WESTERVILLE UPTOWN REVIEW BOARD CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 21 S. STATE STREET THURSDAY, MAY 5, 2016 MINUTES

The Westerville Uptown Review Board met in regular session on Thursday, May 5, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in City Council Chambers at 21 S. State Street. Members present were Ralph Denick, Matt Whitehead, Dennis Blair, Melissa Law, and Jeff Reschke. Del Robeson and Amanda Terrell were excused. Bassem Bitar and Jayme Maxwell represented Staff.

Chairman Blair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2016 MEETING

Mr. Whitehead moved to approve the April 7, 2016 meeting minutes as presented; Ms. Law seconded the motion.

Yeas: Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Denick, Ms. Law, Mr. Reschke, Chairman Blair

Nays: None

Motion Passed: 5-0

Chairman Blair explained the process for the meeting. Ms. Maxwell swore in Staff and all those wishing to speak before the Board.

NEW BUSINESS

<u>URB 2016-10; 43 E. HOME STREET (RISING SUN CAFÉ); EXTERIOR HOOD VENT;</u> APPLICANTS: SETH & MARINA ROZEN.

Mr. Bitar gave the staff presentation closely following the written staff report outlining the application, giving site details and the 3 options considered by the applicant:

- 1. Vent as presented last month but factory painted to match the brick;
- 2. Moving the vent above the rear entry door;
- 3. Different fan system in interior with smaller exhaust outside.

Marina & Seth Rozen, applicants, and Tim Bass, architect, were present.

Mr. Bass further detailed the three options:

Base condition:

- Avoids egress area which had troubled the Building Division;
- Fan can be factory painted to minimize maintenance.

Vent placement over the door:

- Subordinates the depth of the fan because of the pier which is about 14" deep;
- Requires a pipe to pull condensate off the sidewalk;
- Requires taking ceiling out and installing new rated lower ceiling; requires a clean out and people in the egress area cleaning it out.

In-line fan:

• Did an inline fan at J. Liu in Dublin and he has had some issues with it as it pushes grease out with air (although there would not be as much grease in this instance);

- They have to provide clearance (18") from wood, which would put the vent at the side of the pier, meaning they would have to do a horizontal turn in addition to the vertical one, requiring multiple cleanouts;
- Has the undesirable consequences of bringing the noise inside the sanctuary, visible equipment and significant intrusion on the mezzanine.

Conclusion: They have found out that they can get the vent factory-painted. This would double the cost of the fan component (\$700-\$800 extra), but the owners are willing to expend this extra money if they can keep the vent at the base location. The other options are more expensive.

Chairman Blair opened the floor for public comment and seeing none, invited discussion between the Board, applicant, and staff.

Mr. Reschke asked about the condensate pipe when the fan is over the door. Mr. Bass explained that there will be a hole with either option, but if it is above the door, then they would need a pipe to divert it in order to maintain public safety.

Mr. Reschke asked about the size of the hood as it sounds like it is bigger than the impression that was given last month. Mr. Bass answered 40 inches. Mr. Rozen explained that it is a 36-inch range. Mr. Bass noted that the applicants are complying in the fullest for a commercial range (for any potential future needs) and trying to do the right thing.

Mr. Denick said he has limited experience in doing this and can appreciate the 18-inch clearance, cleanouts and everything options 2 and 3 would involve so those do not make sense to him. He continued by stating he was not a fan of the first version but sees no other reasonable option to reduce the size. Painting the vent would help.

Mr. Denick confirmed the size of the fan is 25 inches. Mr. Bass shared that he did ask for a smaller footprint and there is 21-inch version but it would not have serviced this hood.

Mr. Denick asked for color chips. Mr. Bass stated the intent is to match the brick and they will go with the darkest variation; the vendor will custom match the brick. Mr. Denick indicated he was comfortable with Staff review on the color with commitment to select the darkest brick hue.

Ms. Law thanked the applicant for the work put into these considerations and explanations. She asked about the size of the hole through the brick and indicated that was her biggest concern. Mr. Bass answered 10"-12".

Mr. Denick asked how it is attached to brick. Mr. Bass stated they could specify that it be attached to mortar joints only.

Mr. Whitehead stated that he appreciated the background and work that went into this and appreciated protecting the inside as well. He is supportive of option 1 and probably would add the administrative approval of paint as he does not want to delay this process any further.

Mr. Reschke moved to approve URB 2016-10 with the following condition:

1. That the fan be installed as presented in Scenario #1 and painted a custom color to match the brick to the satisfaction of Staff.

Mr. Denick seconded the motion.

Yeas: Mr. Reschke, Mr. Denick, Mr. Whitehead, Ms. Law, Chairman Blair

Nays: None

Motion Passed: 5-0

<u>URB 2016-12; 29 W. COLLEGE AVENUE (HANNAH MAYNE HOUSE); CHIMNEY</u> <u>REMOVAL; APPLICANT: DAVID BEEMAN, SEM ARCHITECTS.</u>

The applicant was not present so Mr. Whitehead moved to table URB 2016-12 to the final item on the agenda or until next month if the applicant is not in attendance. Mr. Denick seconded the motion.

Yeas: Mr. Reschke, Mr. Whitehead, Ms. Law, Mr. Denick, Chairman Blair

Nays: None

Motion Passed: 5-0

Clerk's Note: Mr. Beeman, applicant for URB 2016-12, arrived at 7:39 p.m. and the item was heard at that time as follows:

Mr. Bitar gave the staff presentation closely following the written staff report. He explained that the applicant and church are concerned with the long term maintenance of the chimneys given the discovery of some foundation issues.

Chairman Blair said that he had no concerns with the removal of the chimneys.

Chairman Blair and Ms. Law both stated that they were originally concerned about the loss of symmetry until they realized that the east and west chimneys are not really symmetrical.

Mr. Denick asked if all 3 were original or added later. Mr. Beeman said there is no original documentation on the building so they cannot tell.

Mr. Whitehead moved to approve URB 2016-12 as presented; Mr. Denick seconded the motion.

Yeas: Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Denick, Ms. Law, Mr. Reschke, Chairman Blair

Nays: None

Motion Passed: 5-0

<u>URB 2016-13; 15 N. STATE STREET (SHIRLEY'S GOURMET POPCORN CO.); WINDOW</u> <u>SIGN/SANDWICH BOARD SIGN; APPLICANT: JOHN BLANKEMEYER.</u>

Mr. Bitar gave the staff presentation closely following the written staff report outlining the applicant's request and project history. He showed a rendering of the window sign as presented as well Staff's suggested iteration.

Chairman Blair invited the applicants forward.

John and Anna Mae Blankemeyer, applicants, were present. Mr. Blankemeyer stated they will adjust the size according to Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Reschke indicated the smaller sign would provide for better security allowing visibility inside the store and he complimented the nice graphic sign.

Ms. Law complimented the sign.

Mr. Reschke asked about the recommended measurements. Mr. Bitar explained that Staff is recommending that the total height be around 36", which makes the width around 27". The sign would be 6"-7" from the edges.

Mr. Denick stated that the proposed sandwich board sign is good-looking. They have not been supportive of dry-erase boards in the past because it could easily look bad if the lettering is sloppy. In this case, the lettering looks good, so he is fine with it as long they keep this effort up. Mr. and Mrs. Blankemeyer stated that they want it to be tasteful as well.

Chairman Blair referenced the bollard to the left of the door and stated that it seems like an opportunity to do something sculptural with it. Mr. Blankemeyer said they have been warned that there is a tripping hazard so they installed that bollard.

Mr. Denick moved to approve URB 2016-13 with the following condition:1. That the window sign be reduced to no more than 36" in height.

Ms. Law seconded the motion.

Yeas: Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Denick, Ms. Law, Mr. Reschke, Chairman Blair

Nays: None

Motion Passed: 5-0

<u>URB 2016-14; 10 E. MAIN STREET (RED APRON PIZZA CO.); WINDOW AND AWNING SIGNAGE; APPLICANT: JOHN J. EAU CLAIRE.</u>

Mr. Bitar gave the staff presentation closely following the written staff report.

John Eau Claire, applicant, was present.

Ms. Law moved to approve URB 2016-14 as presented; Mr. Reschke seconded the motion.

Yeas: Ms. Law, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Denick, Mr. Reschke, Chairman Blair

Nays: None

Motion Passed: 5-0

ADMINISTRATIVE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

URB 2016-15; 46 E. HOME STREET; HOUSE AND GARAGE REPAINTING; APPLICANT: SHARON D. HAYHURST.

Mr. Bitar stated that the gray paint on this house has faded to the point that it actually looks pink on a couple of sides. The applicant intends to repaint both the house and garage the same color as the existing (Behr "Dark Pewter" PPU18-04), although it is likely to appear darker.

Ms. Law asked if the applicant is if fixing the wood trim. Mr. Bitar answered in the affirmative.

<u>URB 2016-16; 43 E. COLLEGE AVENUE; NEW LANDSCAPING; APPLICANT: SANDRA J.</u> <u>SPETTEL.</u>

Mr. Bitar introduced the item and explained the request as a significant landscape update. He stated that the applicants have done a nice job cleaning up the building and now they want to continue with landscaping. The plan is to achieve privacy around the rear patio with landscaping. Mr. Bitar stated that he did share the plan with landscape experts on Staff and they said it was appropriate.

MISCELLANEOUS

Façade Improvements

URB 2015-13; 22 N. STATE STREET; REAR FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS; APPLICANT: JEFFRY BOWELL.

Mr. Bitar gave an update on URB 2015-13 (Talbott' Flowers building). He reminded the Board that the owner had obtained two Façade Improvement Program grants to improve the front and rear facades. There are two items on the rear that need to be addressed. The first is a light fixture that was proposed by the architect above the back door. Given the trim detail that has been installed, the building owner has informed Staff that there is not enough room to install this fixture and that there is a nearby light pole, so they would like to eliminate that fixture from the plans.

The other issue is a railing that was installed on the roof of the one-story part of the building. It was proposed in the plans to screen the mechanicals, but the one actually installed is taller than the original design and appears to be out of proportion. The vinyl railing is white (while the rest of the trim is off-white) and is a little crooked, so Staff wanted to discuss with the Board whether it would be better to simply remove it. Mr. Bitar showed pictures of the building before and after the railing was installed.

Chairman Blair said his preference would be the wood one that had been approved. Ms. Law said she likes a railing, just not the one installed.

Chairman Blair stated it can easily be cut down shorter.

Ms. Law said there is paint made to adhere to plastic.

Mr. Denick preferred keeping the railing, but having them lower it, paint it the correct color, and attach it so it is not slanted. Mr. Bitar said he is going to ask about making it turn that corner as well.

Mr. Denick said the rest of the work really improves the back of that building.

Mr. Whitehead referenced the light and asked if there is an option to mount lights on either side of the door as it seems like a missed opportunity.

Mr. Reschke asked if there is supposed to be egress lighting, stating that if it were a new build, that would be required. Mr. Bitar said he will ask the Building Division.

<u>Northstar Café Brick</u> <u>URB 2014-10; 109 S. STATE STREET (NORTHSTAR CAFÉ); CONSTRUCTION OF NEW</u> RESTAURANT; APPLICANT: GRA+D ARCHITECTS LLC.

Mr. Bitar stated that when the project was approved in 2014, the applicant had proposed exterior brick with a smooth surface and some variation in color. The architect has recently informed him that the specified brick had been discontinued, so they would now like to use a textured brick that is uniform in color. The architect believes this would actually be an improvement as the color variation might have looked too busy with all the other details. Mr. Bitar showed images of the originally proposed brick as well as a picture of a mock-up wall with the proposed new brick. He stated they would like to have a smooth surface on the interior (easier to clean) and a textured surface on the exterior.

Chairman Blair asked about mortar joints. Mr. Bitar said they would use standard mortar joints with a clean, traditional look.

Mr. Denick wondered if it needed a motion.

Clerk's Note: Mr. Beeman, applicant for URB 2016-12, arrived at 7:39 p.m. and the item was heard. See above.

Mr. Whitehead moved to recess for 15 minutes to review material samples at the Northstar Cafe site; Mr. Reschke seconded the motion.

Yeas: Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Reschke, Ms. Law, Mr. Denick, Chairman Blair

Nays: None

Motion Passed: 5-0

The Board recessed at 7:43 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:59 p.m. with all members returning to the dais for the remainder of the meeting.

Chairman Blair stated they are considering the question of switching to a different brick textured on outside, smooth in the interior with gray mortar.

Mr. Whitehead moved to amend URB 2014-10 as follows:

- 1. That the brick color and texture be changed as presented (textured exterior with a uniform color), smooth interior and gray mortar.
- Mr. Denick seconded the motion.

Yeas:	Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Denick, Mr. Reschke, Ms. Law, Chairman Blair
Nays:	None

Motion Passed: 5-0

Chairman Blair adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:01 p.m.

Ĵ

Dennis Blair, Chairman

itan Alles Bassem Bitar, Secretary