

# UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

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

## MEETING SUMMARY

date January 18, 2018

place Northwood & High Building  
2231 North High Street, Room 100

time 6:30pm – 9:45pm

present Ted Goodman, Keoni Fleming, Frank Petruziello, Abby Kravitz, Stephen Papineau,  
Pasquale Grado

absent Doreen Uhas-Sauer

A. 6:30 – 6:33

Business of the Board

1.

Approval of Meeting Summary from December 2017

motion by

Mr. Grado / Ms. Kravitz

motion

To approve the Meeting Summary as submitted.

vote

6-0 to Approve

2.

Presentation

University District - Arts and Character Plan – Matt Hansen and Josh Lapp

- Mr. Hansen, manages UDO, UCBA and SID, presented an overview of the Arts and Character Plan. Engage community and University in improving District and showing off the distinctness of the people.
- Mr. Lapp showed slide and described the program and events; describes community as youthful and irreverent – art to reflect this fact; art in ROW and wayfinding; dumpster murals; music/culture trail in UD; soapbox lectern; local and state grants to pursue projects; integrate art into new projects.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the edges and found spaces can be energized by these efforts; High Street is becoming corporate and homogenized.
- Mr. Goodman commented that public lectern could be done in several spaces.
- Mr. Lapp mentioned the temporary art installation at 14<sup>th</sup> and High.
- Mr. Ferdelman stated that projects on private property come to UIDRB; projects in ROW go to the Columbus Art Commission.

6:33 – 6:55

B.

1.

Applications for Certificate of Approval

84 East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Zeta Tau Alpha

UD-18-01-001

app no.:

applicant:

Christine Eaton, Nick Davis (Browning Day Mullins Dierdorf)

reviewed:

demo & rebuild

6:55 – 7:22

- Mr. Davis reviewed the program and modifications from last month; removed false porch; extended overhang; geometry stays the same.
- Mr. Grado expressed concern that the cornice height is significantly different than the other buildings in the block; the cornice height and massing is dramatically different.
- Mr. Goodman replied that the two story porch seems to align with the cornices of the adjacent buildings; the porch is pretty substantial.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the porch resolves the issue of cornice height.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the site plan/ landscaping; the Board indicated that the site plan needs additional information.
- Mr. Fleming commented that the current design is an improvement; a streetscape drawing may

help understand the mass and alignment of cornices; look at the windows north of the fireplace as a possible way to add asymmetry and express the nature of the interior space.

- Mr. Goodman requested section details to prove the construction.
- Mr. Petruziello use square column bases; white downspouts against the brick is problematic; look into details of pediments.
- Mr. Grado suggested bringing the cornice line down; the low slope is problematic.

Tabled

To Consider:

1. Sections, Details, and Site Plan w/ Landscaping.
2. Use a larger and/or different window north of the fireplace to designate importance of space and add asymmetry.
3. Use square column bases.
4. Downspouts in different color, maybe bronze.
5. Review roof slope and possibility of lowering cornice.

motion

2.

app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
7:22 – 7:53

1924 North High Street

Chick-Fil-A

UD-18-01-002

Steve Malloy (Edwards + Hotchkiss Architects, P.C.)

signage & patio

- Mr. Malloy reviewed the program, details and patio options.
- Mr. Fleming expressed concern regarding the railing to define private space in public right-of-way.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that the particular location of this patio is the problem.
- Ms. Kravitz suggested planters perpendicular to the building faces, but not extended into the right-of-way.
- Mr. Petruziello recommended that the tables come inside every night rather than be chained outside.
- Mr. Malloy replied that the tables and chairs will not be chained; the option (2) with seating out to 10' and no guardrails will be used.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested that shop drawings for the storefronts be provided to staff for review; the astragal should remain.
- The Board and Applicant discussed the location of the entry door and storefront details.
- Mr. Grado expressed concern regarding an inconsistency over the placement of lights on the façade between two sets of drawings.
- Mr. Fleming reiterated that the drawings need to be an accurate reflection of what is to be built; the inconsistencies need to be reconciled.
- Mr. Grado reviewed the problem of the placement of the projecting sign shown EHA's drawings with the placement of the wall sconces shown on the Acock drawings.

motion by

Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Papineau

To approve the proposed door relocation, patio and signage on the condition

1. That measured as-built drawings with the shop drawings for the storefronts be presented to staff for review and approval.
2. That the entry door shall have an astragal.
3. That the returns of the wall sign shall match the projecting sign (Dark Bronze).
4. That the patio be approved for 10' from face of building without any railings except that a raised planter may be located at the southern end of the patio.
5. That the projecting sign shall be brought back to the Board for review; with clarification of the location of the projecting sign in relation to the wall sconce.

motion

vote

6 - 0 to Approve

3.

1928 North High Street

Huntington Bank

app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
7:53 – 8:25

**UD-18-01-003**

Daniel Wondolowski (Huntington Bank), Tracey Diehl (Expedite the Diehl)  
**signage & canopies**

- Ms. Diehl reviewed the sign details.
- Mr. Grado remarked that the vinyl and backlit ATM surround is too garish; the green on the canopies and other graphics will be sufficient; no transom vinyl; no illuminated canopies.
- Ms. Diehl questioned whether an awning could be installed over the ATM and provide area lighting.
- Mr. Grado stated that a light just over the ATM would be fine, just not a backlit cowling.
- The Board and Applicants discussed the canopy details.
- Mr. Fleming suggested removing the raceways; mount the sign cabinet to the wall.
- Ms. Diehl returned to the glow wall; an example could be mocked-up for the Board to review.
- Mr. Grado stated that he was opposed to the amount of green; maybe the background could be grey.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that he could not support a glow wall, a white edge glow may be ok; the projecting sign should be thinner in profile.
- Ms. Diehl stated that the thickness of the projecting sign can be 5" to 6".
- Mr. Goodman commented that the canopy drawings lack detail on the placement of the tie back rods.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested that a section through the storefront showing these canopies will be helpful.
- Mr. Wondolowski enquired as to what type of lighting would be appropriate at the ATM; the ATM needs additional lighting for safety and the glow wall helps.
- Mr. Petruziello suggested additional down lighting in canopy.

**Tabled**

**To Consider**

1. Remove the green vinyl from the transoms.
2. Remove glow wall.
3. Use grey instead of green for surround.
4. Edge light and down light the ATM and surround rather than glow.
5. Provide additional details on canopies, including section that shows relationship to storefront and how mounted; show location of tie back rods consistently through drawings.
6. Remove raceways from wall signs, individual mount like Chick-Fil-A.
7. Thinner profile on projecting sign - 5" to 6".

motion

4.

app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
8:25 – 8:38

**2130 North High Street**

**Chipotle**

**UD-18-01-004**

Steve Moore, Moore Signs), Jen Saum (Chipotle)  
**signage**

- Mr. Moore reviewed the signs; the Board and Applicant talked through the details.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the attachment detail is for masonry, while the building is frame structure at his location.
- Mr. Moore stated that engineered drawings will be provided.

motion by  
motion  
vote

**Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Grado**  
**To approve the signs as submitted.**  
**6-0 to Approve**

5.  
app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
8:38 – 8:50

**1525 North High Street** **Luxe Belle**  
**UD-18-01-005**  
Joe Tanoury, David Hodge (Underhill + Hodge LLC)  
**signage**

- **Mr. Tanoury reviewed the sign options.**
- **Mr. Grado stated that Option A is the best scheme.**
- **Mr. Petruziello requested that the beginning of the sign align with the vertical line of the brick below.**
- **Mr. Goodman commented that the font should be san-serif.**
- **Mr. Fleming concurred with font and location.**
- **Ms. Kravitz commented that the sign could grow a little, but the L should align with vertical below.**

motion by

**Mr. Grado / Mr. Petruziello**

**To approve the building sign as submitted on the condition:**

motion

1. **That the sign use the sans-serif font (Option A).**
2. **That the first letter begin at the line coincident with the window and wall juncture to the South.**

vote

**6-0 to Approve**

C.

1.  
app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
8:50 – 9:12

**Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/or Conceptual Review**  
**1503-1505 North 4<sup>th</sup> Street** **Multi-Family Residential**  
**UD-18-01-006**  
Juliet Bullock (Juliet Bullock Architects)  
**Conceptual – new multi-family**

- **Ms. Bullock presented the building as a transition from what will most likely be a commercial building on the corner of 11<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> to the residential buildings just south of this property; the two existing buildings are non-contributing and have structural issues; variances are for percentage of glass, site setbacks and residential use on ground floor; some in Weinland Park meeting suggested commercial use; commercial building just North of 11<sup>th</sup> has yet to get tenants due to lack of parking, this site would have the same problem; building is row house typology.**
- **Mr. Grado commented that the proposed structure makes sense.**
- **Mr. Fleming stated that the design is sympathetic to the context.**
- **Mr. Goodman agreed that the building is a good transition.**
- **Mr. Petruziello suggested that the middle unit should receive a porch.**
- **Ms. Bullock stated that the builder prefers crawl spaces to basements; that helps with FAR in this particular case.**
- **Mr. Petruziello requested that the sills on the ground floor windows should be lowered.**

**Tabled**

**To Consider:**

motion

1. **Add a porch to the middle unit.**
2. **Lower the sills on the first floor windows.**

2.

app no.:  
applicant:  
reviewed:  
~ 8:15

2711 North High Street

Mixed Use

UD-18-01-007

Matt Canterbury (Borror Properties), David Vottero (Schooley Caldwell Architects)

Conceptual – new mixed use

- Mr. Fleming recused himself in consideration of this project, his colleague Mr. Vottero is the project architect.
- Mr. Canterbury reviewed that the building is composed of two retail spaces, 11,200sf of office and 53 residential units with 62 beds; 72 parking spaces with variance for 5; height request at rear building, for 8’.
- Mr. Vottero reviewed history of the site; Olentangy Amusement Park; the ravine culverted; White Castle and Patrick J’s; the site is 80% in University District, building in UD and parking to rear and north.
- Mr. Grado suggested the parking to the north be available and designed for community activities – permeable pavers.
- Mr. Vottero reviewed that the building is composed of two retail spaces, 11,200sf of office and 53 residential units with 62 beds; 72 parking spaces with variance for 5; height request at rear building, for 8’, to screen the RTU’s.
- Ms. Kravitz questioned the view possibilities down Glenn Echo to the Olentangy; the service area to the south portion of lot seems problematic.
- Mr. Petruziello commented that there are several dynamic elements assembled in a static way; the ques to White Castle and OAP are awkward, White Castle is viewed as an object building and not as an extrusion – this stretching the form does not work; the brick facade does not work; think as these as elements that come together with slippage; additional attention to the north portion of the lot; build more building – variances should not stop you from optimizing your site; extend the residential building to the north.
- Mr. Papineau stated that he liked the brick front portion but the rear portion is too simple, too plain; the back part looks like warehouse.
- Mr. Goodman commented that the forms could change; look at approaches from north and south High Street; good conceptual building.
- Mr. Petruziello questioned whether the building complied with the UCO; Mr. Ferdelman commented that they most likely do not meet the 60% frontage requirement along High Street; the vacantness on the northern portion of lot is problematic.
- Mr. Vottero questioned whether the variances seemed problematic.
- The Board was non-committal but generally favorable; Mr. Petruziello expressed the frontage issue will require a variance that the board is not usually supportive of.

Tabled

To Consider:

1. Parking area to the north as possible community space made available at times.
2. Permeable pavers in north parking.
3. Resolve service area at the south.
4. Reconsider homage to past buildings.
5. Extend and cantilever building at the rear.
6. Review rear portion – too simple and plain.
7. Extend the frontage of the building along High Street.

motion

