



Entrance Corridor Review Board
Review of Certificate of Appropriateness for 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue

Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Date of Planning Commission Meeting: February 14, 2023

Project Planner: Matt Alfele

Date of Hearing: February 14, 2023

Application Number: P22-0133

Zoning: R-3 Residential with Entrance Corridor Overlay (Fontaine Ave/JPA; Sub-area C.)

Tax Parcels: 17-104, 17-103, 17-103.1 (Note: 17-104 is not within the EC Overlay.)

Site Acreage: 1.7 acres (74,531 sq ft)

ERB Staff report prepared by: Jeff Werner, AICP, Preservation and Design Planner

Submittal: Mitchel/Matthews Architects & Planners drawings for *2005 Jefferson Park Avenue Entrance Corridor Review Application*, dated December 20, 2022: Sheets 1 (cover) through 76.

Relevant Code Section

The Planning Commission serves as the Entrance Corridor Review Board (*ERB*), responsible for administering the design review process in entrance corridor overlay districts (*EC*). This development project requires a site plan, and therefore also requires a Certificate of Appropriateness (*CoA*), pursuant to the provisions of Section 34-309(a)(3) of the City's Zoning Ordinance. The ERB shall act on an application within 60 days of the submittal date, and shall either approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application. Appeal would be to City Council.

Standards for considering certificates of appropriateness

Per Section 34-310, in reviewing a CoA application the ERB must consider certain features and factors in determining the appropriateness of proposed construction, alteration, etc. of buildings or structures located within an EC. The five primary criteria in Section 34-310 are:

- 1) Overall architectural design, form, and style of the subject building or structure, including, but not limited to: the height, mass and scale;
- 2) Exterior architectural details and features of the subject building or structure;
- 3) Texture, materials and color of materials proposed for use on the subject building or structure;
- 4) Design and arrangement of buildings and structures on the subject site; and
- 5) The extent to which the features and characteristics described within paragraphs (1)-(4), above, are architecturally compatible (or incompatible) with similar features and

characteristics of other buildings and structures having frontage on the same EC street(s) as the subject property.

Links to EC Design Guidelines

[EC Design Guidelines Chapter I - Introduction](#)

[EC Design Guidelines Chapter II - Streetscape](#)

[EC Design Guidelines Chapter III - Site](#)

[EC Design Guidelines Chapter IV - Buildings](#)

[EC Design Guidelines Chapter V - Corridors](#)

Summary of CoA Request

Applicant requests a CoA to construct a brick and stucco building composed of a five-story, U-shaped, two-wing building surrounding a central courtyard and set atop a two-story brick foundation [or podium] of approximately 150-ft (at JPA) and 312-ft (at the sides). Each wing is approximately 62-feet wide separated by a roughly 30-ft wide courtyard.

The site slopes downhill, approximately 30-feet, from the NW corner on Observatory Avenue to the SE corner at JPA and Washington Avenue. As such, the seven-story primary façade (at JPA) is reduced to a five-story elevation at the NW corner and a six-story elevation at the NE corner.

Viewed from JPA, the primary facade is composed of a two-story, brick foundation with punched windows. (Set behind sidewalk-level, walled patios, this elevation forms the primary entrance.) At the east corner, the foundation continues along Washington Avenue, receding into the grade to a single story. At the west corner, the foundation continues along Observatory Avenue, receding into the grade completely. Above the foundation, the primary facade of the east wing features a three-story, brick tower extending from the foundation below. Setback from this façade, the wing rises to five-stories, featuring brick and stucco sections with punched windows. The primary façade of the east wing also features a three-story, brick tower, but setback from the foundation wall, behind an elevated terrace and pool area. The side elevation mimics the east wing, but being lower into the grade than the east wing allows for a series of first-floor entrances with low-walled porches.

The two wings enclose an inner courtyard, which, elevated two stories above JPA, conceals the interior parking area below it. At the rear wall (north), the two wings join, completing the U. (The rear wall continues the same design; however, it is not visible from the EC.)

[Staff note: Plan view shown on sheets 44 and 49 are for context only re: landscaping and site lighting. The plan view on sheet 13 is the *formal* plan relative to the footprint and architectural elements. If, during site plan and/or building permit review, there are minor variations re: wall locations and architectural elements, staff will defer to the elevations on sheets 15, 18, 21 and 24.]

Building materials:

- Foundation/Podium: Red brick (Sheet 42)
- Walls:
 - Red brick (Sheet 42)
 - Stucco, painted (Sheet 42)
- Windows: PlyGem PVC, single hung, 1/1, insulated glass. Color: Black units and white units; varies per wall section. (Sheet 43)
- Panels and mullions between windows: Cement board, painted.
- Large windows and entry doors: Commercial, metal-framed storefront with clear glass. [Staff note: Recommend condition that the glass will be *clear* for all glazed entries and windows on: the podium (front and side elevations); the three-story brick towers on each wing (front, east, and west elevations); and the four porch-level entrances on the west elevation. Re: *clear* glass, refer to the attached August 2018 memo.]
- Railings, entry canopies, entry door surround: Metal, painted (Sheet 42) [Staff note: Recommend condition that any new railings—i.e., at low walls, if required during code review, etc.—will match railings at podium terrace.]
- Parapet coping: Metal cap

Landscaping:

- Plantings: (all on City tree list)
 - Willow Oak
 - London Plane Tree
 - Witch Hazel
 - Sweetbay Magnolia
 - Kentucky Coffeetree (alt Honey Locust)
 - Black Gum
- Landscape/terrace walls: Red brick with bluestone cap. Fieldstone with bluestone cap. (Sheets 42-45)
- Paving:
 - Entry plaza, porches on Observatory Ave., path at rear: Scored concrete, buff colored.
 - On-site walks/terraces at Observatory Ave. and Washington Ave.: Brick
- Micro-bio-filters along Observatory Avenue. (Sheet 45)

Site Lighting:

- Illuminated bollards, planting accent lights, inset wall lights and surface mounted wall lights. Per sheet 50, the noted fixtures and locations are conceptual and may vary during construction. [Staff note: Recommend a condition that the lamping for exterior lighting be dimmable, have a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and a Color Rendering Index not less than 80, preferably not less than 90. Additionally, should there be concerns expressed later related to glare, the owner will work with NDS to find a reasonable solution. Also, to prevent bright light and glare emanating from the garage, specifically at/near the Washington Avenue entrance, lamping for the garage lights will comply with the above.]

Screening:

- Mechanical equipment: Rooftop units will be screened behind the parapet.
- Sheet 44 indicates an area near the garage entrance designated for Mech Equip. [Staff note: It is unclear what might be placed here or the precise location and dimensions of the brick wall; however, if used for mechanical units, utility/service boxes, storage, trash containers, etc., it will be appropriately screened. If not by the wall, then appropriate fencing or plantings.]
- Dumpsters/trash: It is understood these will be located within the garage and pulled to the curb on collection days. (Near the garage entrance, a low wall will enclose the area noted on sheet 13, so this not intended to serve as a screened enclosure.) [Staff note: Recommend a condition establishing that dumpsters and trash and/or recycling bins will be located within the garage and pulled to the curb only on collection days.]

Public Comments Received

No public comments regarding this CoA request have been received to-date.

Staff Recommendation

Staff finds the proposed improvements are appropriate and recommends approval of the CoA with the conditions noted in the motion below.

Per the approved Special Use Permit—approved September 19, 2022, link below—the proposed building height is permitted on this site and within the modified rear setback, therefore the maximum height and footprint have been established.

[CC memo - Sept 19 2022 SUP for 2005 JPA](#)

Staff concurs with the applicant's comments:

- *Exterior material selections are predominantly brick and stucco, consistent with other buildings along the JPA corridor. The color palette falls in a compatible range. Building massing is varied, not monolithic. The scale evident in fenestration, entrances, site stairs, canopies and porches is appropriate for this district. The landscape design along JPA-- consisting of multiple terraces and plantings-- has the potential to enhance the corridor's character, creating opportunities for pedestrian comfort and interaction in a shaded environment that is a marked improvement over other student housing that fronts this corridor.*
- *Material, textures and colors are varied. Brick veneer is used both to establish a building base and to emphasize smaller scale building faces within the longer facades, an effort to differentiate volumes within the mass.*

Attached is a comprehensive review of the design guidelines, reflecting both the applicant's and staff's comments. Also attached are staff's comments from the SUP request (2021), which addressed many of the issues related to height, massing, and scale, and also clarified how staff approached the apparent conflict between the vision for this EC adopted in 2011 and the

Comprehensive Plan updated in 2021. Attached SUP memo also includes the section from the design guidelines, Chapter V, re: the Jefferson Park Avenue Entrance Corridor.

Suggested Motion

Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City's Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed design for 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue is consistent with the Guidelines and compatible with the goals of this Entrance Corridor, and that the ERB approves the Certificate of Appropriateness application as submitted, with the following conditions of approval:

- Glass will be clear, at the locations noted in the staff report.
- New railings, if required, will match the metal rail at the podium terrace.
- All exterior lighting and interior lighting visible at the garage entrance will have lamping that is dimmable, has a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and has a Color Rendering Index not less than 80, preferably not less than 90. Additionally, the owner will address any reasonable public complaints about light glare by either dimming the lamp or replacing the lamps/fixtures.
- Dumpsters and trash and/or recycling bins to be located within the garage and pulled to the curb only on collection days. If they cannot be located within the garage, they will be contained within an area near the garage entrance and will be appropriately screened. That location and screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- If used for mechanical units, utility/service boxes, storage, trash containers, the *Mech Equip* area noted on sheet 44, at the west elevation, will be appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- Any ground-level mechanical equipment and/or utility boxes will be appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- Meters and panel boxes for utility, communications, and cable connections will be located preferably within the garage; if not, then in non-prominent locations on the side elevations only and appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.

Alternate Motions

Deferral: I move to defer [or, to accept the applicant's request to defer] the Entrance Corridor Certificate of Appropriateness application for 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue.

Denial: Having considered the standards set forth within the City's Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed design for 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue is not consistent with the Guidelines and is not compatible with the goals of this Entrance Corridor, and that for the following reason(s) the ERB denies the Certificate of Appropriateness application as submitted...

Attachments

1. Applicant's submittal. Mitchel/Matthews Architects & Planners drawings for 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue Entrance Corridor Review Application, dated December 20, 2022.
2. Review of the EC design guidelines re: CoA request for 2005 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue.
3. May 10, 2022 Staff report ERB Review of Special Use Permit Request for 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue.
4. July 17, 2018 Summary of BAR Discussion re: Clear Glass.