



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT May 13, 2015

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-15-140) on the proposed renaming of Spring Street to Ted Turner Drive between West Peachtree Street and Whitehall Street.

Applicant: Friends of Ted Turner
101 Marietta Street, Suite 1010
Atlanta, GA 30303

Facts: The City Council City Utilities Committee is considering a proposal to rename a segment of Spring Street between West Peachtree Street and Whitehall Street to Ted Turner Drive. This street segment is located in the western portion of Downtown. The application by Friends of Ted Turner was forwarded to the Staff by the Office of Transportation in the Department of Public Works.

In the materials submitted with the application, no information was included regarding the origins of the name Spring Street. The Staff presumes that is named for springs that existed in that area. As more fully detailed in the submitted application materials, Ted Turner has had a distinguished career as businessman, entrepreneur, and philanthropist. Starting his career at his father's advertising company he built the company into what became Turner Broadcasting Company, a multi-faceted, international business enterprise with various subsidiaries and interests. This company was eventually sold to Time Warner, Inc. where he assumed various governance roles. In addition, his philanthropic work has included work with the United Nations, founding the Goodwill Games, advocating for nuclear non-proliferation with Senator Sam Nunn, and other initiatives. He is also well known for his ownership of the Atlanta Hawks and Atlanta Braves professional sports teams.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 138-8 of the Atlanta City Code:

(e) *Urban design commission review and comment.* All street renamings and dedications located in the City of Atlanta must be reviewed by the urban design commission and be the subject of a regularly scheduled commission meeting. In advance of such a meeting, neighborhood associations, historical groups, historic preservation groups, and other interested parties will be notified that the street renaming or dedication has been placed on the commission's agenda. After the meeting, written findings regarding the street renaming or dedication must be forwarded to the city's commissioner of its department of

public works and must be received by the commissioner before the commissioner is authorized to submit to the city council legislation authorizing the street renaming or dedication.

The naming or renaming of a street (or any other City-related facility) is a significant undertaking by the City as it is one of the few ways for a person or event to be honored by the City by giving it a potentially permanent place in the City's future and thus its history. When streets and facilities (whether from the City's founding or more recently) are considered for renaming, the Staff finds that it is not appropriate to compare the significance of the existing name to the proposed name (and by extension the people, events, or locations memorialized in those names). It is more appropriate to consider the respective honorees in relation to the era in which their significance is associated and how that significance is related to the City of Atlanta.

When taking this approach into account, the Staff finds that Ted Turner is a significant figure in the City's more recent history for several reasons. First, his media endeavors, such as CNN, Headline News, TNT, TBS, Turner Classic Movies, and Cartoon Network brought international attention to Atlanta as a news and entertainment center. Second, his ownership of two of Atlanta's professional sports teams gave national exposure and a sports identity to the City. Lastly, Mr. Turner's philanthropic work contributed to the City's reputation as a world-wide center for human and civil rights initiatives, and social change.

The Staff does have a concern that there is a substantial segment of Spring Street north of Downtown that will not be renamed which could lead to some confusion with addressing, finding locations, maps, etc.

In conclusion, the Staff finds that Ted Turner is worthy of recognition for his role in the City's more recent history and that the historic significance of Spring Street (and the spring(s) was presumably named for) should continue to be recognized as well. Further, the Staff would recommend that if a portion of Spring Street is renamed to Ted Turner Drive, that appropriate actions are taken to mitigate potential confusion between the differently-named segments of the same street corridor.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that a letter with the comments and findings of the Commission and Staff (as noted in the Staff Report) regarding the Review and Comment (RC-15-140) on the proposed renaming of Spring Street to Ted Turner Drive between West Peachtree Street and Whitehall Street are sent to the Applicant and the appropriate City agencies.



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT May 13, 2015

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-15-155) for site work and an addition at **31 Woodcrest Avenue**- Property is zoned R-4/ Brookwood Hills Conservation District.

Applicant: Gail Glozier
3763 Rogers Bridge Road, Duluth

Facts: According to the Brookwood Hills Inventory, the single-family dwelling was built in 1923 and is considered contributing.

At the December 14th meeting, the Commission reviewed and commented on application (RC-14-372) on alterations and additions.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:
Per Section 16-20.007(b) of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:

Conservation Districts Exempted: Certificates of appropriateness are not required for Conservation Districts. However, no person shall construct, alter, demolish or move, in whole or in part, any building, structure or site located within a Conservation District until the Commission shall have reviewed the proposed action(s) and made written recommendations regarding any such action to the owner(s) of the property.

Sec. 16-20.009. Same; further standards.

In deciding individual applications for certificates of appropriateness, the commission shall be guided by the purposes set forth in section 16-20.001, by findings contained in ordinances designating buildings and sites for protection, by purposes and objectives which are contained within individual Landmark and Historic District regulations, and by findings contained in reports prepared in support of Landmark and Historic District regulations as are required in article D of chapter 4 of part 6. Furthermore, in considering whether to grant approval, conditional approval or denial of an application for a type II or type III certificate of appropriateness, the commission shall apply the following standards:

- (1) Every reasonable effort shall be made to adapt the property in a manner which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure or site and its environment.
- (2) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

- (3) Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.
- (4) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, object or site shall be kept where possible.
- (5) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should reflect the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.
- (6) Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.
- (7) Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to buildings, structures or sites shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building, structure or site would be unimpaired.

Brookwood Hills Conservation District does not have specific architectural regulations similar to Atlanta's historic or landmark districts, therefore the Commission should refer to Further Standards listed in Chapter 20 of the zoning ordinance, which apply to all locally designated districts and properties.

The Applicant is proposing to remove a section of the existing concrete driveway towards the rear of the house and create a new parking area with concrete pavers. As the concrete pavers will be in the same location as the existing concrete parking area, Staff finds the proposal is appropriate. Staff finds the proposed site work will not impact the existing historic house and will not impact the streetscape. Staff has no concerns regarding the proposed site work.

Staff recommends the Commission send a letter with comments to the Applicant.



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT March 11, 2015

Agenda Item: Application for a Review and Comment (RC-15-157) for alterations, an addition, and site work at **18 Palisades Rd.** – property is zoned R-4 / Brookwood Hills Conservation District / Beltline.

Applicants: Dianne Barfield
PO Box 675935

Facts: According to the 1991 photographic inventory this residential building was designed in 1923 by Neal Reed and is considered contributing to the District.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 16-20.007(b) of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:

Conservation Districts Exempted: Certificates of appropriateness are not required for Conservation Districts. However, no person shall construct, alter, demolish or move, in whole or in part, any building, structure or site located within a Conservation District until the Commission shall have reviewed the proposed action(s) and made written recommendations regarding any such action to the owner(s) of the property.

Sec. 16-20.009. Same; further standards.

In deciding individual applications for certificates of appropriateness, the commission shall be guided by the purposes set forth in section 16-20.001, by findings contained in ordinances designating buildings and sites for protection, by purposes and objectives which are contained within individual Landmark and Historic District regulations, and by findings contained in reports prepared in support of Landmark and Historic District regulations as are required in article D of chapter 4 of part 6. Furthermore, in considering whether to grant approval, conditional approval or denial of an application for a type II or type III certificate of appropriateness, the commission shall apply the following standards:

- (1) Every reasonable effort shall be made to adapt the property in a manner which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure or site and its environment.
- (2) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.
- (3) Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.

- (4) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, object or site shall be kept where possible.
- (5) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should reflect the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.
- (6) Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.
- (7) Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to buildings, structures or sites shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building, structure or site would be unimpaired.

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing to install a fence, retaining walls, and new steps at several areas on the property as well as a concrete terrace at the rear of the property. Staff has no concerns with the proposed retaining wall or the proposed concrete terrace. The Applicant has not submitted information regarding the design or materials for the new steps, or materials for the fence. Staff would suggest that the Applicant consider using a compatible material such as concrete or brick for the steps. Staff would suggest a material such as ornamental metal picket or wood be used for the proposed fence.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing to install a new metal and masonry spiral staircase within the existing second level porch on the rear of the property. Staff finds that the materials of the proposed spiral staircase are not compatible with the existing building as they could appear too industrial in their character and would not be compatible with the Colonial Revival style of the existing structure. Staff would suggest that the Applicant consider using materials which are more compatible with the style of the existing building.

The Applicant is proposing to fill an existing arch on the east side façade with brick. Staff would recommend that the Applicant consider revising their plans to maintain the existing arch opening.

The Applicant is proposing to install a new triple grouped casement window on the east side façade. Staff has no general concerns with the installation of this window grouping. However, staff would suggest that the Applicant consider making these windows taller in order to make them more compatible with the existing windows on this façade.

Additions

The Applicant is proposing to install a side addition on the west side of the building for storage. The addition will use siding and roofing materials which match those found elsewhere on the building. Staff has concerns with the use of a sliding door on this addition which could appear either too rustic or non-residential in character. Staff would suggest that the applicant consider using a hinged door.

The Applicant is also proposing to install a metal two level porch on the rear of the property. The lower portion of the porch will use bluestone flooring. The second story porch will use concrete flooring. Staff finds that the design and materials would not be to compatible as they could appear to industrial in their character. Staff suggests that the Applicant consider revising their plans to show porch designs and materials which are more compatible with the Colonial Revival style such as wood or brick.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter with comments to the Applicant.



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT May 13, 2015

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-15-166) for the projection of a new sign into the public right of way at **200 Peachtree Street** - Property is zoned SPI-1 (Subarea 1).

Applicant: Norman Koplon
600 Peachtree Street

Facts: The portion of the proposed project subject to review and comment by the Commission consists of the installation of a new commercial sign and associated canopy along Peachtree Street which projects over the right of way. The property and building are located on the northeast corner of Peachtree Street and Ellis Street. The building formerly housed the Macy's Department store and is now home to several restaurants and entertainment venues, as well as technology-related uses. The Peachtree Street façade of the building is located at the back of the sidewalk, essentially even with the property line.

The proposed sign would be located between two of the large arched window bays that dominate the first and second floor of the Peachtree Street façade of the building. The double-sided, shield-shaped, projecting sign would project about 68 in. from the face of the building, while canopy below it would project slightly less. The canopy would extend across both window bays just above the display windows.

Additional signage is proposed for the business that is attached to the building, but does not project into the right-of-way. Further, there are building renovations related to the business, but these are not subject to review by the Commission as the building is not designated by the City of Atlanta either individually or a part of a district. Only the elements that project into the right-of-way are subject to review and comment by the Commission.

Analysis: The following code section applies to this application.

Per Section 6-4043:

(5) The commission shall review the proposed location and design of buildings, bridges, viaducts, elevated ways, streets, highways, gates, fences, railings, lamp standards, and other structures or fixtures to be erected or placed on land belonging to the city, or on any private or public property which extends over or upon any property or right-of-way owned or controlled by the city.

The Staff finds that the material and design of the projecting sign (which include red neon tubing, a LED back-lite cabinet, and several connected / applied elements) are typical of many present-day commercial signs related to eating, drinking, and entertainment establishments. While the current building is quite large and as whole has a tremendous presence along Peachtree Street, businesses inside the building don't have much exposure when looking at the building from one end or the other. This sign and canopy greatly increase the exposure of the business.

As for the relationship of the sign and canopy to the right of way, the Staff is concerned about the depth of the canopy which would cover about 6.5 ft. of the sidewalk along that portion of the building. The Staff is concerned about the creation of a shadowed space below the canopy and would suggest that down lighting be included in the canopy design, if not the case already.

The canopy sign has substantial clearance above the sidewalk (about 10 ft.) which would eliminate any hazards to passing pedestrians and might facilitate the use of the double doors for loading purposes.

It is not clear how this signage and canopy would relate to signs and canopies for other businesses along the Peachtree Street façade of the building which also project into the right-of-way.

Staff Recommendation: Confirm that the Staff and Commission comments were delivered at the Commission meeting regarding the Review and Comment (RC-15-166) for the projection of a new sign into the public right of way at **200 Peachtree Street**.