City of Avondale Estates, GA

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Monday, August 6, 2018
7:00 p.m.
Action Minutes

Members Present: **David Sacks, Chair**
Frank Brown
Christine McMahan
Kathleen Minnix
Peter Yoxall
Debbie Toole, Consultant

Staff Present: **Caryl Layton**
Ken Morris

Item 1. Meeting Called to Order:

- David Sacks called the meeting to order.

Item 2. Approval of minutes from July 2, 2018.

- Christine McMahan made a motion to approve the minutes.
- Kathleen Minnix seconds the motion.
- All are in favor.

Item 3. Old Business: None

Item 4. New Business:

- Wells and Hobbs Streets – Avondale Residential/Inline Communities – Construct six new townhouse buildings with a total of 33 residential units in two phases of development.
  - Jason Braga, John Davis, Lionel Johnson, were present at this meeting.
  - Jason Braga presented an overview of the project.
  - Debbie Toole delivered the review of the consultant's report prior to discussion.
  - Commission and applicant had discussion about overall height, materials, front and rear elevations, and lack of windows on the first level side elevation.
  - David Sacks opened the floor for public comment/discussion.

- Peter Yoxall made a motion to defer a decision until the September 5 meeting when revised design drawings with adjustments to elevations would be presented.
- Christine McMahan seconds the motion.
- All were in favor.

- Maple Multi-Family Land SE, L.P. – Justin Adams - Construct a 286-unit apartment complex with street-level retail space and rear parking garage. Seven existing buildings currently on the site were approved for demolition by the ARB at the June 2018 meeting.
  - Justin Adams, Jason Gadsden, Jay Silverman, were present at this meeting.
  - Jay Silverman with TCR delivered an introduction to the project mainly speaking on the architectural aspects of design and materials. He noted the design team's incorporation of the City's Tudor architecture in the resubmitted design.
  - Debbie Toole delivered the review of the consultant's report prior to discussion.
  - The Commission discussed aspects of the development and made remarks on bulleted items noted in the consultant's report as it related to the project. The discussion included the topics of height and scale, façade as it relates to the Gateway area, architecture, building materials and landscape.
  - David Sacks opened the floor for public comment/discussion. The public spoke about noted concerns mentioned in prior meetings that had still not been addressed by the applicant. Scale, density, design and development footprint were repeated concerns from attendees of the meeting.
  - Peter Yoxall made a motion to deny approval based on the property not being compatible with the commercial district as a result of scale, including, height and footprint concerns, the unfocused architectural design of the façade of the entire building, and the concerns with respect to the landscape plan, including, the lack of greenspace.
  - Christine McMahan seconds the motion.
  - All were in favor.

Item 5. Other items deemed appropriate for discussion:

- Charles Welch - 2700 East College Avenue – Internally illuminated ground monument sign & projecting blade sign for the Willis at Avondale Estates. (Sam's Crossing)
  - Charles Welch and Corey Anderson, were present at this meeting.
  - The applicant presented several variations of proposed signage for discussion. The signage is to be installed at the Willis - Avondale Estates apartment homes at 2700 East College Avenue. Requested feedback was provided to the applicant regarding design, location

and illumination. The applicant will submit a formal application to be included on the September 5 agenda of the ARB.

Item 6. Adjournment:

- Christine McMahan made a motion to adjourn.
- Kathleen Minnix seconds the motion.
- All were in favor.

NOTE: Due to the inadvertent failure of the recording device used during these proceedings, a complete audio recording is not available. A written recall of events submitted by individuals who attended the meeting have been submitted and included in these minutes as SUPPLEMENT A, B, C, D, E.

Applicant: Maple Multi-Family Land SE, L.P./Justin Adams

Property Address: 2740 East College Avenue

Property Type: New Multi-Family Residential Construction with First-Floor Commercial, Central Business District, Western Gateway/extended Ingleside Area

Project Summary: The proposed project for this site is to construct a 286-unit apartment complex with street-level retail space and rear parking garage. Seven existing buildings currently on the site were approved for demolition by the ARB at the June 2018 meeting.

Applicable Guidelines: *ARB Design Guidelines – Site (Placement, Orientation, Scale, Footprint), pp. 12-21; Structure (Form, Materials, Openings, Details), pp. 24-33; Setting (Streetfront, Streetscape, Landscape, Illumination, Parking), pp. 36-47*

Analysis: The project proposes to construct a 286-unit apartment complex, with street-level retail space and a rear parking garage, on an L-shaped, 3.935-acre site that fronts onto East College Avenue to the south, the rail line to the north, Hillyer Avenue to the west, and the north portion of Maple Street to the east. The site currently contains 7 buildings that have been approved for demolition for the re-development. Around the existing buildings, much of the site is currently covered with concrete and asphalt; grassed areas exist between some of the buildings and along the rail line at the rear of the site. The site slopes downward from East College Avenue at the front to the rail line at the rear.

The proposed new construction will consist of two apartment buildings connected with a multi-story parking garage. Building 1000, the larger of the two apartment buildings, will front onto East College Avenue, with its west side elevation along Hillyer Avenue. The south front elevation of Building 1000 will consist of two sections with a recessed courtyard between them. The section at the corner of East College and Hillyer will be three stories in height; the street level will contain retail space. The other section will be four stories in height and will contain the fitness/amenity space for residents at street level with no streetfront access. Behind these two front sections, the building height will increase to five stories; the site will be stepped down to the rear to help minimize the effect of the increased building height on the street-front elevation. An interior courtyard with pool will be located in the center of Building 1000 and will not be visible from the exterior.

The parking garage will be located behind Building 1000 at the rear of the site. Entrances to the garage will be located off Hillyer Avenue on the west side and off a new drive extending along the north rear edge of the site. Apartments will hide the garage's west and east end elevations. The garage will be open and visible on the north side facing the rail line.

Building 2000 will be located at the east end of the parking garage; its north elevation will face the rail line, and its east elevation will face Maple Street. This building will also be five stories in height.

The three- and four-story front-elevation sections of Building 1000 fronting onto East College and Hillyer will contain retail and resident fitness/amenity spaces on the first floor; these spaces will have traditional aluminum-frame (dark bronze) storefront windows and entrance doors (no exterior entrance doors in fitness/amenity space) and will be finished with red brick veneer. A flat metal canopy will extend over the retail storefronts in the three-story section. The residential floors above the storefronts will contain vinyl-clad windows and fiberglass balcony doors; the exterior walls will be finished with a mix of horizontal wood siding, horizontal fiber cement siding, and fiber cement board-and-batten panels. The material color palette will include medium and dark browns, light and dark grays, and brownish red. Balconies will be protected with flat metal canopy roofs; metal balcony railings will have metal mesh panels.

The five-story building sections of both Building 1000 and Building 2000 will also contain vinyl-clad windows and fiberglass balcony doors and will be finished with a mix of horizontal wood siding, horizontal fiber cement siding, and fiber cement board-and-batten panels. Balconies will have flat metal canopy roofs/floors, and the metal balcony railings will have vertical aluminum pickets. Both apartment buildings will have flat roofs finished with TPO roofing behind parapet walls. The parking garage will be constructed of poured concrete.

The site's street frontage along East College Avenue will contain an 8-foot wide concrete sidewalk with planting areas between the sidewalk and the street curb. Behind the sidewalk and between Building 1000's two front sections, a recessed courtyard paved with concrete will provide outdoor eating and gathering space for the public and residents. The courtyard will be outlined with low granite retaining walls and planting areas, including a river rock bed and raised planters. At the corner of East College and Hillyer, a concrete area with red brick veneer retaining walls and concrete steps will provide access from the sidewalk to the first-floor retail space. Street furniture will include metal benches, trash receptacles, and bicycle racks.

Along Hillyer Avenue and the building's west side elevation, board-formed concrete retaining walls will support a concrete ADA-accessible ramp and a service ramp. A 5-foot wide sidewalk will extend along Hillyer; planting areas will be located along the building's west elevation, including bump-out areas for street trees. On-street parking will be located along Hillyer between the street trees. The main entry into the parking garage will be from Hillyer.

Along the site's north rear edge, a new 22-foot wide drive will connect Hillyer Avenue and Maple Street and provide a second entry point into the parking garage. A 7-foot wide sidewalk and planting areas will extend along this new drive and the complex's north rear elevation. A sidewalk and planting areas will also extend along Maple Street at the east end of Building 2000; a sidewalk into the interior of the property will lead to a garden courtyard. An open space amenity will be located adjacent to Maple Street; an existing wall and fence will remain in place in this area to separate existing properties from the new complex. Planting areas and grassed areas will extend along the entire east side of the property.

All existing trees on the site will be removed. Along the East College Avenue street frontage, street trees will be planted behind the sidewalk. Understory street trees will be planted between the sidewalk and the street curb. Additional understory trees will be planted around the recessed courtyard. Along Hillyer Avenue, street trees will be planted in bump-out planting areas between street parking areas. Additional street trees will be located along the rear elevation and along Maple Street.

Street light poles will be located along East College Avenue, the new rear drive, and Maple Street. The cast aluminum poles will be 14'-6" tall with a black finish; the lighting fixtures will be mounted on a curved arm. Wall lights will be mounted on exterior walls at the recessed courtyard.

The *ARB Design Guidelines* include the following guidelines for new construction in the *Gateway* and *Warehouse* character areas that apply to this proposed project:

Site

The proposed site plan should reflect the community's traditional context and development pattern, specifically in terms of placement, orientation, scale, and footprint; preserve community-valued landscape features; incorporate and reference community-valued architecture; reflect the community's overall quality of development; reinforce and establish a traditional façade line and a pedestrian-friendly site; and consider and implement creative site planning alternatives.

- Placement – The site should reflect the community's traditional pattern of placement with a consistent façade line which delineates the street and prioritizes the pedestrian. *Gateway* character guidelines recommend a zero lot line along East College Avenue. Along secondary and tertiary streets, and in *Warehouse* character areas, larger breaks in the façade line or alternative setbacks may be considered for established natural features or site amenities. Use corner lots to mark the façade lines for both frontages.
    - The placement of Building 1000 along East College Avenue, with two front-elevation sections placed approximately parallel to the street, set back slightly from the zero lot line, and separated by a recessed courtyard, still presents a consistent façade line along the street. The recessed courtyard creates a break in the façade line, but the façade line is defined at the courtyard by street trees and landscaping. Drives into the complex are located on Hillyer Avenue and at the rear of the site. Building setback from the public sidewalk ranges from 10 to 22 feet along East College. The corner of the site at East College and Hillyer avenues is delineated by the building elevation along each street, emphasizing the street intersection. Sidewalks along the streets and within the complex, the recessed public courtyard just behind the East College sidewalk, and marked pedestrian crossings at the entrances to the parking garage create a pedestrian-friendly environment.
- Orientation – New buildings should be oriented with the front elevation and primary entrances toward the street.
    - The proposed Building 1000 is appropriately oriented with its front elevations toward East College Avenue and its main side elevation along Hillyer Avenue. The corner building placement is emphasized by the detailing of the front and side elevations of Building 1000's front corner section, including entrances into both elevations. The other front section does not include a primary entrance facing East College Avenue, although the detailing matches that of the other storefront. The parking garage is appropriately located at the rear of the complex and is out of sight from both Hillyer Avenue and Maple Street.
- Scale – New construction should maintain and reinforce the established scale of two-story buildings, particularly along primary street frontages in *Gateway* areas. However, building heights may be increased away from the primary street elevation provided there is diminished visibility of the building, and in non-frontage locations. New construction in *Warehouse* areas may be up to three stories in height.

- The proposed Building 1000 is three- and four-stories high along the primary street frontage of East College Avenue, higher than is recommended by the ARB guidelines. The remainder of the building increases in height to five stories behind the two front sections. To compensate for the increased height, the first five-story section of the building is set back behind the 3- and 4-story front sections. Then, the site is stepped down so that the roof height of the building's rear section is equal to or lower than the roof height of the front sections. Building 2000 is also five stories high but is in a non-frontage location.
- The 2014 Downtown Master Plan Update states that Multifamily Residential developments may be up to 5 stories in height, particularly in the Northern Gateway area where topography is lower; Mixed Use developments may be 3 to 4 stories in height. (2014 Downtown Master Plan Update, p. 69) The Plan also states that large-scale redevelopment opportunities exist in the Western Gateway area and that buildings along US 278 (East College) may be one-story in height, but buildings farther north adjacent to the rail line may be 3 to 4 stories in height. (2014 Downtown Master Plan Update, p. 82)

- Footprint – New construction should respect the limited footprint of traditional buildings within the community, breaking up the overall building mass to appear as multiple buildings.
    - The proposed complex consists of one large building with connected parking garage and a separate but still connected building at the rear, creating one very large building footprint. The two separate and smaller sections of Building 1000's front elevation along East College Avenue help give the appearance of more traditionally sized building footprints and of multiple buildings. The remainder of the building is divided into multiple sections, somewhat reflecting multiple buildings along a street. The existing street grid is maintained, as there appear to be no other streets or alleys within the block.

<u>Structure</u>

The proposed architectural design should reflect the community's traditional context and built environment, specifically in terms of form, materials, openings, and details; incorporate and reference community-valued architecture, including traditional building materials and significant design elements; reflect the same overall quality of construction as the existing built environment; and reflect the limited scale of buildings and pedestrian character of the community and minimize the visual impact of larger-scaled structures and utilitarian appurtenances.

- Form – In *Gateway* character areas, use traditional building forms, matching the visual character of the community's traditional buildings in terms of vertical emphasis. Traditional or modern building forms may be used in *Warehouse* character areas. Parapet roof forms are appropriate.
    - The proposed front-elevation sections of Building 1000 that front onto East College Avenue reflect traditional commercial building forms with a vertical emphasis and a traditional commercial visual character that includes street-level storefronts and upper-level windows. The proposed parapet roof form is appropriate.
    - The first-floor storefront windows continue along a portion of the Hillyer Avenue elevation of Building 1000, maintaining the appropriate traditional commercial building appearance. The remainder of the Hillyer Avenue side elevation has a more residential appearance on the first floor but continues to have large expanses

of windows and balcony doors. Upper floors have window and balcony door openings. Building 2000 has the same residential appearance.

- Materials – Use brick and mortar, particularly on primary streets in *Gateway* areas, and reflect the community's traditional color palette. Avoid the use of half-timbering, out-of-scale modular materials, and synthetic substitutes. The use of new or innovative materials may be considered, particularly in *Warehouse* areas. Parapets with hidden roof materials are appropriate.
    - The proposed front-elevation sections of Building 1000 will be finished with red brick veneer on the first floor only; the upper floors will be finished with a mix of horizontal wood siding, horizontal fiber cement siding, and fiber cement board-and-batten panels. The remaining sections of the buildings will be finished with a similar mix of horizontal wood siding, horizontal fiber cement siding, and fiber cement board-and-batten panels. The use of red brick on the first-floor storefronts facing East College Avenue is appropriate. The use of horizontal wood siding, particularly unpainted, is not a traditional siding material for commercial buildings. Fiber cement siding and board-and-batten panels are new materials that may be considered appropriate.
    - Storefront frames on the front-elevation sections will be aluminum. Windows will be vinyl (no further information is provided for proposed windows). Exterior balcony and entrance doors will be fiberglass. All storefront, window, and door frames will be dark bronze in color. Aluminum storefront frames in a dark color are appropriate. Vinyl windows are not acceptable unless shown to be of a type that will give the same profile and appearance as aluminum- or wood-frame windows.
    - The material color palette will include medium and dark browns, light and dark grays, dark bronze, and brownish red. This color palette reflects the community's traditional color palette, with the exception of the unpainted wood siding.
    - TPO roofing materials will be hidden by parapet walls. The parapet walls will be capped with metal which is appropriate.
- Openings – New construction should reflect traditional commercial building fenestration, with storefront windows at the street level and regularly spaced, residentially-scaled openings on upper stories. For new commercial buildings in the *Gateway* character area fronting onto East College Avenue and Avondale Road, fenestration at the sidewalk level should be at least 75% (80% preferred) of the front façade width and at least 7 feet in height. Extend fenestration at least 25% of the building depth along the side elevation from the front façade. Avoid solid wall sections more than 25 feet in length. Traditional or alternative storefront configurations at sidewalk level may be considered. On upper-floor levels, use a solid-to-void ratio approaching 4-to-3 for single windows, and respect the existing alignment and patterns of upper-floor windows. Alterative window configurations, such as recessed openings and modern balconies, may be considered in *Warehouse* character areas.
    - The three-story front section of Building 1000 at the corner of East College and Hillyer has street-level storefront windows along both East College and Hillyer; these windows are approximately 9 feet in height and make up 93% of the wall area facing East College and 75% of the wall area facing Hillyer (based on fenestration calculations provided). The four-story front section of Building 1000 facing East College also has street-level storefront windows (no exterior entrances) that are approximately 7 feet in height and make up approximately 82% of the wall area (calculated from drawings provided). These storefront

window areas are appropriate for buildings facing East College. Both front sections of Building 1000 have storefront windows continued along the side elevations to more than 25% of the building section's depth. Long solid wall sections are avoided.

  - The upper-floor rows of windows on the front sections of Building 1000 reflect the traditional alignment and patterns of upper-floor windows in the central business district. On the elevations facing East College, the windows are grouped in threes, and the outer-most window bays extend outward to reference bay windows found in the Tudor Village. The ratio of solid-to-void for upper-floor openings on the front elevations is not calculated.
  - The remainder of the east side elevation of Building 1000 along Hillyer Avenue has both storefront and alternative storefront (floor-length windows with patio door) configurations at the street level and on the upper floors. The use of alternative storefront configurations is appropriate in this non-frontage area. The fenestration pattern continues to reflect existing alignments and patterns. The fenestration ratio for the residential section is 58% for the Hillyer Avenue elevation and 49% for the Building 2000 elevations (based on fenestration calculations provided). Balconies are located along all elevations, including the East College Avenue front elevations.

- Details – New construction should reflect the City's traditional architectural details, particularly in terms of type, placement, and degree, in *Gateway* areas. Use modern interpretations of Tudor Revival details to articulate buildings in a manner similar to traditional buildings, particularly along East College Avenue and Avondale Road. Use architectural details to emphasize a building's roofline and/or corners, around windows and entrances, and to emphasize story divisions, particularly between the storefront level and upper stories. Use of modern and creative details is appropriate for *Warehouse* areas.
  - Proposed building details reflect traditional architectural details in some areas, while other proposed details are more modern. The use of red brick around the street-level storefront spaces emphasizes the first-floor retail space; continuing the brick around the corner and along the Hillyer Avenue elevation emphasizes the corner location. The red brick also delineates the first-floor storefront area from the upper floors, as traditional commercial buildings do. Window groupings are emphasized with different materials from the surrounding wall areas. The use of vertical fins to separate various portions of the building's side elevations is a more modern detail. The buildings' rooflines are not emphasized with traditional cornices but simply end in a parapet cap.
  - Some of the proposed building details reflect modern interpretations of Tudor Revival details, such as the grouping of windows, the outward extension of window groups to reflect bay windows, and the use of "board-and-batten" panels around window groups to reflect half-timbering.

<u>Setting</u>

The proposed setting and landscape design should reflect the community's traditional context and established natural environment; preserve community-valued landscape features and incorporate them in an integral fashion; reflect the same overall quality as in the existing community environment; and create an attractive and inviting setting for the proposed structure and minimize the negative impact of utilitarian appurtenances.

- Streetfront – Maintain traditional commercial-type building forms, with open first-floor storefronts to invite customers into retail spaces, and upper-floor rows of windows that reflect upper-floor use. Signs should be appropriate materials and only externally lit.

    - The proposed building sections with frontage along East College and Hillyer avenues are designed to appear as traditional commercial buildings even though the large majority of the space will be residential use. These sections have a traditional commercial building form, with first-floor storefronts, a distinction between the first floor and upper floors, and upper-floor rows of windows, presenting a streetfront design that is appealing to pedestrians. The recessed courtyard between the two front sections invites pedestrians and customers into the buildings. Even though the east-most front section does not have an outside entrance but houses amenity space for residents, the outward appearance is that of a storefront.
    - A flat metal storefront awning is proposed over the retail space storefront between the storefront windows and transom area, in the traditional location of awnings. Metal awnings or flat canopies are considered appropriate for industrially-styled properties.
    - Proposed signage for the retail spaces is shown in perspective drawings above the storefronts in the traditional sign area. No information is given on signage for the residential complex.
    - HVAC units will be located on the buildings' roofs and hidden by parapet walls.
- Streetscape – Streetscape elements between the buildings and the street should create a pedestrian-friendly "outdoor room."
    - The proposed streetscape between Building 1000 and East College and Hillyer avenues will include sidewalks along the length of the property on both streets; ADA-accessible ramp and service ramp; a paved area between the sidewalk and retail spaces as well as the Leasing/Amenity apartment entrance; and a recessed courtyard with outdoor dining and gathering space. These streetscape amenities will provide an inviting, accessible, and pedestrian-friendly environment. Street furniture will include benches, trash receptacles, and bicycle racks and will be consistent with City design standards.
    - Sidewalks along the new rear drive, along Maple Street, and within the complex will provide a pedestrian-friendly environment.
- Landscape - The existing tree canopy should be protected. Open spaces should be provided. Plantings should enhance architectural features, strengthen vistas, and provide shade. Achieve unity of landscape design by use of a somewhat limited palette and repetition but diversify plantings to avoid wholesale loss of a specific species. Walkways should be brick, concrete, or stone.
    - The few existing trees on the property will be removed. Street trees will be planted behind the sidewalk along East College, in bump-out planting areas along Hillyer, and behind the sidewalk along the rear drive and Maple Street. Understory trees will be planted between the sidewalk and street curb. Additional planting areas and raised planters will be located around the recessed courtyard and along the buildings' front elevations. The proposed trees and plantings along East College and Hillyer will provide a pleasantly landscaped and inviting area for pedestrians.
    - Two additional open landscaped spaces will be provided for residents – one accessible from Maple Street and the second between Buildings 1000 and 2000.
    - Proposed sidewalks, the recessed courtyard, and walkways within the complex will all be concrete, as recommended. Additional hardscape features and materials include tumbled granite retaining walls, a river rock bed, and brick veneer retaining walls and planters; all of these materials are appropriate.

- Illumination – Use lighting to highlight on-site pedestrian crossings, parking, and open spaces. Limit pole height and use night-sky protective fixtures. For supplemental zones, use adjacent wall fixtures or decorative poles. On the building, use fixtures appropriate to the building's architectural design; wall-washing lighting fixtures are recommended.
    - Street light poles and fixtures will be cast aluminum with a black finish; poles will be 14'-6" tall; lighting fixtures will be mounted on a curved arm and will be a downward-facing cone shape. Wall-washing lights will be mounted on exterior walls at the recessed courtyard and will face downward. These street and wall lights are appropriate.
- Parking – Locate parking areas in side and rear yards, avoiding off-street parking in front of primary buildings. Provide for inter-connectivity between parking lots and pedestrian access to adjacent properties; utilize pedestrian crossings. Utilize perimeter and interior landscaped areas to mitigate visibility of paved areas. Provide for overstory trees in parking areas.
    - Proposed parking for apartment complex residents will be provided in a parking garage located at the rear of the complex and hidden from view along Hillyer Avenue and Maple Street by apartment buildings. The parking garage will only be visible from the rear drive. Sidewalks provide pedestrian connectivity from the parking garage to the remainder of the property and adjacent properties.
    - Additional on-street parking will be available along Hillyer Avenue. This parking will be visually mitigated with street trees located in bump-out planting areas.
    - Pedestrian crossings at the entrances to the parking garage on Hillyer Avenue and the rear drive will be appropriately marked for safe crossing.

Recommendation: Based on the *ARB Design Guidelines*, approval of the proposed project is recommended if the ARB finds that the following items are appropriate and meet the ARB guidelines:

- Is the buildings' three- to five-story height appropriate for this *Western Gateway* and *Warehouse* character area?
- Is the one very large building footprint appropriate for this area?
- Is the delineated façade line along East College Avenue, with setback and recessed courtyard, acceptable as a *Western Gateway* property?
- Does the buildings' architectural design reflect the City's traditional built environment and architecture?
- Are the proposed vinyl windows appropriate for the buildings? Additional information such as window profile and frame size should be provided.
- Are unpainted horizontal wood siding, fiber cement board-and-batten panels, and horizontal fiber cement lap siding appropriate finish materials in the *Gateway* area?
- Is the landscape plan appropriate?
- What type and design of signage will be installed to identify the complex?

---

*Reviewed by WLA Studio. This review is based on materials received by the applicant at the time of review. New information from the applicant and/or a site visit to the subject property may amend the recommendation.

SUPPLEMENT A

Submitted Wednesday, August 15, 2018 8:53am

By Debbie Toole

City of Avondale Estates
Architectural Review Board
August 6, 2018 Meeting

Meeting Notes

Applicant: Maple Multi-Family Land SE, L.P./Justin Adams

Property Address: 2740 East College Avenue

David Sacks, ARB Chair, laid out procedures for ARB's discussion and consideration of the project; noted bullet list of questions to be considered by the ARB in COA Application Review Recommendation to be discussed item by item.

Summary of proposed project given by Applicant.

Summary of COA Application Review given by Debbie Toole, WLA Studio, Consultant:

- Brief proposed project description; project located in both *Western Gateway*/extended Ingleside (*Warehouse*) character areas.
- Summary of ARB Design Guidelines – Site, Structure, Setting – that apply to this project; generally how the project meets/does not meet these guidelines.

The following questions were discussed by the ARB:

- Is the buildings' three- to five-story height appropriate for this *Western Gateway* and *Warehouse* character areas? The following remarks were made:
    - Three- to four-story height overall, rather than five-story, would be better.
    - Five-story height farther back on the lot may be okay.
    - Large scale of the project is an issue.
- Is the one very large building footprint appropriate for this area?
    - The very large footprint was discussed in earlier meetings, but the designers did not take earlier comments into consideration and did not address the footprint issue.
    - South City project is not to be considered as a template for future development.
- Is the delineated façade line along East College Avenue, with setback and recessed courtyard, acceptable as a *Western Gateway* property?
    - Proposed delineated façade line along East College considered acceptable.
- Does the buildings' architectural design reflect the City's traditional built environment and architecture?
    - Appreciation was expressed for designers making an attempt to scale down the buildings at the streetfront and to incorporate elements from the City's traditional architecture.

    - However, the design looks like too many other developments in other communities.
    - Too many materials are used; "lots going on."
    - Long expanses of facades are not broken up enough.
    - Design would be better if there were not so many different designs/elements.
    - Proposed design/scale seem overwhelming.
    - The main problem is the large scale of the project.
    - The design appears as large "blocks" put together.
- Are the proposed vinyl windows appropriate for the buildings?
    - Vinyl windows may be appropriate if they are commercial grade with appropriate depth/profile.
- Are unpainted horizontal wood siding, fiber cement board-and-batten panels, and horizontal fiber cement lap siding appropriate finish materials in the *Gateway* area?
    - Too many materials in the design.
    - More brick on the first and second floors would be more in keeping with Avondale Estates.
    - Use 1 or 2 materials rather than so many.
    - Less mass.
- Is the landscape plan appropriate?
    - Landscaping comment – some plantings specified as trees are not really trees, but are too small.
    - Streetscape – needs to be adjusted to match what is being built; more room is needed for mature trees.

Public comments from the audience were then invited. The following comments were made/items were discussed:

- Streetfront – 10-foot thruway needed.
- Walkability – very important to make the project fit into the community and provide interaction between community and development.
- More non-residential development is needed on both streetfronts.
- More interaction needed at street-level.
- Rear street discussed.
- Open space provided off Maple Street is very small.
- Transformers need to be screened and not be visible. Applicants noted access requirements by GA Power.
- Project is too massive.
- Needs more cohesiveness.
- Issues of large scale and footprint not addressed by designers.
- Project references larger-scale buildings near/at the MARTA station rather than the traditionally smaller-scale buildings in Avondale Estates.
- Needs an overall statement; too much going on.
- More green space and diversification of uses needed.

Motion to deny the application due to (1) scale – too large; (2) lack of coordination in design; (3) landscape plan – streetfront space, not enough open space.
Motion seconded and passed.

Meeting Notes taken by Debbie Toole, WLA Studio, Consultant

SUPPLEMENT B

Submitted Wednesday, August 15, 2018 1:39pm

By David Sacks

The TCR project architect, Jay Silverman, gave a brief introduction focused mainly on the architectural design and how the team had tried to incorporate materials that reflect Avondale Estates' existing built environment, and to lessen the industrial character of the original design, in response to comments made by the ARB in previous meetings. Examples of these design elements included the increased use of brick, especially on the College Avenue portion of the building; the introduction of wood siding on the south façade; the color choices; the window arrangements and board-and-batten material detailing that subtly recall Tudor architecture; and other elements [refer to Sheet AR-17 of the Application].

ARB consultant Debbie Toole gave a brief synopsis of her analysis of the project. [Refer to attached copy of her report.]

Chair David Sacks noted that the report concludes with a recommendation to approve the project "if the ARB finds that the following items are appropriate and meet the ARB guidelines," and that the report then lists eight bullet points of items that the ARB is asked to evaluate; David stated the Board would discuss each of the eight items, then open the floor for public comment. The Board's discussions are summarized as follows:

1. Height: Peter Yoxall stated, and all of the members agreed, that the height – in combination with the large footprint (point 2, below) – gave the project an excessive scale that was inappropriate to the district and incompatible with the guidelines. Peter expressed disappointment that the overall scale had not changed since the initial discussion of the project [February 2018] when the same concerns were noted. Christine McMahan clarified that the retail portion of the project is at a 4-story height even though it was described in the application as 3 stories [based on the first floor retail having a ceiling height equivalent to 2 stories, then having 2 stories of residential above it].
2. Footprint: As noted above the members all agreed that the large footprint was inappropriate.
3. Façade delineation along College Avenue: none of the members stated a concern that the façade setback and recessed courtyard did not exactly match the guidelines. David commented that although the courtyard creates a break in the façade, he felt the façade treatment in combination with the streetscape design created a well-defined edge, which is consistent with the intent of the guidelines, and was therefore not a concern.
4. Architectural design: Peter and David both commented that although they appreciated the work and thought that the architects had put into trying to incorporate details and materials that were in some way taken from examples in Avondale's existing historic district and its downtown [see Sheet AR-17], but that overall the effort did not succeed in making the project seem compatible for Avondale. Peter commented that – as had been stated in the initial meeting – the project looked extremely similar to many projects going

up all over the Atlanta region. He also commented that although he appreciated all the design references to existing Avondale buildings that there were too many different styles or examples being incorporated, and that it all seemed overwhelming and not cohesive; he suggested the design would be more compatible if it limited the number of different materials and references. David added that the large scale of the building probably contributed to this effect. He felt that the team had been more successful in making the College Avenue façade feel more specific to Avondale and less generic, but that the other three sides seemed generic. Frank Brown asked for clarification that two different guardrail materials were being used and suggested that one would be better.

5. Vinyl windows: it was noted that "commercial grade" vinyl windows had been approved for South City Partners and that, even though "decisions of prior boards" are not part of ARB's considerations, that vinyl windows of similar quality might be acceptable here. More information would be needed in order to finalize this.
6. Finish materials: As noted above (point 4), the Board felt that there were too many different materials used and that the scale of the building made it difficult to come up with an arrangement of materials that seemed appropriate. Peter suggested that at the ground floor, at least, the use of brick throughout would be a better fit with Avondale. David commented that the length and breadth of areas where a single material appears, for example the areas of dark siding on the east and west elevations, seemed excessive, and that again, if the footprint were smaller and broken into more than one building, this concern could be mitigated. It was suggested that if there were two buildings and the one on College Avenue were faced with brick, while the rear building (which is in the Warehouse district) could have more modern materials, then that would be more appropriate. David noted that the consultant's report had questioned whether wood siding would be considered appropriate in the Gateway area (facing College Avenue) but the ARB did not discuss or reach a conclusion on this item.
7. Landscape plan: David noted two concerns with the landscape plan that would need to be addressed if the project were to go forward. The tree planting/furniture zone along the College Avenue curb line should be 8 feet deep to match the pattern begun with South City Partners; this is important in order to one day be able to support large canopy trees in that location. Also, small species such as Emerald Arborvitae or Oakleaf Holly should not be included as "trees" for the purposes of ARB review. He stated that the design team had done a good job creating an appropriate quality of landscape design given what space they had to work with, but that the quantity of actual usable outdoor space seemed inadequate.
8. Signage: signage was not included and was not discussed. It was noted that this could be reviewed as a subsequent/separate submittal, should the project go forward.

Public Comment: Several residents expressed concerns about the project.

Action

Peter Yoxall motion to deny the application for a COA because of the excessive mass and scale of the building; because of the uncoordinated architectural design; and because of the landscape plan. Seconded by Christine McMahan. Motion approved 5-0.

SUPPLEMENT C

Submitted Wednesday, August 15, 2018 9:25am

By Christine McMahan

The Trammel Crow application.

Debbie Toole consultant for WLA studio reviewed her consultant's report point by point with the applicant and then turned the discussion over to the board.

The board reviewed all 8 bullet points for appropriateness one by one.

- Is the buildings' three- to five-story height appropriate for this *Western Gateway* and *Warehouse* character area?

Christine asked the question was the 3-story part of the building the same height as the 4-story part of the building. TCR answered yes. The board agreed that the 4 - 5 stories of the building was not aligned with the downtown master plan. The college avenue corridor is 2-3 stories according to the Downtown Master Plan.

- Is the one very large building footprint appropriate for this area?

The ARB board was particularly concerned with the mass and scale of the building and again agreed it was not aligned with the DMP. We told TCR at previous meetings that the scale and mass were not appropriate. We discussed requesting they break up the property into smaller buildings. At earlier meetings but they made no changes.

- Is the delineated façade line along East College Avenue, with setback and recessed courtyard, acceptable as a *Western Gateway* property?

We thought the proposed delineation was acceptable.

- Does the buildings' architectural design reflect the City's traditional built environment and architecture?

We discussed the numerous architectural elements and felt it was not compatible to the neighborhood. Too many different types of surfaces making it look like a pile of legos.

- Are the proposed vinyl windows appropriate for the buildings? Additional information such as window profile and frame size should be provided.

The board discussed the approval of a vinyl window for South City and agreed that vinyl may be acceptable if similar to South City. There was no further information on window type offered by TCR

- Are unpainted horizontal wood siding, fiber cement board-and-batten panels, and horizontal fiber cement lap siding appropriate finish materials in the *Gateway* area?

The Board thought all the different architectural elements represented in the drawings were too much for the district. We understood what TCR was trying to accomplish but thought it was "too much going on" for Avondale. We felt that a mostly brick façade was more appropriate

- Is the landscape plan appropriate?

The board did not find many issues with the landscape design. David Sacks recommend TCR pay close attention to plant material specified as trees when they are actually shrubs.

- What type and design of signage will be installed to identify the complex?

I don't really remember much discussion on this item.

Peter Yoxall made a motion to deny the application and the board voted 5 – 0 in favor of denial.

SUPPLEMENT D

Submitted Wednesday, August 15, 2018 5:31am

By Frank Brown

Representatives from Trammell Crow came up and were seated.

I believe it was their architect (the man seated closest to me) said that he may have to leave early as he had to catch a flight. So, if he left before the discussion was over, please do not think he was angry and storming out. I told him that I understand.

Debbie then read the application and her review.

I cannot remember what the segue was (I believe it was when Peter voiced his disappointment on the generic material use and design), but I asked if there were in fact two types of metal materials being used for the balcony rails.

I believe David talked about certain "trees not being trees" pertaining to the landscape plan.

I'm 90% sure that someone on the ARB as well as someone during public comment mentioned that the E. College first floor was closer to 1 1/2 stories on the bottom level, making it actually 3 1/2 stories on the South elevation.

We opened it up for public comment.

David then said, because he was chair, it may be more appropriate for someone else to open it up for a motion/vote.

Peter put a motion on the floor for denial based on the inappropriate height, inappropriate footprint, and generic material not respectful of Avondale Estates. (Those were not his exact words, but the meaning is the same).

Either Christine or Kathleen seconded the motion, and we all voted for denial, unanimously.

At one point during the meeting, the one rep. next to me did in fact leave early.

As the rest of the T.C. reps were leaving, David basically told, I believe Justin, that he was sorry we couldn't make this work and maybe in the future they could submit something doable. Again, not an exact quote. There was no comment from any of the reps.

I hope this helps,

Frank

SUPPLEMENT E

Submitted Wednesday, August 15, 2018 9:43am

By Peter Yoxall

My motion for denial was based on the property not being compatible with the commercial district as a result of scale, including, height and footprint concerns, the unfocused architectural design of the façade of the entire building, and the concerns with respect to the landscape plan, including, the lack of greenspace.

Below are some additional notes about the meeting:

- The applicant did not respond on the night to any concerns raised by the public or the board.
- The public raised concerns as to scale, height, and massing of the commercial district. The public also raised concerns that the applicant had not addressed any of the concerns raised at previous meetings. I specifically concurred with that opinion.
- Height and Footprint Concerns: I specifically discussed concerns with the height of the building in light of board approving the Sam's Crossing project as a unique project approved at the height as a result of its location at the gateway to the city, with the intent that the rest of the commercial district be at a lower height of 2-3 stories, which is more compatible with the existing commercial district and the overall plan. I also specifically discussed concerns with the footprint in light of the building being one singular building and the massing affect that this has. I pointed out that the applicant may have tried to reduce the massing effect by having recessed facades and a multitude of various designs; however, I suggested that in my opinion the design had the opposite effect and created a massing effect
- Unfocused architectural design of the façade: I raised concerns over the unfocused architectural design of the design. I pointed out that the applicant had made an effort to try and incorporate many architectural designs in the residential and commercial district; however, my concern was that the result was an unfocused design that was not compatible with the neighborhood and resulted in a massing effect and the overall appearance of the property to look like a block of different colored lego blocks, which was not compatible with the neighborhood. I suggested that the architect focus on two or three architectural designs from the neighborhood that would be compatible with the commercial district. I also suggested that Avondale Estates was unlike other neighborhoods and deserved a more "unique" design as Avondale is unique and that the stock design of the applicable was not compatible with the commercial district.