

# 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

May 17, 2018

place

Northwood & High Building  
2231 North High Street, Room 100

time

6:30pm -8:55pm

present

Stephen Papineau, Pasquale Grado, Kay Bea Jones, Doreen Uhas-Sauer, Frank Petruziello

absent

Keoni Fleming

A. 6:30 – 6:37

Business of the Board

1.

Approval of Meeting Summary from April 2018

- The Board discussed the expansion of the UID boundaries.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated expansion would be facilitated by the modification of the residential portion of the UDZO; the Planning Division is generally supportive of the expansion into the commercially zoned areas but not the remainder of the residential zones; the citizens of Dennison Place are pursuing a historic district designation.
- Mr. Grado supported the idea of expanding into commercial zones.
- Ms. Jones commented that Lane Avenue should have an Urban Design plan to address its deficiencies.
- Mr. David Hodge (Underhill & Hodge LLC) commented that expansion into commercial zones would be welcome, if UID expands to whole UD then the UAC should secede their review and recommendations on zoning matters.
- Mr. Ferdelman reviewed several items from the April Agenda; discussion of eh time and location change should happen at the end of the agenda.

motion by

Ms. Jones/ Ms. Uhas-Sauer

motion

To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.

vote

5-0 to Approve

8:32 – 8:55

2.

UIDRB Location and Time Change

- Mr. Ferdelman reviewed the proposal to relocate the UIDRB meeting to the 4:00pm on the fourth Wednesday of every month at the Michael B. Coleman Government Building Hearing Room.
- Mr. Grado requested UIDRB review in the entire University District in exchange for relocated and changing the time.
- Mr. Ferdelman replied that he staff's a second Review Board in East Franklinton; the request to expand the UIDRB boundary would triple the number of parcels reviewed by the Board, from 2,000+ parcel to 6,000 – the majority being residential.
- Mr. Papineau enquired whether moving the time and location is a requirement.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that the only Board or Commission staffed by Planning and BZS not holding their meetings in the Hearing Room is the UIDRB.
- Mr. Papineau posited the question about time and day; is Wednesday a requirement?
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that he would have to look at the Hearing Room schedule, but the fourth Wednesday is available and does not run afoul of holidays in November and December; the fourth Thursday requires looking for alternate dates and location for the meeting in November and December.
- Ms. Jones sated that Wednesdays are out for her; Mr. Grado concurred.

- Mr. Petruziello commented that the UARB met on the fourth Thursday for many years; Ms. Uhas-Saur agreed and added that 4pm was not a problem.
- Mr. Grado commented that starting at 4:00pm was problematic for community people with day jobs.
- Mr. Ferdelman replied that the agenda would be modified to place controversial projects at the end of the agenda.
- Mr. Grado commented that the meeting time is still too early.
- Mr. Papineau commented that if the start time moves to 5 or 6 people would need to contend with rush hour traffic.
- Ms. Jones expressed concern about the tone of the correspondence and that the Planning Division did not reach out to community members prior to developing the policy.
- Mr. Ferdelman apologized that he did not think to reach out to the groups mentioned in this matter.
- Mr. Papineau commented that if the start time moves to 5 or 6pm people would need to contend with rush hour traffic.
- Mr. Petruziello asked why the meetings moved to the third Thursday anyway.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that Room 100 was scheduled by another group on the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday at our time.
- Ms. Jones suggested that the Planning Division reach out to the UDO, UAC and the Civic Associations to get their feedback as to the move; can these groups make it downtown at 4pm.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer replied that this can be said of all the other Boards that have already made the move or have always had their meetings downtown.
- Mr. Jerry X, a UD Resident, enquired why the meeting was in this building that is not a City of Columbus building.
- Mr. Petruziello replied that the original UARB met in the Marconi Building, but was demolished; the meetings moved to the Northside Library and then its current location.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the hearing room at the Coleman Government Building is set up with the proper equipment to hold a meeting like the UIDRB without bringing all the equipment like our current arrangement.
- Mr. Jerry X agreed that moving the meeting downtown would not be a burden.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the UIDRB is the outlier for public meetings that conduct City of Columbus business.
- Ms. Jones replied that City Staff could and should have reached out the neighborhood groups.
- Mr. Ferdelman expressed regret that he did think to follow up with the neighborhood groups.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that any effort now would look disingenuous.
- Mr. Ferdelman remarked that he was not certain whether the fourth Thursday in the Hearing Room was available; the third Thursday conflicts with HRC; that is probably why the fourth Wednesday was considered.
- Three Board members confirmed that Wednesdays do not work.
- All Board Members present stated that the fourth Thursday would work.
- Mr. Papineau and Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that 4pm seemed a fine start time as long as items needing input were put later on the agenda.
- Mr. Grado commented that a 4pm start time made for a better commute.
- The Board conducted side conversations regarding dates, times and locations; Thursdays was the consensus for date and 4:00pm was determined to be appropriate; the Board was inconclusive on which Thursday was suitable but preferred the third Thursday.
- Mr. Ferdelman summed up the conversation:
  - The fourth Thursday at 4pm in the Hearing Room at the Coleman Government Building was deemed reasonable.
  - The June meeting will be held the third Thursday at 6:30 in Room 100 at the Northwood and High Building unless new information comes to light.

**B.**

**1.**  
app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
6:37 – 6:55

**Applications for Certificate of Approval**

**1525 North High Street**

**Taco Bell**

**UID\_18-05-001**

Robert Schorr (DaNite Sign Co.), David Hodge (Underhill & Hodge LLC)  
**graphics**

- **Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended approval with some modifications.**
- **Mr. Hodge gave context to the building and proposed signs.**
- **Mr. Schorr reviewed the details of the sign.**
- **Mr. Grado requested that the letters be dimensioned on the sign drawings; the maximum letter size is 12".**
- **Mr. Ferdelman stated that the guidelines recommend that lettering should be between 8" and 16" on a wall sign; not a requirement but a recommendation.**
- **Mr. Petruziello replied that the sign letters can be what the Review Board deems appropriate.**
- **Ms. Jones expressed some confusion regarding the drawings between the rendering and the sign details.**
- **Mr. Grado requested accurate drawings.**
- **Mr. Petruziello stated that the wall sign should show the band on which it is mounted on, with accurate measurements and dimensions, provide a section with the band; the projecting sign should not be surface mounted or the escutcheon should have a cover plate over the mounting bolts.**
- **Ms. Jones expressed concern regarding the kerning of the letters, they are too close and do not read very well, otherwise the letters will read as a jumble.**
- **Mr. Petruziello suggested that the can letters have white returns rather than black so they will read better; the depth of the channel letters matter.**
- **Mr. Schorr replied that the channel letters are 3" deep.**
- **Mr. Petruziello commented that the bell may be too large, but it is hard to determine with the information provided.**
- **Ms. Jones requested drawings large enough and with sufficient details to review.**

motion

**Tabled**

**To consider:**

- 1. A proper set of drawings including plans, sections and elevations.**
- 2. That the lettering on the signs be dimensioned**
- 3. That the projecting sign should be mounted behind the brick veneer.**
- 4. That the letters be spaced appropriately.**
- 5. That the channel letters have white returns.**
- 6. Review the size of the bell on the wall sign.**

**2.**  
app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
6:55 – 7:30

**1980 North High Street**

**BLUCHA**

**UID\_18-05-002**

Tim Lai, Joel Burke (Tim Lai Architects)  
**graphics, exterior modifications**

- **Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended approval with conditions to clean Chick Harley and remove previous sign bolts.**
- **Mr. Burke reviewed the sign design and other conditions; respectful of the Chick Harley bas relief; balanced with PNC signage.**
- **Mr. Petruziello expressed concern with the design proposal; the proposal breaks up a façade that has become unified by the recent interventions; the colored entry and painted storefront are problematic; the projecting sign should be the same size of the PNC projecting sign and mounted at the same height.**
- **Ms. Jones commented that collage of parts works for this space; the color and form helps to designate this business, as differentiated from how PNC did not address their space.**

motion

- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the proposal is similar to a solution that the Board had requested on the entire façade where the marquee once was located; a 'box' wireway over the brick that would act as the backdrop and mounting for future signs; the owner chose to parget the brick with concrete and paint to match the terracotta.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that the Review Board has been seeking improvements to the façade of this building since the beginning; the façade finally has some dignity; suggested that the projecting sign be relocated or removed, could not support existing location; the building was built by Leo Yassenoff as a great public edifice, a theater for the District; the color of the entry and sign is jarring.
- Mr. Burke stated that the color of the sign and portal was intentional to indicate the entrance to this business.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer replied that the selling of the product will be in the quality of the product not the color and graphics of the signage.
- Mr. Grado commented that any solution should free Chick up.
- Mr. Lai asked how the Evolved Tattoo sign got approved.
- Mr. Grado stated that it was not approved.
- Mr. Ferdelman concurred and stated that the signage for Evolved was not reviewed by the Board or by Staff, though was uncertain whether a permit was issued for the graphics; the previous Used Kids signage was approved by the Board.
- Ms. Jones requested that staff pursue action against the Evolved Tattoo sign.
- Mr. Petruziello recommended that the sign above the entry should become more ... a mini marquee
- Ms. Jones indicated that the blade could be place at the edge of the inset.

Tabled

To consider:

1. Clean the Chick Harley terracotta element, remove bolts and other extraneous fixtures.
2. Relocate projecting sign; reassess the focus and intent of the design.

3.

app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
7:30 – 7:55

2084 North High Street

Donatos

UID\_18-05-003

Jeff Baldwin, Art Prendergast (Donatos Pizza)

graphics, exterior modifications

- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended approval with conditions that permit level drawings be submitted; reduce the number of projecting signs.
- Mr. Baldwin reviewed the program and details; black brick and blade sign are important aspects of the proposal.
- Ms. Jones questioned whether the windows behind the grates are one or two windows.
- Mr. Baldwin commented that the drawings should be accurate, the windows are similar to those on the Frambes elevation. [Further research indicates that the windows are single (double hung) windows behind the grates.]
- Mr. Grado expressed some concern with the symmetry of the proposal; place wall sign over center door on High Street; he enquired about the entries into the restaurant.
- Mr. Prendergast replied that the center door on High Street and a door on Frambes – third of the way down the façade.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the proportions of the windows on the second floor seem off. [Further research indicates that the windows are approx. 56" tall (21 bricks), they scale 42" on the drawn elevation]
- Mr. Grado suggested the projecting sign to the right (south) on the High Street elevation.
- Mr. Petruziello confirmed that the building will be striped of the signs, awnings, and other fixtures including the grates on the second floor; two new projecting signs, two new wall signs and a canopy will be affixed to the building; will the windows be replaced?
- Mr. Baldwin agreed with the assessment, though the windows will just be repaired and painted.
- Mr. Petruziello requested drawings of the canopy; the remainder of the building is unchanged

including doors and storefronts?

- Mr. Baldwin commented that the High Street door may become a wood door rather than aluminum.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned why the entire building is not painted.
- Mr. Baldwin replied that the building was painted in 2007 and is in generally good shape.
- Ms. Jones commented that the drawings are hard to understand; sympathetic to the need to update the location, but the drawings need to clarify the design approach.
- The Board discussed the use of an arrow or not an arrow.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned the line at which the paint starts on the Frambes elevation.
- Mr. Grado suggested starting just east of the Frambes entrance or the entire building; Mr. Papineau concurred.
- Ms. Jones suggested installing a projecting sign on the corner; Mr. Grado concurred.
- Mr. Baldwin questioned what it does with the size and dimension?
- Ms. Jones commented that the size would not change but it helps wrap the corner and the arrow becomes more logical.
- Mr. Ferdelman suggested that the Applicants meet with the Zoning Department regarding the projecting sign; whether the signs can be permitted as proposed without a Graphics Variance (sign mounted above the sills of the windows on the second floor.)
- Mr. Grado suggested reducing the size of the wall signs and boosting the size of a corner sign.
- Mr. Baldwin questioned the allowable size of the sign.
- Ms. Jones stated that there is no definitive size limitation; it has to be viewed in context with the entire building plan.

motion

**Tabled**

**To consider:**

1. That the drawings be reviewed for accuracy.
2. Review the composition of elements on the High Street façade; an asymmetrical placement of elements may not work.
3. Detail drawings of the canopy.
4. Locate the projecting sign on the corner at angle; maybe larger.
5. Review the start of where the Tricorn Black paint starts.

**4.**

app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
7:55 – 8:15

**2247 North High Street**

**UID\_18-05-007**

Zac Romer-Jordan (BBCO Architects)

**equipment screening**

**View on Pavey Square**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended approval of the transformer without additional screening.
- Mr. Romer-Jordan reviewed the program and equipment.
- Mr. Grado commented that the equipment should be screened.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that an historic marker could be placed here to denote the location of Dr. Pavey's bomb shelter.
- Ms. Jones suggested sides of brick screen walls.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested walls on three sides; the doors would be too large for the transformers.
- Mr. Grado suggested that wrought iron fencing be used to reinforce the balconies.
- Mr. Jones replied that the landscaping should address this situation.

motion by  
motion

**Ms. Jones / Ms. Uhas-Sauer**

**To approve the location and details of the proposed AEP transformer:**

1. That the landscaping be reconsidered to eliminate lawn and incorporate vertical oriented vegetation to partially screen the equipment to the North and South.
2. That a new (partial) site plan be submitted to staff for review and approval.

vote | **5-0 to Approve.**

**C.**

**1.**  
 app no.:  
 applicant:  
 reviewed:  
**8:15 – 8:25**

**Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review**  
**165 East 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Multi-Family Residential**

**UID\_18-05-008**  
 Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate), Bradley Blumensheid (dkb Architects)  
**Conceptual Review – addition**

- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; no recommendation.
- Mr. Garland explained the impetus to change the internal works of the existing building and the addition, the proper unit type for the neighborhood.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked for clarification on the existing garage materials.
- Mr. Blumensheid replied that the garage is constructed from concrete block.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer mentioned that s garage in this particular area has a turntable within it.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested lowering the height of the dormers; and move the eave height to match the existing building; consider a shed roof rather than another hip and drop eave on porch; combine dormers on east elevation.
- Ms. Jones suggested recreating the roof details of the front porch for the new rear porch.
- Mr. Petruziello complimented Mr. Blumensheid regarding his drawings and accuracy.

motion

**Tabled**

**To consider:**

1. Reduce the height of the dormers.
2. Lower the eave height on dormers to match front dormer.
3. Change the rear porch roof to shed.
4. Combine dormers on east elevation or separate.
5. Recreate the roof details of the front porch for the new rear porch.

**D.**

**8:25 – 8:32**

- 1.**
- 2.**
- 3.**
- 4.**
- 5.**
- 6.**
- 7.**
- 8.**

**Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**

items approved

<b>UID_18-01-008</b>	<b>parking</b>
<b>247-249 East 11th Avenue</b>	
<b>UID_18-04-016</b>	<b>windows</b>
<b>2265 North High Street</b>	
<b>UID_18-04-017</b>	<b>parking</b>
<b>1951 Indianola Avenue</b>	
<b>UID_18-04-018 Review Statement</b>	<b>rooming house</b>
<b>1951 Indianola Avenue</b>	
<b>UID_18-04-019</b>	<b>windows</b>
<b>90 East 12th Avenue</b>	
<b>UID_18-05-004</b>	<b>sign</b>
<b>1251 North High Street</b>	
<b>UID_18-05-005</b>	<b>landscaping</b>
<b>292 East 15th Avenue (Landscaping)</b>	
<b>UID_18-05-006</b>	<b>roof</b>
<b>127 East 11th Avenue</b>	

motion by  
 motion  
 vote

**Mr. Grado / Ms. Jones**  
**To approve the Staff Issued COA's as submitted.**  
**5-0 to Approve**

<b>E.</b>		<b>Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval</b>		
			approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	UID_17-04-001 1444 North High Street (Latern Square_Parking)		04/20/2017: parking	05/08/2018
2.	UID_18-01-002 1924 North High Street (Chick-Fil-A_Signs)		01/18/2018: signage	05/03/2018
3.	UID_18-01-002 1924 North High Street (Chick-Fil-A_Storefront)		01/18/2018: storefront, patio	05/03/2018
4.	UID_18-01-006 RECOMMENDATION 1503-1505 North 4th Street (Multi-Family)		04/19/2018: zoning variances	04/20/2018
5.	UID_18-04-014 1400 North High Street (UNCOMMON_Signs)		04/19/2018: signs	05/08/2018
<b>F.</b>		<b>Next Meeting</b>		
1.		Thursday June 28, 2018   4:00pm until End of Business Michael B Coleman Government Building Hearing Room (111 North Front Street, Room 204)		