

UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-6096 F (614) 645-6675

MEETING SUMMARY

date August 23, 2018

place Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room
111 North Front Street, Room 204

time 4:00pm

present Stephen Papineau, Pasquale Grado, Keoni Fleming, Frank Petruziello, Kay Bea Jones

absent Doreen Uhas-Sauer

A. 4:00 – 4:08

Business of the Board

1. Introduce and Induct Kerry Reeds

- Mr. Ferdelman introduced then inducted Mr. Reeds.

2. Approval of Meeting Summary from July 2018

motion by: Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Jones

motion: To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.

vote: 6 - 0 to Approve

B.

Applications for Certificate of Approval

1. 17 East Lane Avenue

Core Life

app no.: UID_18-08-001

applicant: Jill Waddell, Robert Schorr Jr. (DaNite Sign Co.)

reviewed: signage

4:08 – 4:18

staff report:

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended that the signs be reduced by 20% to 25%.

discussion:

- Mr. Fleming noted that the proposed sign obscures the transom windows behind.
- Mr. Grado commented that the letters and graphics are too big.
- Mr. Fleming replied that he could support the letter sizes but not coving the architectural components of the building.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested that the channel letters should fit within the band and not cover the transoms or storefront below; and required remote ballast; the EATERY logo will be problematic.

motion:

Tabled

To consider:

1. That the sign not cover the transom windows beyond.
2. That the sign fit on the existing sign band and be sized accordingly.

2.

18 East 11th Avenue

Elia Athenian Grill

app no.: UID_18-08-002

applicant: Robert Schorr Sr. (S&S Signs), Ilias Zervas (Elia Athenian Grill)

reviewed: signage

4:18 – 4:35

staff report:

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff commented that the proposed signs and graphics are consistent with the Guidelines.

discussion:

- Mr. Schorr stated that client wants to paint and repair the canopy and install the new signs.
- Mr. Grado commented that the graphics on the doors should be aligned and the same size.
- Ms. Jones commented that the graphics are too crowded on the right side.

motion by: Ms. Jones / Mr. Petruziello

motion: To approve the proposed signage on the condition:

1. That the existing canopy be painted black.
2. That the applicant reconsider the composition of the sign cabinets on the canopy to balance the entire storefront appearance.

vote: 6 - 0 to Approve.

- Mr. Petruziello suggested stacking the Athenian Grill over the Elia.
- Mr. Reeds suggested placing the logo at the pilaster.
- Mr. Zervas commented that the sign is to the right due to a tree in front of building.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the details of the signs.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the sign drawings presented to this Board should be the fabrication drawings.
- Mr. Grado commented that the logo is good but the letters should be a little smaller.

3. **app no.:** 1624 North High Street **City Gear**
app no.: UID_18-08-003
applicant: Darren Grey, Kody King (Sign Vision Co., Inc.)
reviewed: signage
4:35 – 4:45

staff report:

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended approval as submitted.
- Mr. Grado questioned the use of red on the canopy.
- Mr. Petruziello requested the graphic on the awning be the width of the doors below, or 6' maximum.
- Mr. Grado concurred on the awning graphic.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested making the projecting sign thinner.
-

discussion:

motion by: Mr. Fleming / Mr. Grado

motion: To approve the proposed signage and graphics on the condition:

1. That the width of the graphic on the awning be the width of the door opening below, or 6'-0" maximum.
2. That the projecting sign be constructed of coped aluminum sign faces, therefore the only illuminated portion of the sign will be the works City and G.E.A.R

vote: 6 - 0 to Approve.

4. **app no.:** 99 East 11th Avenue (10th Avenue Building) **Multi-Family Residential**
app no.: UID-18-02-006
applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (dkb Architects), Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate)
reviewed: new multi-family
4:45 – 4:52

staff report:

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended approval with consideration of pervious pavement or pavers for a portion of the parking area and provide a detailed landscape plan.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the plans and program.
- Mr. Petruziello requested information on the thickness of the materials; questioned the material at the corner of the insets.
- Mr. Blumensheid replied wood but changed to cement board at the suggestion of the Board.

discussion:

motion by: • Mr. Petruziello suggested making the projecting sign thinner.
• Mr. Reeds suggested a consistent curb along the perimeter of the parking.
Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Jones

motion: To approve the building and site on the condition:
1. That the vertical trim at insets be cement board to match adjacent surfaces.

vote: 6 - 0 to Approve.

5. **124 West 8th Avenue** **Multi-Family Residential**
app no.: UID_18-07-005
applicant: Bradley Blumensheid (dkb Architects), Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate)
reviewed: addition
4:52 – 4:57

staff report: • Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended approval as submitted.

discussion: • Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the plans and program; commented that the residential code does not allow windows within 5' of the property line without rating the windows.
• Ms. Jones enquired about the egress windows in the basement.

motion by: Ms. Jones / Mr. Fleming

motion: To approve the proposed building and site as submitted.

vote: 6 - 0 to Approve.

C.

1. **Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review**
1444 North High Street **Mixed Use Addition**
app no.: UID_18-02-010
applicant: David Keyser (dkb Architects), Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate)
reviewed: Conceptual –mixed use addition
4:58 - 5:28

staff report: • Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions; staff recommended continued refinement of the building façade; for COA, permit level drawings and details.

discussion: • Mr. Keyser reviewed the program and building design; enhanced the pedestrian connection to the courtyard, width is 12'; canopy to tie sides together.
• Mr. Fleming commented that the 'courtyard' is more like a light well.
• Mr. Keyser remarked that the space is not as bad as described.
• Mr. Fleming replied that capping off the end of the 'courtyard' makes the space worse.
• Mr. Keyser commented that the connection between the old and new is set back to let some light in, the floor plan in the presentation is from a previous scheme.
• Mr. Fleming replied that the move helps, but more transparency will be beneficial.
• Ms. Jones commented that containing the space at the courtyard is a good move; the widened and splayed entries help along High Street; the building section should help clarify the action on the courtyard.
• Mr. Petruziello commented that the face to the courtyard should read more like an entry, rather than the back of a building.
• Ms. Jones remarked that it is a palazzo cortile; the façade is funky but maybe a little too fussy; the railing on the roof is superfluous
• Mr. Petruziello stated that the building has too many material sequence issues and possibly too many materials.

- Mr. Jones commented that she likes the layering of materials and the use of shadow.
- Mr. Fleming observed that the composition of the rear façade is more successful.
- Mr. Reeds questioned that the need for canopy, it creates more dark space.
- Mr. Fleming replied that the canopy is not necessarily beneficial.
- Ms. Jones stated that the canopy seems to work.

Tabled

To consider:

motion:

1. Remove the railing at the roof.
2. Add some transparency to the connection between old and new.
3. Reduce the number of materials and resolve how they read on the High Street façade.
4. Review the need for the canopy.

2.

app no.:

applicant:

reviewed:

5:28 – 6:15

staff report:

2180 North High Street

Mixed Use Redevelopment

UID_18-08-004

Christopher Johnson (CA Student Living), Bhakti Bania, Bharate Baste, Zac Romer (BBCO)

Conceptual –mixed use redevelopment

discussion:

- Mr. Ferdelman presented slides of the site location and existing site conditions. The proposal as submitted was largely consistent with the plan except for the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of existing Contributing Buildings; the proposal involves the demolition of 5 Contributing Buildings to be replaced by a 6 story mixed use building with 151 du/192 beds, 5,000sf of retail space and a garage with 152 spaces. The applicants intend to ask for no zoning variances to redevelop these properties. The travel aisle of Pearl Alley at Lane and Pearl is 16' wide, the ingress and egress in this area is already problematic due to the CVS connection and the parking arrangement for 30 East Lane Avenue.
- Ms. Bania reviewed the program and form based on allowances within the UDZO Code.
- Mr. Johnson commented that the traffic and parking is under review by an engineering firm and through The Public Service Department.
- Mr. Fleming questioned how many parking spaces were provided.
- Ms. Bania stated that 152 spaces are provided; 177 spaces for the residential and the remaining for the commercial tenants.
- Ms. Marlene Robins a UD home owner and resident commented that the proposed development will upset the balance of Old North; the proposal is out of character with all that surrounds it; the existing units are occupied by students and other of modest means unlike the newer developments; expressed concern that other residents could not be present at meeting due to time and location.
- Mr. Ferdelman mentioned that 4 letters were received and the sentiment of the letters included talk of affordability, scale of the proposed development, possible materials of the proposed development, preservation of the buildings and character of the immediate neighborhood, and the overburdening of Pearl Alley.
- M. Petruziello enquired about the allowed heights adjacent and across the street; Mr. Ferdelman replied that the properties to the North are in NC district with 45' height limit; the properties to the West are RC with 72' and across at Norwich is NC with 45' height allowance.
- Mr. Grado stated that the density is problematic; Norwich is the densest census tract in the entire city; how does this proposal honor the surroundings.
- Mr. Ferdelman reviewed the Plan and Code provisions to allow 72' buildings.
- Ms. Jones commented that the policies establish that it can be done, now is the question should it be done?
- Mr. Petruziello asked what can the Board affect and not affect.
- Mr. Ferdelman replied that the Board should use the Plan and Guidelines within to form a basis for review; the Plan has guidelines that speak to preservation and compatibility of buildings in their context.
- Mr. Fleming reinforced the concept that the Board is to review projects based on bulk, height, density and architectural integrity for the particular neighborhood and site conditions.

- Mr. Petruziello questioned the applicants how they would address the necessity to conform to the scale of the existing neighborhood buildings; this property is at the edge of two significantly different height zones, high to low.
- Ms. Bania replied that they would treat each façade differently; differentiating the material from one portion of the building to the other will help diminish the scale.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that he was more interested in how the volume will be affected.
- Mr. Grado commended the Mr. Baste and Ms. Bania on their record of working with the Board toward improved projects; Pavey and the King Avenue Apartments; maybe save portions of the buildings on High Street.
- Mr. Johnson stated that the buildings were studied; preserving the mediocre facades is not something they would like to invest their time or energy toward; the storefronts are T-111 with a lot of rot.
- Mr. Grado replied that the storefronts could be improved in the process.
- Mr. Papineau commented that the older buildings with the new might not be the look we should be support at this location.
- Ms. Jones concurred; the Pavey solution preserved the High Street experience; in this situation saving the muddled facades does not add as much; this complex does have a series of public spaces right off High Street with walk up entries that may form an idea for an appropriate solution.
- Mr. Fleming remarked that driving this project is the need to double the amount of beds to make the investment work.
- Mr. Johnson replied that assumption is correct; construction cost and bed count is important; the preservation of any building will not work in the pro-forma.
- Ms. Jones remarked that the prosed amenity courtyard space in the proposed is entirely different than the semi-public space of the existing building typology; the impact of the North portion of the building should be assessed.
- Mr. Petruziello remarked that the height and mass of the North portion will affect the adjacent structure except at noon and early afternoon; more concerned about height, light, and mass than the semi-public courtyard; the building should not just be an extrusion that meets the need for maximum number of beds.
- Mr. Fleming remarked that he is usually not opposed to maxing out height along High Street, but in this case he questions the need; the 72' height district should not have extended this far North; if this project where on the CVS site this would not be an issue; massing should more appropriately address the context; review Hubbard Park Place.
- Mr. Reeds suggested a horizontal semi-public green rather than a perpendicular green.
- Ms. Bania enquired whether the Board had comments on materiality.
- Ms. Jones stated that no restrictions should be placed on materials, but a great design is necessary.
- Mr. Petruziello expressed gratitude for bringing conceptual drawings to a conceptual review rather than a fully baked building.
- Ms. Jones observed that the project is being followed by many in the neighborhood, but are unable to make it to the meeting due to the time of day and location.

motion

Tabled

To Consider:

1. Review possibility of selective preservation.
2. Reduce the height and bulk of the building especially on the North portion of the site.
3. Explore the courtyard typology, semi-public space off high that leads to units.
4. Explore possibility of parallel versus perpendicular courtyard.

D. 6:15 – 6:20 Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

		items approved
1.	UID_18-08-005 219 East 17th Avenue	roof
2.	UID_18-07-016 438-440 King Avenue	roof
3.	UID_18-07-015 1589 North High Street	sign reface - AT&T
4.	UID_18-07-014 1566 North High Street	signs for rebranding - District Pourhouse
5.	UID_18-07-013 53 East 12th Avenue	stairs
6.	UID_18-07-012 68 East 11th Avenue	door & windows
7.	UID_18-07-011 212 East 15th Avenue	roof
8.	UID_18-07-010 1646 North 4th Street	deck
9.	UID_18-07-009 2321 North High Street	roof
10.	UID_18-07-004 172-174 East 13th Avenue	windows
11.	UID_18-01-009 80-82 Euclid Avenue	parking
12.	UID_18-08-006 257 East 11 th Avenue	parking
motion by:	Ms. Jones / Mr. Fleming	
motion:	To approve as submitted.	
vote:	6 - 0 to Approve.	

E. Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	UID_18-07-007 RECOMMENDATION 52 East 14th Avenue (BZA18-083)	7/26/2018: temp cell antenna	8/13/2018
2.	UID_18-06-006 1614 North High Street (A&F)	6/28/2018: signs, canopy	7/18/2018
3.	UID_18-06-005 193-195 Chittenden Avenue (Two Bucks)	6/28/2018: signs	7/26/2018
4.	UID_18-05-008 165 East 13th Avenue (Multi-Family)	6/28/2018: addition	8/17/2018
5.	UID_18-05-007 2247 North High Street (VOPS)	5/17/2018: electrical transformer	8/13/2018
6.	UID_18-05-003 2084 North High Street (Donatos)	6/28/2018: paint, signs, graphics	7/18/2018
7.	UID_18-04-015 1892-1928 North High Street (The Wellington)	4/19/2018: signs	7/18/2018
8.	UID_18-01-001 84 East 15th Avenue (ZTA_Permit)	3/15/2018: building & site	8/15/2018
9.	UID_17-11-001 470-472 King Avenue (Stairs)	11/16/2017: porch & stairs	7/26/2018
10.	UID_17-04-001 1444 North High Street (Parking_Rev)	4/20/2017: parking & landscaping	8/1/2018

F. 1. | **Next Meeting**
September 27, 2018 | 111 North Front Street, Room 204 | 4:00pm

G. **6:15 – 6:30** | **Board Comments**

Sidewalks

1.
 - Ms. Jones expressed concern regarding ads placed on the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Ferdelman advised to call the City of Columbus 311 system and specifically address the concern to the Public Service Department.

Code Enforcement Complaint | Target

2.
 - Ms. Jones remarked about the windows at the new Target Store; ads cover the entire windows.
 - Mr. Grado concurred; the graphics are attached to blinds about 6" away from the glass; the code requires any graphics to be placed 4' beyond the glass.
 - Mr. Petruziello commented that the Board worked with the Target on this issue throughout the review.

motion by: Mr. Grado / Ms. Jones

motion: To submit a letter to Code Enforcement, The Edwards Company and Target regarding the illegal graphics.

vote: 6 - 0 to Approve.

Meeting Time and Location

3.
 - Mr. Fleming remarked about public input and the timing of the meeting.
 - Mr. Papineau replied that the members of the Board are present; the concerned public can come to this open meeting.
 - Mr. Fleming commented that the people in the neighborhood may not have the ability to make mid-day meetings due to work and family obligations.
 - Mr. Papineau replied that they can send letters to staff that can be entered into the record.
 - Mr. Ferdelman stated that he will read letters during the public comments portion of each case.
 - Ms. Jones stated that the Planning Division should reassess the time and location of the meeting.
 - Mr. Ferdelman questioned whether it is time and location or just the time; parking is free here at the Coleman Building.
 - Ms. Jones stated that the Board should get input from the many U groups as to the best way for input.