

motion by motion | **Mr. Fleming / Mr. Grado**
To approve the graphics, signs, and exterior modifications on the condition:

1. That the logos and sponsorship tag below the pizza graphic be removed., on the South elevation
2. That the Pizza and Delivery super-graphic be removed, on the North elevation.
3. That the pizza graphic on the South elevation may be repeated on the North elevation about the entrance.
4. To remove the existing lighting under the awnings.
5. To approve the signs, awnings and paint as shown.
6. To support any variance that may be necessary to allow the projecting sign as proposed.

vote | **4-0 to Approve.**

2. | **193-195 Chittenden Avenue** | **Two Bucks Food & Spirits**
app no.: **UID_18-06-005**
applicant: Eric Nugent (Two Bucks), Jim Hartley (SignCom)
reviewed: **signs**
4:30 - 4:40

- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended approval of the signs if the raceways were made shallower, 1" to 1 ½".
- Mr. Nugent described discrepancies in the drawings versus the actual proposed sign.
- Mr. Fleming stated that he could approve the signs that are accurately depicted but the Two Bucks sign is in error.
- Mr. Grado commented that he had problems with the depth of raceways.
- Mr. Fleming remarked that the raceway would read rather strong because of the mass, the offset from the wall; an accurate representation is necessary.
- Mr. Ferdelman requested a clarification on the depths of the sign cabinets and raceway; if Two Bucks sign was individually mounted the Food and Sprit signs would be 4" prod of that sign.
- Mr. Fleming replied that if the signs had remote ballasts, then the raceways could be much thinner.
- Mr. Grado commented that if the raceways were an inch in depth that would be acceptable.

motion by motion | **Mr. Fleming / Mr. Grado**
To approve the new wall sign as submitted on the condition:

1. That the individual can letters are mounted to a wireway that is no more than 1 ½" in depth.
2. That the wireway is painted to match the color and tone of the brick to which it is mounted.

vote | **4-0 to Approve.**

3. | **1614 North High Street** | **A&F**
app no.: **UID-18-06-006**
applicant: Lauren Heidlebaugh (A&F), Laura Davis (red architecture + planning)
reviewed: **canopy, signs**
4:40 - 4:45

- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended approval as submitted.
- Ms. Heidlebaugh reviewed the canopy and sign design.
- Ms. Jones questioned the height of the blade sign.
- Ms. Heidlebaugh replied that the blade is installed at the same height of the previous sign.

motion by motion | **Ms. Jones / Mr. Grado**
To approve the signs and canopy as submitted on the condition:

1. That the projecting sign be mounted at a height consistent with City of Columbus standards.

vote | **4-0 to Approve.**

4.
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
4:45 – 4:52

165 East 13th Avenue
UID_18-05-008
Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate), Bradley Blumensheid (dkb Architects)
addition

Multi-Family Residential

- **Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended approval as submitted.**
- **Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the program and modifications in the design.**
- **The Board and Applicant discussed the size of a window on the West elevation.**

motion by
motion
vote

Ms. Jones / Mr. Grado
To approve the proposed addition and exterior modifications to the existing house as submitted.
4-0 to Approve.

C.

1.
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
4:52 – 5:12

Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review

99 East 11th Avenue

Multi-Family Residential

UID-18-02-006

Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate), Bradley Blumensheid (dkb Architects)

Zoning Recommendation – demo & new multi-family

- **Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; recommended that the Board should support the requested variances for CV18-042 with a few conditions - consider pervious pavement or pavers for a portion of the parking area. Provide a detailed landscape plan. - :**
3333.035, AR-4, Apartment Residential District Use, to allow multiple buildings across parcel lines.
3325.705, Supplemental Parking Requirements, to permit pavement of part of the west perimeter yard for a driveway to enclosed and surface parking.
3325.905(A), Maximum Lot Coverage, to increase lot coverage from 30% to 39%.
3325.907(A) (B), Parking, to increase lot area devoted to parking and maneuvering from 35% to 43% and to decrease required parking from 86 spaces to 46 spaces.
3325.911(C), Building Separation and Size, to increase the permitted calculated floor area of the new eight (8) dwelling unit building from 10,200 SF to 17,460 SF.
3333.255, Perimeter Yard, to reduce perimeter yard from 17.5 feet to the following: East: 2' for existing E 11th Avenue dwelling and zero (0) for part of the parking lot; South: zero (0) for driveways to the new 8 dwelling unit building and to ten (10) feet for the proposed building setback; and west: zero (0) to three (3) feet for pavement and existing dwelling side yard, respectively, as depicted on the Site Plan.
- **Mr. Garland explained the practical difficulties of getting UAC recommendation prior to coming to the Review Board; the UAC zoning committee voted unanimously to recommend approval to the zoning.**
- **Mr. Grado commented that the Board could act on this proposal due to the fact of previous reviews and the UAC Zoning Committee endorsement.**
- **Mr. Fleming recounted some of the variances as requested.**
- **Ms. Jones commented that site has more parking than should be required; the site design could do more, the green space at the center should have a more consistent message.**
- **Mr. Garland replied that they will provide more landscaping than is currently shown, without sacrificing safety and vision clearances.**
- **Ms. Jones commented that the space should be designed with some ideas in mind.**
- **Mr. Garland replied that he likes have the project farther along to assess how the space works out.**
- **Ms. Jones expressed some concern whether the land will truly be allocated to landscaping/greenspace rather than maximizing the building footprint.**
- **Mr. Grado suggested removing two parking spaces to the west and expand the greenspace; turn the handicap spaces to be parallel.**
- **Mr. Fleming concurred regarding the importance of providing open/greenspace for tenants.**
- **Mr. Garland commented that other bodies may not agree with the parking reduction, like the UAC and the Zoning Department.**
- **Ms. Jones expressed gratitude to Mr. Garland and his operation.**
- **Mr. Fleming commented that the Board can vote to support the variances and work out the other issues in design.**
- **Mr. Garland replied that a full blown landscape plan will be necessary.**

- The Board voted on the Variance request.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that the Applicants' indicated that they would like review and approval of the building architecture.
- Mr. Grado questioned whether the idea about pushing and pulling the entries were studied.
- Mr. Blumensheid stated that they did review the option and could not resolve the design, it looked awkward; we introduced canopies as an entry element.
- Ms. Jones remarked about balconies except for the end units.
- Mr. Blumensheid replied that the balconies for those units are on the sides.
- Mr. Fleming suggested inserting an additional window in one or two units.
- Ms. Jones enquired about the material in the insets.
- Mr. Blumensheid confirmed that the material is Hardi-Panel.
- Mr. Fleming stated that for full approval, the landscape issue needs to be worked out; plans, sections and elevations.
- Mr. Garland commented that he wanted to be able to report to the UAC the full discussion here with the Review Board.

motion by
motion
vote

Mr. Fleming / Ms. Jones

To support the requested variances that allow the proposal as presented to advance for later design review.

4-0 to Approve.

2.
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
5:12 – 5:30

95, 97-99, 101-103, 107-109, 113 East 11th Avenue Multi-Family Residential

UID-18-06-007

Wayne Garland (Buckeye Real Estate), Bradley Blumensheid (dkb Architects)

Conceptual – rehab existing multi-family residences

- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report; the buildings are to be reviewed for concept.
- Mr. Blumensheid reviewed the program and designs.
- Mr. Garland stated that he would like to introduce some outdoor space for the 4 bedroom upper units.
- Mr. Fleming commented that he did not look favorably on the two story front facing porches on the end buildings.
- Mr. Blumensheid replied that the buildings already have the porches; what of rear porches.
- Mr. Fleming stated that he did not object to allowing two story porches at the rear.
- Ms. Jones commented that the porch at the rear would be a good shading device for the South facing elevation.
- Mr. Blumensheid remarked that the porches will help break up the massing of the rear of the buildings.
- Ms. Jones suggested putting a demising wall or element between the front porches; enquired about the paint scheme for the buildings.
- Mr. Garland discussed the paint palette of other projects.

motion

Tabled

To consider:

1. Second story porches at rear.
2. Rework end units to eliminate two story porches on 11th Avenue frontage.
3. Place divider between units on porches.

3.
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
5:40 – 6:10

2711 North High Street **Mixed Use**
UID-18-01-007
Dave Vottero (Schooley Caldwell Architects), Matt Canterbury (Borrer Properties)
Conceptual – new mixed use

- Mr. Fleming recused himself from this case.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report;
- Mr. Canterbury commented that the program was reduced from 4 to 3 stories and the office component was eliminated; the architecture was modified to take some ques from the existing contributing buildings.
- Mr. Vottero reviewed the site plan and building design; three story building more in keeping with context; some effort to highlight ravine on North portion of the lot;
- Ms. Jones asked for clarification of the site plan.
- Mr. Vottero reviewed some of the site features; site access will mainly be handled at the signalized entrance opposite Arcadia Avenue.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the unit mix.
- Ms. Jones requested information on the unit layouts.
- Mr. Vottero remarked that the black material is a fiber cement panel with battens.
- Mr. Grado commented that the move to 3 stories was good and the handling of materials on the front portion of the building; the West elevation needs additional study.
- Ms. Jones remarked that she did not understand the treatment of the residential bridge feature, why is it treated so different; the residential portion should not be so different and it should hold some interest; if modern, make everything modern.; siting, massing and how it works in its setting are good form an urban design perspective.
- Mr. Canterbury commented that the design direction was in response to conflicting recommendations from the Board.
- Ms. Jones stated one should not design by committee; make a commitment to what you want; there is a little discord between the expressions of the different uses.
- Mr. Canterbury reviewed their timeline for review; will be back in August for a recommendation on the zoning after UAC.

motion

Tabled

To consider:

1. Show unit layout in next review.
2. Review the articulation/materials of the residential portion of the building.

4.
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
6:10 – 7:25

2500 North High Street **Mixed Use**
UID_18-06-008
Jonathan Leonard, George Berardi (Berardi Partners)
Conceptual – new mixed use

- Mr. Fleming returned to review this case.
- Mr. Ferdelman gave the Staff Report: The Applicants seek to develop a 4 story mixed-use building, encompassing an area of 43,737sf, exceeding the FAR by 2,617 sf; 30 new units, and 4 existing units on East Tompkins. 5,343 sf of Commercial; demolition of three buildings: 2500 High, 2480 High, and 28 Wilcox. Upon initial review the Variances requests will include an increase of building height of 0'-10"from 45'AFG, a FAR variance of 2,600sf and a variance to allow parking on residentially zoned property; parking beyond the alley is not supported.
- Mr. Leonard reviewed the architecture of the building; Mr. Berardi reviewed the possible zoning variances; remarked on the need to demolish the residence on Wilcox; remarked on the need to go above 45'.
- Mr. Papineau entertained questions from the public.
- Mr. Mike Fritz, a UD homeowner within two blocks of the project site, commented that the building as proposed does not enhance the neighborhood; parking should not extend past the commercial area into the residential area; Wilcox and East Avenue are quite nice, parking

will destroy the character of the area.

- Ms. Carly Elger, a UD resident for 8 years, lives less than a block from proposed project; traffic and parking will be an issue; safety for residents that do not have off-street parking and the increased parking demand of the proposal without providing enough parking.
- Mr. Jeremy Graham, a UD resident, the proposed development modifies the character of the neighborhood – pushing out families; the size and height of the building is not consistent with the immediate surroundings.
- Mr. Fleming questioned why increased density would affect other rentals in the area.
- Mr. Graham stated that landlords are having a problem leasing their units in this area.
- Ms. Jones asked whether that market was mostly students.
- Mr. Graham stated that the rentals are students, young professionals and some families.
- Mr. Fritz stated that the units on East Avenue is usually Grad or PhD students; the younger crowd lives South of Maynard; Wilcox is a tight two way street; no one has met with the neighborhood groups regarding this project.
- Mr. Ferdelman commented that a formal application with the City of Columbus Zoning has not been filed at this point; the applicants are before this Board on a conceptual basis, not to get a recommendation on the zoning; the public process starts upon formal submission to BZA or Council.
- Mr. Grado asked whom the developer is ... Gilbane; unit mix; Mr. Berardi stated that the developer is Verge Development Company; the units are all 2 bedroom; 30 units – 60 new beds along with 8 existing beds on Tompkins.
- Mr. Grado observed that 4 stories on this portion of High Street is inappropriate; the area is a 2 story environment; nearby courtyard building is a better typology; trying to attract retirees to this portion of the neighborhood, ample greenspace would be the attractor.
- Ms. Jones remarked that crossing over the alley with auxiliary commercial uses is problematic; the residential area is mature and forested, a surface parking lot destroys these qualities that the residents enjoy; this area does not have a consistent language; the proposed architecture currently is too generic, it needs to offer more, be more compelling.
- Mr. Fleming stated that the height and density at this location is not a problem; parking across the alley is a non-starter; not addressing aesthetics at this point; 3 or 4 stories at High is fine taller street face on High, but step down on Wilcox.
- Mr. Grado made a clarification on his comment about the existing building typologies in the neighborhood that provide density but also provide good amenities for the tenants and community; because the maximum allowed is 45' does not mean that the Review Board cannot make an aesthetic judgement that 4 stories or 45' is not appropriate - the Pavey project as an example; Mr. Fleming replied that his assessment is that 4 stories is not offensive in this particular context.
- Ms. Jones commented that if a 4 story building were to be approved her, it would need to make a statement; the proposed building is not there at the moment.
- Mr. Berardi replied that he can make the changes in the architecture; the 45' height limit is allowed within the zoning code, not just a guideline; the per unit price to upgrade the Tompkins property is higher than the unit cost for the new building; the house on Wilcox does not have the same value.
- Mr. Fleming suggested building a duplex on Wilcox as the zoning allows; the safety issues of the neighborhood stem from a gas station and an auto parts store and the lack of residents in this particular sub area; the vacancy problem will be resolved by folks in Clintonville moving south or by owner occupants buying rental property.
- Ms. Jones remarked that the parking for the commercial space should be behind that space, not remote; Mr. Fleming said commercial space may not require parking, depending on tenant.
- Mr. Ferdelman suggested investigation of possible tanks underground.

motion

Tabled

To Consider:

1. Possibly reduce the height to 2 or 3 story.
2. Less generic and more compelling design and materials.
3. No parking across the alley; possibly a duplex on that site.

D.

5:30 – 5:40

Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

items approved

1.

**UID_18-05-005
292 East 15th Avenue**

landscaping

2.

**UID_18-05-006
127 East 11th Avenue**

roof

3.

**UID_18-05-009
181 East 11th Avenue**

roof

4.

**UID_18-05-010
72 Chittenden Avenue**

roof

5.

**UID_18-05-011
1892–1928 North High Street**

building modification

6.

**UID_18-05-012
64-70 East 12th Avenue**

roof

7.

**UID_18-05-013
227 East 18th Avenue**

siding, windows

8.

**UID_18-05-014
85 East Woodruff Avenue**

roof

9.

**UID_18-05-015
1911 Indianola Avenue**

roof

10.

**UID_18-05-016
1626-1628 Summit Street**

roof

11.

**UID_18-05-017
101 East 14th Avenue**

roof

12.

**UID_18-05-018
1764 North High Street**

siding

13.

**UID_18-05-019
2661 North High Street**

brickwork

14.

**UID_18-06-001
237 East 11th Avenue**

roof

15.

**UID_18-06-002
200 East 17th Avenue**

roof

16.

**UID_18-06-003
1924 North High Street**

door astragal

17.

**UID_18-06-004
2591 North High Street**

sign replacement

motion by
motion
vote

**Mr. Fleming / Ms. Jones
To approve as submitted.
4-0 to Approve.**

E.

Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval

		approved : items approved	COA issued
1.	UID_17-03-001 97-101 East 10th Avenue	5/18/2017: building & site	05/22/2018
2.	UID_17-04-0001 1444 North High Street	4/20/2017: parking & landscape	5/8/2018
3.	UID_18-01-001 84 East 15th Avenue	3/15/2018: building & site	5/30/2018
4.	UID_18-02-007 1444 North High Street	3/15/2018: zoning recommendation	6/1/2018
5.	UID_18-02-013 15 East Lane Avenue	3/15/2018: building signs	5/22/2018

F.

1. **Next Meeting**
July 26, 2018 | 111 North Front Street, Room 204 | 4:00pm