts of the cornice seem open to the weather.**
 - c. The Southernmost portion of the façade has a brick bridge above the storefront windows that was not part of the approved drawings.**

- **Mr. Caplinger commented that the 'bridge' would be covered with the stone crown molding; the post tension slab occupies the area in question.**
- **Mr. Fleming stated that the concrete could be cut back except if the tensioning rods were in the area to be cut.**
- **Mr. Ferdelman commented that the purpose of the review and remediation is that plans approved by the Board are expected to be built as reviewed and approved unless modifications are made known to the Board and approved by them.**
- **Mr. Caplinger stated that as the Wellington progresses issues or concerns will be made known to the Review Board.**
- **Mr. Petruziello remarked the entire parapet is lower than was in the approved drawings.**
- **The Board and Applicant discussed the difference in the cornice/parapet.**
- **Mr. Goodman expressed the concern that the execution of the design was inconsistent; the Board expects a higher level of care especially on High Street; speaking for the Board we expect substantial adherence to the approved drawings.**
- **Mr. Petruziello commented that stone should return in the insets; the running bond versus rusticated stone seems less important than removing the sigma of the thin veneer applique on these storefront bays.**
- **Mr. Grado commented that the brick and stone should return along the entire High Street façade.**
- **Mr. Goodman remarked the Applicants should respond to the comments with proposed design solutions.**
- **Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the solution should be compliance to the Board approved design.**
- **Mr. Grado concurred that the proposed remedies should be aimed at compliance with the original design intent.**
- **Mr. Fleming commented that some work will be required on this building; the building as-built calls into question the entire design review process.**
- **Mr. Ferdelman stated that the ground level at minimum should be addressed.**
- **Mr. Petruziello stated that drawings and details must be reviewed by the Board prior to doing any remedial work.**

Tabled

To be considered:

1. **Provide drawings and details on how to bring building into substantial compliance with Board approved design.**
 - a. **Return the brick and stone into insets along High Street façade.**
 - b. **Resolve issues with cornice/parapet; can these elements be raised to meet Board approved design.**
 - c. **Remove 'bridge' at southernmost per Board approved design or provide design alternates.**

motion

3.

applicant:
to be reviewed:
7:05 – 7:35

186 East 16th Avenue

Barry Jardine, Wayne Garland (Buckeye real Estate)

building addition and site

Multi-Family Residence

- **Mr. Jardine reviewed the program and details.**
- **Ms. Uhas-Sauer voiced some concern at losing the expressive window at the rear of the building**
- **Mr. Petruziello commented that the dormer should be brought out of the roof at 45 degree; the slopes should be similar.**
- **Mr. Goodman commented that the roof will be quite visible from Indianola.**

Audio was lost

- **Mr. Fleming commented that the roof should be simplified.**
- **Mr. Goodman clarified that the roof, back wall and stairs need additional attention and**

motion

details.
Tabled
To be considered:
1. Rectify the dormer roof.
2. Drawings and details on the roof, rear wall and stairs.

4.
applicant:
to be reviewed:
7:35 – 7:55

15 East Lane Avenue
Steve Moore (Moore Signs)
signage

Chipotle

- **Mr. Moore reviewed the sign designs, placement and details.**
- **Mr. Grado expressed concern that the signs are too common; the wall sign need to work within the spandrel – additional information needs to be presented on the actual dimensions of the spandrel.**
- **Mr. Petruziello concurred that the sign should be more specific to the building and locale; be more creative**
- **Mr. Goodman commented that Lane and High is a very prominent corner to put the company's typical signage package may be a disservice.**
- **Ms. Uhas-Sauer suggested some neon.**
- **Mr. Grado suggested that a projecting sign may be appropriate at this location.**

motion

Tabled
To be considered:
1. Signage that is specific to the site and building.
2. Signs that are more creative; not typical chain prototypes.

5.
applicant:
to be reviewed:

470-472 King Avenue
Thom Shapaka (Architect)
exterior modifications

Multi-Family Residence

- **Project was tabled prior to the meeting.**

6.
applicant:
to be reviewed:
7:55 – 8:00

2203 North High Street
Scott Ellsworth (Owner)
storefront

Three's

Audio restored

- **Mr. Ellsworth reviewed the proposed storefront.**
- **Mr. Grado questioned whether the Zoning had been figured out.**
- **Mr. Ellsworth stated that he is working with an architect finish and submit drawings.**

motion by
motion
vote

Mr. Fleming / Mr. Petruziello
To approve the storefront window as submitted.
5-0 to Approve

7.
applicant:
to be reviewed:
8:00 – 8:10

1976 North High Street
Joe Tanoury, Dave Hodge (Underhill Hodge, LLC)
ad mural

Columbus State (Ad Mural)

- Mr. Tanoury reviewed the program for the new graphic.
- Mr. Grado remarked that a new sign seems to be located below the ad mural; the sign was not reviewed by this Board and should be removed.
- Mr. Petruziello added that the extra sign is wired to be lit; the sign is inappropriate and was not approved by this Board.
- Mr. Ferdelman explained his error in labeling the agenda item incorrectly; the ad for review is Columbus State not Piada.

motion by
motion

Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Uhas-Sauer

To approve the Ad Mural as submitted on the condition:

1. That all extraneous signage be removed from the wall.
2. That the graphic be approved for three months from the date of installation.

vote

5-0 to Approve

C.

1.
applicant:
to be reviewed:
8:10 – 8:25

Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review

1525 North High Street
Dave Hodge (Underhill Hodge, LLC)
Conceptual Review - signage

Luxe Belle

- Mr. Goodman commented that the type of font running vertically is problematic.
- Mr. Grado stated that the proposed sign would work better horizontally.
- Mr. Petruziello remarked that the sign does not necessarily need to be legible, but should be aesthetically compatible with the building.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the sign could work vertically but the font is problematic.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the sign should start below the top line of the windows to the North; the sign might need to be scaled down.
- Mr. Fleming noted that the font should be of a more modern nature consistent with the building design.

motion

Tabled

To be considered:

1. Chose a different font if letters remain vertically orientated.
2. The lettering should be tighter, scaled down.

D.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
motion by
motion
vote

Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

items approved

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | 22 East 12th Avenue | Roof |
| 2. | 50-52 Euclid Avenue | Parking |
| 3. | 262 East 12th Avenue | Roof |
| 4. | 314 King Avenue | Deck Skirt |
| 5. | 1444 North High Street | Roof |
| 6. | 1564 Highland Street | Roof |
| 7. | 1783-1785 North 4th Street | Windows |

Mr. Grado / Mr. Fleming
To approve the as submitted.
5-0 to Approve

E. Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	470- 472 King Avenue (Garage)	7/20/2017: garage and site	10/10/2017
2.	1444 North High Street (Parking)	4/25/2017: parking and landscaping	9/25/2017
3.	1976 North High Street (Piada)	9/21/2017: ad mural	9/27/2017

F. Next Meeting

1. **Thursday November 16, 2017 | 6:30pm | 2231 North High Street (Room 100)**