



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 464 Grant Street

APPLICATION: CA2-18-314

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5

Date of Construction: 1906

Property Location: East Blockface of Glenwood Avenue and Sydney Street

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Queen Anne bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K and Sec.16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20K of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Alterations

Front Porch

The Applicant proposes to do alterations on the porch of the existing structure which entails floorboard repair; replacing cement steps with brick steps; adding cheek walls; replacing columns and replacing front porch railings. Additionally, the Applicant proposes to alter the windows and siding.

The District regulations allow two criteria for reviewing alterations to contributing structures. The work can either be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction, or the work should not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property and environment. Staff deemed the former applies to the Applicant's proposals.

Floorboards

The photos the Applicant provided illustrate damage to the floorboards at the top of the stairs. The Applicant has not shown on the plans specifics regarding how the floorboards will be repaired. Staff recommends, the Applicant repair the front of the floorboard in-kind to the orientation and material as the existing floorboard.

Steps and Cheekwalls

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing cement steps with brick steps and construct a new 16-inch-wide brick cheekwall. The District regulation states a front step shall contain a minimum of two entrance step risers each of which shall be no less than six inches in height and all front steps shall have closed risers and closed ends. The photos provided by the Applicant shows four existing steps and the propose cheekwall will act as closed ends, therefore Staff has no concern with this proposal.

Porch Columns

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing porch columns with 8ft tall square columns. Staff finds the new columns will be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property and environment. Staff has no concern with the proposed columns.

Porch Railings

The Applicant proposes to install a 28-inch-tall wood turned balustrade railing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend any additional height needed to meet the code be achieved through a simple plane extension.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall repair the front of the floorboard on the porch in-kind with a vertical orientation as the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20K.007 2 (d)(1);
2. Any additional height needed shall meet code be achieved through a simple plane extension, per Sec. 16-20K.007 (2) (d) and
3. Staff shall review and approve if appropriate and approval all final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 422 Langhorn Street, SW
APPLICATION: CA2-18-271
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018 (Deferred from August 8, 2018)

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/ Beltline

Date of Construction: Circa 1921

Property Location: East blockface of Langhorn Street, South of Lucile Avenue and North of Greenwich Street

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

Dormer Addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.006

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Previously work had begun on March 30, 2018 the property received a Stop Work Order for work without a permit.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20G of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Staff's second review is in italic and board wording.

Plans

The Applicant has not provided a site plan with FAR information. Staff recommends the Applicant provide new plans with site and FAR information.

The Applicant submitted a new site plan which included FAR information. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Dormers

The Applicant proposes to construct new dormers on the left elevation of the existing house roof. In considering the proposed work, Staff relied on the District regulations that states 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. Staff has deemed that the proposed dormers are not in scale or compatible with the existing roof and overwhelms the massing of the house. Staff recommends the added dormers be smaller in scale that does not overshadow the massing and roof.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to construct a deck at the rear of the existing property that does not go pass the corners of the house nor rear setback. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The dormers shall be smaller in scale and not overshadow the massing and roof of the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20.009 (6) and
2. Staff shall review and approve if appropriate and approval all final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 621 Moreland Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-18-311
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** Candler Park (SPI-7 SA2C)

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: East of the Blockface of Moreland Avenue and North Avenue on the corner lot.

Contributing (Y/N)? N.A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Fence

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-18G and Sec. 16-18

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance of Chapter 20G of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Fence

The Applicant proposes to install a 4ft rod iron fence around the property line of the existing structure. The District regulations states fences and walls not exceeding six feet in height may be erected in side or rear yards and all fences located in a required front yard or in a required yard adjacent to a street shall be constructed of brick, stone, ornamental iron, or wood pickets, in a manner which is substantially characteristic of the chosen architectural style. Additionally, the District regulations states that fences not exceeding four feet in height may be erected in the front yard. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 146 Savannah Street SE
APPLICATIONS: CA2-18-312 (revision of plans)
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbagetown Landmark District (Subarea 3) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: pre-1899, per District Inventory

Property Location: East side of Savannah St., between Tennelle and Pickett streets

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural style:** Shotgun House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Revised plans to include transom above non-historic secondary entrance door

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Section(s): Section 16-20A.006 and Section 16-20A.009

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Previous application for alterations (CA2-18-221) approved in July 2018._

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve with conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20A of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Revision of Plans

The revised plans consist of the installation of a single-light, fixed transom with a wood frame above the non-historic side entrance door on right side of the porch to match the original front door.

The District regulations require alterations to contributing buildings to be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the existing building. Further, alterations cannot destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

Staff finds the proposed work meets the District's two standards for alterations. Introduction of the transom is consistent with the existing historic architectural character of the house and does not destroy any character-defining features or materials. Staff recommends a slight variation in the design of the new transom window compared to the original (e.g. stiles and rails be wider or deeper casing) to provide a measure of differentiation between the new and the old features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall slightly vary the design of the new transom to differentiate between the old and the new, per Section 16-20A.006(14);
2. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 340 Hopkins Street
APPLICATION: CA2-18-319
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/ Beltline

Date of Construction: Circa 1923

Property Location: West Block Face of Sells Avenue on the interior lot.

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G-006 and 16-20-009

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20G of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Plans

The Applicant has not provided site plans to demonstrate setback requirements. As such, it is not possible for Staff to determine if the addition meets the setback requirements of the underlying zoning. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide site plans that specify setback requirements.

Roof

The Applicant proposes to construct a new gable roof on all the existing entrances on the main structures replacing the shed roof over the entrances. The District regulations state that replacement porches, steps and stoops shall match the original in size, style and materials. Construction of the gable roof over the porch would create a porch that would not be compatible with the simplistic ornamentation of the existing structure. Staff recommends the Applicant construct a flat roof over the existing porches.

Columns

With the new proposed dormers, the Applicant has also proposed new columns on the existing entrances. While the Staff has no concern with new columns, Staff does recommend the Applicant construct the columns in a fashion that is consistent with both the architectural style of the house and original porches in that block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide site plans that specify setback requirements, per Sec. 16-20G.004;
2. The Applicant shall construct a flat roof over the existing porches, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(a);
3. The columns shall be constructed in an architectural style that is consistent with other original porches on the blockface, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (9)(d); and
4. Staff shall review and approve if appropriate and approval all final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1152 Eggleston Street
APPLICATION: CA3-18-233
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018 (Deferred from June 27th, July 11th, July 25th and August 8th)

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/ Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location South blockface of Holderness and Westend Pl

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Folk Victorian

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear Roof Addition

- Fenestration and Windows alterations
- Doors
- Shed roof over front porch
- Front porch rails

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.006

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20G of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The updated review is done in italics.

Plans

The site plan received by Staff does not contain lot coverage or FAR calculations. Staff recommends the site plan be revised to show the existing and proposed lot coverage and FAR.

The Applicant still has not submitted plans that include site plans for setbacks and FAR information. Staff recommends that site plans be revised to show existing and proposed lot coverage, setbacks and FAR.

Porch roof and front railing

Staff has reviewed the photos of the front façade provided by the Applicant. The Applicant does not provide detail information of the repair of the roof over the front porch or information of the repair of the front porch railings. Staff recommends the Applicant provide detailed information regarding the shed roof and porch railing repair.

The new plans the Applicant submitted still does not provide specific on the proposed front porch railings. Staff recommends the rails be replaced and repaired in-kind and the height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code and note that on the plans.

The Applicant proposes that the shed roof will be repaired/replaced. Staff recommends that repaired shed roof be repaired in-kind. Staff also recommends that replacement roof materials be of the same size, texture and material as existing, exposed roofing materials when the existing, exposed roofing materials constitute a significant architectural feature of the structure.

Gable Roof

Staff reviewed the photos the Applicant provided. On the front gable, the vent is missing on the plans. Staff recommends Gable vent be retained.

The new plans provided by the Applicant indicates the front gable vent is retained on the new front elevation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Addition

The Applicant proposes to change the roofline over an existing bedroom in the rear of the house to increase the height to allow for the interior renovation. The new roofline will continue the Hip roof line that is existing on the house. Staff is not concerned with this new roofline. Additionally, Staff finds the addition will fit within the buildable area of the lot and does not encroach on the rear or side yard setbacks. The plans show the addition roof does not exceed the height of the main structure's roof ridgeline. Staff has no concern with the new addition height and build area. However, Staff recommends the Applicant lower the ridgeline six inches of the addition to differentiate the new addition from the existing structure.

The proposed roofline the Applicant has demonstrated on the new plans shows a differentiate roofline that will distinguish it from the existing structure's roofline. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Bay Window Projection

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing bay projection to construct a kitchen. The bay projection is architecturally and historically significant for this house. Staff find the removal of this historic feature inappropriate and alters the character of the structure. Staff recommends the bay project and roof line associated with it be retained.

On the new plans, the Applicant has shown the bay projection to be retained on the right elevation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Alterations

Windows

On the proposed right elevation, the Applicant proposes to remove the existing bay window with the construction of a new kitchen. The Regulations states that the replacement and reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms is permitted. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

The new plans the Applicant submitted shows the bay window will be retained. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

On the proposed left elevation, the Applicant proposes to install accent or transom style window. Staff recommends the proposed window be vertical double-hung in orientation and proportional to the windows on the existing structure.

On the new plans the Applicant continues to propose an accent or transom style window installation. Staff recommends the proposed window be vertical double-hung in orientation and proportional to the windows on the existing structure.

On the proposed right elevation, the Applicant proposes a double grouped one over one window to replace the existing one over one window. Reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms is permitted. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The new plans submitted by the Applicant proposes a doubled grouped one over one windows to replace an existing one over one window. District regulations states that reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations can only be accommodated for kitchen and bathrooms. The new floor plans indicate a study will be constructed not a kitchen or bathroom. Staff recommendation the existing one over one window be retrained to comply with the District's regulations. Staff also recommends new windows added to existing structures shall be located on the façades that don't face a public street.

On the proposed front elevation, the Applicant proposes to install a one over one vertical window to replace the door that currently exist due to a conversion of house to a duplex. Inventory shows the original opening was a window. Staff has no concern with this window proposal.

The Applicant proposes the replacement of window sashes due to damage. However, the Applicant does not demonstrate through detail photos that the window sashes need replacing. Based on the photographs provided, Staff finds the existing windows could be retained, but photographs show only two windows. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation that the windows proposed for replacement on the front façade are non-historic or cannot be repaired. If the photographic documentation shows the windows to be non-historic or beyond repair, Staff recommends the windows be replaced with new windows that meet the District regulations. If the photographic documentation shows the windows to be historic and can reasonably be repaired, Staff recommends the existing windows be retained

The new plans submitted by the Applicant has removed the replacement of the window sashes. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Removal of extension

On the proposed left elevation, the Applicant propose to remove the existing non-original extension on the house. The Applicant proposes to build one seamless elevation. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall submit the site plan be revised to show the existing and proposed lot coverage and FAR, per Sec. 16-20G.001;
2. The rails shall be replaced and repaired in-kind and the height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (9)(d);
3. The replacement roof materials shall be of the same size, texture and material as existing, exposed roofing materials when the existing, exposed roofing materials constitute a significant architectural feature of the structure per Sec. 16-20G.006 (1)(g);
4. The transom window shall be vertical double-hung in orientation and proportional to the windows on the existing structure per Sec. 16-20G.006(1)(g);
5. The existing one over one window shall be retrained to comply with the District's regulations per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(a);
6. The new windows added to the existing structures shall be located on the façades that don't face a public street per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(a);
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1085 White Oak Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-296

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: North blockface of White Oak Ave., east of Peoples St. and west of Lee St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** English Vernacular revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and additions

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the project which are not visible from the public street.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The existing structure was heavily altered by a previous owner without permits or a Certificate of Appropriateness. The original character defining features of the structure were lost through these alterations. The Commission reviewed an application to permit the alterations (CA3-17-212) which was deferred several times before being denied without prejudice due to lack of response from the Applicant. Recently, a tree has fallen on the house and removed the front portion of the structure.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 and Sec 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Interpretation of District regulations

The District regulations allow two options when reviewing alterations and additions to contributing structure. The work can either be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure while complying with the regulations governing new construction, or, the alterations can avoid the destruction of historic materials. As historic materials were removed by the previous owner without permits or approval by the Commission, Staff finds the second criteria is not applicable to this situation. As such, Staff will review the proposed alterations using the first criteria as it relates to the existing structure prior to the work done without permits or approval by the Commission.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes recreating several of the character defining features of the original structure, including the chimney, windows, the flared gable on the left side of the front façade, and the porch opening on the right side of the front façade.

Based on aerial photographs from 1949, Staff is able to determine that the original roof form of this structure was defined by a steep side gabled front roof, consistent with the English vernacular form, and a hipped roof over the rear mass of the home. At some point prior to the District's designation, an addition was placed on the structure which contained a shallow rear gable which was even with or lower than the ridge of the side gabled main roof. The roof form proposed by the Applicant is a side gabled salt-box style roof which raises the main ridge above the height of the original ridge which appears to have been level with the top of the chimney. Staff finds this composition to be incompatible with the architecture of the original structure. As such, Staff recommends the plans be re drawn to include a steep side gabled front façade consistent with the height of the original structure. Staff further recommends that any partial second floor be covered with a shallow pitched rear gabled roof. Lastly, Staff recommends the optional dormers shown on the front elevation be removed from the plans.

The plans provided by the Applicant show eaves along the front side and rear façade. From the District photographic inventory, Staff is able to determine that the original structure did not contain eaves on the front façade or on the side gabled portion of the side façade. The roof over the partial second story, however, did contain eaves as it was a later addition to the property. As such, Staff recommends the eaves be removed from the front façade and the redrawn main side gable. Staff would note that the inclusion of gutters on the front façade is not governed by the District regulations and is not a concern.

The fenestration pattern proposed on the front façade appears consistent with the fenestration pattern of the original structure. However, Staff has concerns with the overall lack of fenestration and the irregular placement of the window openings on the side façades. Staff recommends the side façade fenestration pattern be consistent with the original structure or meet the compatibility rule. The floorplans show a door on the right-side façade of the structure, but the door is not shown on the elevations. Staff recommends that a door meeting the District regulations be shown on the right-side façade.

The Applicant is proposing cementitious siding for the renovated structure. Based on photographs provided by the Applicant and photographs taken by the Office of Buildings Inspection Staff from the original violation case, Staff finds that the original siding is no longer present on site. Staff further finds that cementitious siding is permitted by the District regulations. Staff does, however, recommend the cementitious siding be smooth faced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral conditioned upon the following:

1. The plans shall be re-drawn to include a steep side gabled front façade consistent with the height of the original structure, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
2. Any partial second floor shall be covered with a shallow pitched rear gabled roof, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
3. The optional dormers shown on the front elevation shall be removed from the plans, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
4. The eaves shall be removed from the front façade and the redrawn main side gable, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
5. The side façade fenestration pattern shall be consistent with the original structure or meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
6. A door meeting the District regulations shall be shown on the right-side façade, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
7. The cementitious siding shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a); and,
8. All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1053 Lawton Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-18-272
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018 (Deferred August 8, 2018)

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1921

Property Location: West side of Lawton Ave. between Peoples and Lee streets

Contributing (Y/N): Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Craftsman Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Replacement windows, front door and siding
- Deck

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior renovations

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 and Sec 16-20 M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The second review comments are in bold italics.

Plans Issues

The scope of work for the exterior alterations propose the replace the existing windows, install a new front door and install a rear deck. The submitted plans do not include existing and proposed elevations of all sides of the structure that show where the work will occur. Further, the Applicant has not submitted a site plan for full review for the deck installation and other possible site work. Staff recommends the Applicant submit revised plans that includes accurate and to-scale, existing and proposed elevations and site plans with detail sufficient for review.

The Applicant has submitted new plans that show existing and proposed elevations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. However, the Applicant has not provided a to-scale plan. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a to-scale site plan for review.

Alterations

Windows

The Applicant has proposed replacing the existing windows with new units that match the sizes of the existing openings. The District regulations states require replacement windows to maintain the size and shape of the original window opening. Photos shown from research and the photographic the Applicant submitted demonstrate that some windows on the existing structure are original. The District regulations do not specify materials but do require windows to be compatible with the style of the individual window. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographs of all windows proposed for replacement keyed to the existing floor plan. Furthermore, Staff recommends if the Applicant is going to replace existing three-over-one sash wood windows with vinyl, the vinyl would have to be three-over-one true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass

The Applicant has shown on both the existing and proposed elevations 5 over 1 windows. However, the Applicant has not provided photographic information to allow Staff to determine the feasibility of the windows. Nor has the Applicant keyed all windows to the existing floor plan. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic information of all windows proposed for replacement to allow for a determination of feasibility and key all windows to the existing floor plan

Front Door

On the plans, the Applicant has noted the replacement of all existing doors. The proposed doors are the interior doors, the back door and one front door. Replacement doors that are visible from a public street upon completion fall under the purview of the Commission's review. As such, Staff will only provide design review of the front door.

The Applicant does not indicate the size and style of the proposed door. The District regulations states that the size and type of exterior doors, notwithstanding the compatibility rule, shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame. Staff recommends the Applicant provide additional documentation that demonstrates the style of the proposed replacement door is internally consistent with the historic design of the house. Staff further recommends the front door be either wood panel or fix glass panel in wood frame to meet the District regulations.

On the proposed plans, the Applicant has shown a panel door with three fix panels. Staff recommends the door be wood panel frame to meet the District regulations.

Deck

The proposed scope of work notes the installation small deck at the rear of the house. The District regulations require decks to be located at the rear of the principal structure and to not be wider than the width of the principal structure. The proposed elevations show the deck to be located at the rear of the house and not extending beyond the sides of the house. Staff has no concerns with this component of the project, notwithstanding the previously stated need for a proposed site plan showing the location of the deck.

Siding

The plans the Applicant submitted shows clapboard siding on the existing structure, however, photographic information shows the siding to be asbestos. Staff recommends the Applicant specify what material is on the existing structure by providing photographic information of all sides of the house.

The Applicant has indicated asbestos siding is on the existing structure and has proposed replacement of cementitious lap siding. Staff recommends the cementitious lap siding be smooth-faced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide site plans that show all proposed changes to the property in sufficient detail for review, per Section. 16-20.008(c)(1);
2. The Applicant shall provide photographic information of all windows proposed for replacement to allow for a determination of feasibility and key all windows to the existing floor plan, per Section 16-20M.013(2)(o)(2);
3. The door shall be wood panel frame to meet the District regulations, per Section 16-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
4. The cementitious lap siding be smooth-faced., per Section 15-20M.013 (q); and
5. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1215 South Ponce de Leon Avenue

APPLICATIONS: CA3-18-280 (alterations, addition, and sitework)
CA3-18-281 (variance)

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction: c.1920 Staff Estimate. Non-contributing buildings added c.1965.

Property Location: On an interior lot on the south side of S. Ponce de Leon Ave between Moreland Ave. and Springdale Rd.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural style: Neoclassical Revival Style

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Variance to reduce side yard setback;
- New siding / new configuration of windows/doors
- New parking areas / walkways
- Landscaping

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior renovations

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20B.003 and Section 16-20B.004

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes (*deferred from August 8, 2018 meeting*)

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: CA3-18-280– Defer.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: CA3-18-281 – Approve

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20B of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Variance

The Applicant requests a variance to reduce the west side yard setback from 30' (required) to 1' (proposed) for the installation of a new concrete and steel fire stair connected to an ADA-compliant ramp to provide egress from the second level of the west façade on the existing West Building. The following responses were provided to the questions of in variance petition:

1. What are the extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question (size, shape, or topography)?

Fire code requires a separation distance between the existing and new fire stair, as well as ADA compliant egress (proposed ramp). To achieve the required separation distance, we must place it on the NW corner of the building. An interior fire stair exists on the SE corner of the building. We want to place the new, required stair on the west façade instead of the front (North) façade so as not to detract from the adjacent, historic landmark building on site. Placing this stair and ramp on the west façade within the setback is a more inconspicuous solution than placing it beyond the setback on the front of the building. Several mature trees and foliage will aid in minimizing the visual impact from the street.

2. How would the application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property create an unnecessary hardship?

The application of the zoning ordinance to 1215 S. Ponce de Leon would create an unnecessary hardship. If we do not build the stair and ADA ramp within the imposed side yard setback, we would be forced to place it on the NE (front) corner of the house (not in keeping with the historic ordinance) and run the ramp on the east side of the building, thus narrowing the drive aisle to an impassible width for car and pedestrian. Without said improvements, we cannot employ the second floor for classroom use, thus limiting the school's overall capacity.

3. What conditions are peculiar to this particular piece of property?

The original structure was built over the 7 [sic] foot side yard setback as the zoning laws had not yet been executed when it was built in the mid-twentieth century. This makes any code-required updates along the existing western façade impossible to do within the letter of the ordinance.

4. Submit facts to show that relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The request for a lessening of the west side yard setback would not be detrimental to the public good or impair the purpose and intent of the current zoning ordinance of the City of Atlanta. The stair will allow for a viable use of the campus as a whole by the Montessori In Town School, already an established, contributing member of the Druid Hills Community. The two immediately abutting neighbors have shown their support for this variance we are requesting and will attest to this at the Committee Hearing.

Staff finds the request for a reduction in the side yard setback from 30' to 1' in order to accommodate a new fire stair on the west side of the building to be appropriate considering the existing location of the building, the requirement for a separation distance between the respective fire stairs, and the District's historic preservation regulations that would otherwise preclude the placement of the stair on the front of the building. As such, Staff finds the Applicant has met the requirements of the variance for the reduction in the side yard setback.

Alterations

The proposed project includes alterations and repairs to the existing contributing and non-contributing structures on the property. Main alteration components of the work are addressed below.

New Siding / New Configuration of Windows/Doors on the Non-contributing buildings

The project plans call for the installation of vertical, weathered wood siding (identified as “rain screens”) over the existing concrete masonry unit (CMU) exteriors of the non-contributing east and west wing buildings, new window and door openings on the buildings front facades, and, reconfiguration of existing fenestration on the rear and sides. While the proposed work will occur on the non-contributing buildings, the District regulations require alterations and additions be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the property and its environment. Staff finds the wood materials and modernist aesthetic of the proposed wood siding and new fenestration configuration to not be compatible with the Neoclassical Revival features of the contributing building. Staff recommends any alterations of the non-contributing buildings take its design cues from the materials and character-defining features of the contributing house.

Maintenance Repairs of Contributing House

The plans specify repair of existing windows, repair of the existing clay tile roof, wood soffits, and patching of existing stucco exterior of the contributing house. Staff has no concerns with this component of the work.

Replacement of Existing Exterior Stairs and Storefront Windows

The proposed plans include the replacement of an existing east entrance stair on the non-contributing West Building, replacement of an existing rear window with a new door and the rear fire stair on the central contributing building, and replacement of the storefront systems on the front and rear of the one-story hyphen connecting the contributing building with non-contributing East Building. Staff generally has no concerns with these components of the project. Staff recommends the replacement door at the rear of the contributing building be wood and that the new fire stair be installed in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would not be destroyed.

New Signage

The scope of work calls for the replacement of the existing signage on the contributing house to be replaced with new “Montessori In Town” steel lettering pin-mounted to the façade of the house. Staff recommends the new signage use existing mounting holes where feasible to minimize damage to the historic masonry fabric.

Sitework

Proposed sitework improvements include a reconfiguration of the surface parking, installation of a new playground area, a children’s garden and lawn at the rear of the property. The revised parking will generally retain the existing vehicular circulation system of the property. Primary changes include the hard-surfacing paving of part of the existing large, gravel rear lot and replacement section of the gravel lot and rear asphalt driveway with the playground and lawn. The District regulations require no more than 45 percent of the lot be covered by structures, parking and driveways. According to the submitted plans, the revised parking and paving plan will result in a reduction of lot coverage from 43.12% to 34.77%. Further, all parking on the site will be located within the required setbacks. Staff has no concerns with his component of the project.

A revised landscape plan proposes to remove existing overgrown invasive plants at the sides and rear of the lot and installation of new trees, shrubs, and other foundation plants in the front of the property. Staff finds the proposed work meets the District regulations as consistent and compatible with the overall landscape plan and design on the property and block.

Variance (CA3-18-281)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION - Approval

Alterations, Sitework (CA3-18-280)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following concerns:

1. Exterior alterations of the non-contributing buildings shall be compatible with the materials and architectural features of the contributing building, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(i);
2. The replacement door on the rear of the contributing buildings shall be wood, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(i);
3. The new, rear fire stair shall be installed in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would not be destroyed, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(j);
4. The new signage shall use the existing mounting holes where feasible to minimize damage to the historic masonry fabric, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(j); and
5. The Applicant shall submit any revised plans and supporting materials (including all required copies) at least eight (8) days prior to the Commission meeting to which the application is deferred.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1062 Euclid Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-291

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

Other Zoning: R-5 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1908

Property Location: West blockface of Euclid Ave., at the southwest corner of Washita Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Queen Anne

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance and Special Exception request for placement of accessory structure

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Design of new accessory structure and related site work.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 and Sec 16-20L of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Special Exception

When reviewing special exceptions for active recreation such as a swimming pool in a yard adjacent to the public street in Subarea 1 of the Inman Park Historic District, the Commission must make the following findings:

1. The location of the pool is not objectionable to the occupants of neighboring properties, or the neighborhood in general, by reason of noise, lights, or concentrations of persons or vehicular traffic; and,
2. The area for the location of the pool could not be reasonably located elsewhere on the lot.

With regards to the first criteria, Staff has not received any information from the Applicant that would meet this requirement. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation that the location of the pool is not objectionable to the occupants of neighboring properties, or the neighborhood in general, by reason of noise, lights, or concentrations of persons or vehicular traffic.

With regards to the second criteria, Staff finds that the subject property is a corner lot and contains no yard where a pool could be located that is not adjacent to a public street. Further, due to the development of the property with an accessory structure and driveway in the rear yard, Staff finds it would be infeasible to locate the pool there. As such, Staff finds the request meets the second criteria.

Variance

The requested variance is to allow the accessory structure (pool) to be placed between the principal structure and Washita Ave.

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography;

The Applicant cites the properties configuration as a corner lot. They further argue that the accessory structure (pool) could

The application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship;

The Applicant states that because of the properties configuration as a corner lot, the Zoning Ordinance would prevent the installation of a pool.

Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved;

The Applicant again identifies the properties corner lot configuration. Staff finds that while corner lots exist elsewhere in the District, the majority of lots are interior lots where a compliant accessory structure (pool) could be constructed.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that the accessory structure (pool) would be constructed in-ground at a grade which is 4' higher than the sidewalk along Washita Ave. They further state that evergreen bushes will be planted to obscure the view of the accessory structure from the public right of way. The Applicant further states that the property directly across Washita Ave. is the Bass Lofts which is set back much further from Washita than a single family residence would be.

Staff finds that the request meets the variance criteria.

Accessory Structure, Alterations, and Site work

The Design of the accessory structure (pool), the alterations to the principle structure, and the related site work such as paving and fencing is not within the Commission's purview and will be reviewed separately by Staff. However, Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that the half-depth front yard setback for the accessory structure is based on the compatibility rule and not the 15' setback of the R-5 regulations. As such, Staff suggests the Applicant document the allowable half-depth front yard setback for the new accessory structure based on historic accessory structures on corner lots in the vicinity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide documentation that the location of the pool is not objectionable to the occupants of neighboring properties, or the neighborhood in general, by reason of noise, lights, or concentrations of persons or vehicular traffic, per Sec. 16-20L.006(6)(b); and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate approve all final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2943 Layton Avenue, NW
APPLICATION: CA3-18-301
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Whittier Mill Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/A

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: East, Blockface of Whittier Road and and Butler Way on the Corner lot

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New South Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

Addition (Dormer)
Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20J and Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Chapter 20 and Chapter 20J of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The main structure is located on a half-depth lot with visibility from the public-right away on all four sides. Therefore, the Staff's comments will address all sides of the main structure.

ADDITION

Roof Dormer

The Applicant proposes to construct a rear shed roof dormer to allow for a second-floor attic addition which will contain a bedroom and bathroom. The plans illustrate this new proposed dormer will not exceed the height of the existing structure, a requirement of the District regulations. Staff is not concerned with the proposed dormer addition.

Siding

The proposed siding for the new dormer addition is smooth-face cementitious siding. Staff notes that because the main structure is visible from the public-right away on all sides, the District regulations states that all building materials which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, shall be compatible with those which predominate in the subarea. Staff recommends that the Applicant demonstrates through detail photographic material that smooth-face cementitious siding predominates on other structures throughout the subarea to abide by the District regulations.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant proposes to install one new wood window with 6 inches divided mullions on the rear elevation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to remove the vinyl siding that is currently on the main structure and repair the wood siding that is underneath in-kind. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Skylight

The Applicant proposed a skylight installation on the left elevation of the main structure by the Applicant. The District regulations states that skylights, solar panels and communication equipment, when otherwise allowed by these or other regulations, are not permitted on the roof over the front façade of any structure. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

- 1) The Applicant shall demonstrate through detail photographic material that smooth-face ceremonious siding predominates on other structures throughout the subarea to abide by the District regulations. per Sec. 16-20J.006(6)(a)(5)
- 2) Staff shall review and approval if appropriate, approve all final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 711 Confederate Avenue SE
APPLICATIONS: CA3-18-307 (addition)
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline

Date of Construction: c.1920 per District Inventory

Property Location: Interior lot on south side of Confederate Ave. between Ormewood Ave. and Boulevard

Contributing (Y/N)?: No **Building Type / Architectural style:** Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Street-facing façade of the second level addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Rear addition/deck

Relevant Code Sections: Sections 16-20K.007 and 16-07.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Substantial alterations to the building over time have resulted in the loss of contributing status, per the District Inventory.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20K of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed project scope consists of a second story and rear addition with a deck to the existing non-contributing, one-story house. The proposed addition will not project beyond the sides of the house conform to the setback of the existing building. It will have a gable-on-hip roof and one-over-one sash windows. According to the plans, the upper level addition will have horizontal siding that matches the existing clapboard-style vinyl siding while the rear addition will have horizontal, cementitious clapboard siding and a continuous brick veneer foundation.

Staff finds the proposed addition does not exceed the maximum the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and lot coverage requirements of the underlying R-5 zoning.

The District regulations have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the relevant regulations were met.

Design Components subject to Commission Review

The District regulations provide two standards for reviewing proposed alterations and additions to non-contributing buildings. The proposed work must meet one of the two standards. The first requires alterations and additions “be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure”. The second of the two standards require alterations or additions to “comply with applicable regulations for new construction.” The Staff finds that the proposed project generally meets the second of the two standards.

Roof

The District regulations require roofs to have a minimum 6-in-12 pitch. While it appears the proposed hip and gable roof forms meet this requirement; Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the proposed pitch of the second level addition roof.

Fenestration

The façades of the second level addition that face the public street are solid walls devoid of windows and doors. The District regulations require all facades that face a public street to have fenestration that is either substantially consistent with fenestration on contributing structures of like use in the District, or no less than 15 percent and no greater than 40 percent of the total surface wall area. Staff finds the proposed design of the addition façade is not consistent with the fenestration on other contributing houses in the District. Therefore, Staff recommends the Applicant provide additional documentation that demonstrates the project meets the second fenestration standard of District regulations.

Design Components subject to Staff Review

The plans state the rear addition will have cement fiber clapboard siding with a 6” reveal and trim. Staff recommends the cement fiber clapboard siding be smooth faced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall clarify the roof pitch of the second level addition, per Section 16-20K.007(2)(B)(5);
2. The Applicant shall provide additional documentation that demonstrates the proposed addition meets the District’s fenestration requirements, per Section 16-20K.007(2)(B)(11);
3. The cement fiber clapboard on the rear addition be smooth-faced, per Section 16-20K.007(2)(B)(1 and 15c); and,
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 858 Oakdale Rd.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-313

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1915

Property Location: West blockface of Oakdale Rd., north of Ponce De Leon Ave. and south of the City limits.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics of revival style architecture.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear additions and site work.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 and Sec 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing several rear additions to the property. The first addition will enclose an existing two level screened rear porch, the second addition will place a sunroom on the rear façade, and the third addition will be a porch which will connect the main structure with the accessory structure.

With regards to the rear porch enclosure, the Applicant states that the windows on the new rear façade will match the design of the existing windows on the structure. However, on the new north side façade created by the addition, no windows are proposed. Staff finds the resulting façade to be out of character with the historic structure, and recommends the north side façade of the addition contain a fenestration pattern consistent with the north side façade of the existing structure. Staff further recommends the windows for the rear two story porch enclosure be unclad wood true divided lite windows. With regards to the siding material for the new rear and north side façade, Staff recommends any new siding be wood. Staff further recommends the existing rear façade siding be retained.

With regards to the rear sunroom addition, the overall design will mimic an enclosed porch. Staff finds this approach to be appropriate as it distinguishes the feature as an addition to the structure which will allow for proper interpretation of the addition in the future. Likewise, the steel windows and doors will distinguish this addition from the rest of the house allowing for further differentiation. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed product, but recommends the steel windows and doors for the sunroom addition be true divided lite.

With regards to the rear porch addition, Staff has no general concerns with the design of this feature or the alterations to the accessory structure. Staff does note that the proposed foundation of the porch/patio is shown as masonry, which will contrast with the stone foundation material of the existing structure. As such, Staff recommends the foundation of the porch/patio addition be stone to match the principal structure. Staff further recommends the proposed fireplace and chimney be stone to match the chimneys on the principle structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The north side façade of the addition shall contain a fenestration pattern consistent with the north side façade of the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
2. The windows for the rear two story porch enclosure shall be unclad wood true divided lite windows, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
3. Any new siding on the north side façade shall be wood, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
4. The existing rear façade siding shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
5. The steel windows and doors for the sunroom addition shall be true divided lite, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
6. The foundation of the porch/patio addition shall be stone to match the principal structure, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
7. The proposed fireplace and chimney shall be stone to match the chimneys on the principle structure, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i); and,
8. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 858 Virgil Street NE

APPLICATIONS: CA3-18-315 (addition)

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920-22 per District Inventory

Property Location: Interior lot on north side of Virgil St. near Hale St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural style:** Georgian Cottage / Folk Victorian

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Dormer addition
- Rear addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Rear elevation not visible from a public street or park
- Deck

Relevant Code Sections: Sections 16-20L.005, 16-20L.006, and 16-20.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20L of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The District regulations have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the relevant regulations were met.

Design Review

The proposed project scope consists of a two-level, 976-sq. ft. addition and deck massed at the rear of the existing house and a shed-roof dormer on the right-side (east) rear roof slope. According to the plans, the proposed work will result in a reduction of impervious surface on the lot by 140 sq. ft.

The proposed rear addition will have complex gable roof form that extends to the rear from the highest point of the existing hip roof form. Staff suggests the height of the addition be slightly reduced to give prominence to the ridge line of the original roof.

Cementitious shingles will be used to clad the dormer addition and attic level exterior wall of the rear addition. The side and rear walls of the rear addition will have cementitious clapboard siding. The plans indicate that the existing asbestos shingle siding at the rear of the house will be removed and new cementitious siding will be installed to match the profile of the existing siding. It is unclear to Staff if the replacement siding will be clapboard or shingle style siding. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the type of siding to be used for cladding of the new addition and any proposed cementitious siding be smooth-faced. Staff further recommends that false corner boards be installed at the rear wall junction of the house and new addition to differentiate the existing building from the new construction.

Four French doors on the rear side will provide exterior access to the proposed deck. All proposed new windows will be two-over-two, double-hung sash units to match existing. Staff recommends that all new windows on the sides of the house be unclad wood and the windows have true or simulated divided lights.

Staff Suggestion:

1. Staff suggests the height of the addition be slightly reduced to give prominence to the ridge line of the original roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall clarify the style of siding to be used for the new addition and the proposed siding be smooth-faced, per Section 16-20L.006(1)(p);
2. False corner boards shall be installed at the rear wall junction of the house and new addition to differentiate the existing building from the new construction, per Section 16-20L.005(1)(b)(ix);
3. New windows on the sides of the house shall be unclad wood with true or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass, per Section 16-20L.006(1)(n)(i); and,
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1052 Donnelly Street
APPLICATION: CA3-18-329
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: c.1920, Staff estimate

Property Location: On an interior lot on the south side of Donnelly Street., between U.S. Highway 29 and the intersection of Richland Rd. / Lawton St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Rear addition
- New Windows / doors
- Siding repair/replacement
- Front porch screen

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Deck
- Reroof/gutters

Relevant Code Sections: Sections 16-20M.001, 16-20M.013, 16-20M.017, and Section 16-20.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Previously recommended for demolition by In Rem Review Board

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M, and Chapter 6A of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property is a one-story, Craftsman Style Bungalow with a primary hip roof and front gable secondary porch roof with wide overhangs and exposed rafter tails. The house has a masonry pier foundation with Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) infill. A brick masonry chimney is present on the left eave wall. The building is clad with non-original vinyl siding that approximates the appearance of clapboard siding. All windows and door openings are currently covered with plywood.

The property was recommended for demolition by the In Rem Review Board at the October 2017 hearing. An Type IV application (CA4PH-17-582) to demolish the property due to a threat to public health and safety by the City of Atlanta Police Department Code Enforcement Section was approved by the Commission at the February 28, 2018 meeting. Since that time, the current property has contacted Code Enforcement and has worked to bring the property into compliance.

The District regulations require that one of two standards be met for alterations and/or additions to contributing structures. The first standard requires the work to be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations. The second standard states that alterations and additions cannot destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new building elements and materials may be differentiated from the old. To protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment, the compatibility rule shall apply to any new work regarding the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and environment.

If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related regulations were met.

Plan Issues

The submitted site plan does not include a scale of measurement. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the plan scale or submit a revised site plan with the accurate scale. Staff also notes the chimney is not depicted on the front, rear, and right elevations; however, it appears to be accurately drawn on the left elevation.

Addition

The Applicant proposes to demolish and rebuild the rear, southeast corner of the building within the existing footprint and install vinyl siding on the exterior of the new walls to match existing. The new work would include a raised, pressure-treated wood deck that is located at the rear of the house and does not extend beyond the sides of the building. Staff has no concerns with the deck component of the project.

Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear how much the of the rear corner wall will be removed and rebuilt. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify on the plans where the work will occur. Further, despite the presence of vinyl siding on the rest of the house, Staff finds the proposed vinyl siding for the addition area to be inappropriate for the District. Most likely, wood clapboard siding is present underneath the existing siding. Staff recommends the Applicant select a small, inconspicuous area at the rear of the building to provide photographic documentation of the siding material underneath the existing vinyl siding. If the underlying original siding is wood clapboard,

Staff recommends the new siding on the reworked section be wood, clapboard siding to match existing in material and reveal.

Alterations Subject to Commission Review

New Windows/Doors

The Applicant proposes to install new windows in the existing window openings with six-over-six, double-hung sash windows. Because the existing openings are covered with plywood, it is unclear to Staff how many, if any, of the original windows remain on site. Staff recommends the Applicant provide individual photographs of all windows and doors proposed for replacement keyed to the existing floor plan and information documenting feasibility of repair, if possible.

The District regulations do not specify materials for replacement windows but do require the replacement window styles to meet the compatibility rule. Staff notes that the original windows shown in the District inventory photographs were six-over-one double-hung sash units. Staff recommends any replacement windows meet the compatibility rule, with regard to the size, shape, and style of the proposed windows. Furthermore, Staff recommends any proposed windows with light divisions be true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass.

The submitted plans do not specify the material or style of the proposed replacement front or rear door. Staff recommends the proposed exterior front door be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame and meet the compatibility rule regarding its size and type.

Front Porch Screen

The submitted plans specify the installation of a “new vinyl insect screen” on the front porch. According to photographs of the property, the porch has featured a screen enclosure. Staff recommends any new screen enclosure not result in the removal of any existing porch elements and be installed behind the existing balustrade to give prominence to that feature.

Alterations Subject to Staff Review

Reroof/gutters

The scope of work includes a reroof of the existing roof structure with fiberglass shingles and new gutters. Staff recommends the reroofing not include any changes to the existing roof form, pitch, or slope. Otherwise, Staff has no concerns with this component of the work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall clarify the scale of the submitted site plan or submit a revised, to-scale site plan, per Section 16-20.008(c)(1);
2. The Applicant shall clarify on the plans where the rear addition/alteration work will occur, per Section 16-20.008(c)(1);
3. The Applicant shall provide photographic documentation of the original underlying siding material. If original wood clapboard siding is present, the new siding on the reconstructed rear walls shall match the original underlying siding in material, style, and reveal, per Section 6-20M.013(2)(q);

4. The Applicant shall submit photographs of all windows and doors proposed for replacement, keyed to the existing floor plan, with supporting documentation demonstrating the feasibility of repair, per Section 16-20M.017;
5. Where permitted, replacement windows shall meet the compatibility rule with regard to size, shape, and style, per Section 6-20M.013(2)(o);
6. Where permitted, light divisions of any replacement windows shall be true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass, per Section 6-20M.013(2)(n);
7. If permitted, the proposed replacement front door shall be wood wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame and meet the compatibility rule regarding its size and type, per Section 6-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
8. Reroofing work shall not include any changes to the existing roof form, pitch, or slope, per Section 6-20M.013(2)(r)(6);
9. Any new porch screen enclosure shall not result in the removal of any existing porch elements and shall be installed behind the existing balustrade/railing, per Section 6-20M.013(2)(i); and,
10. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 183 Linkwood Road NW

APPLICATIONS: CA4PH-18-288 (demolition due to public health & safety)

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-3

Date of Construction: 1945 per District Inventory

Property Location: Corner lot on the east side of Linkwood Road between I-20 and Collier Dr.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural style:** American Small House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sections 16-20Q.005 and 16-20.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20Q of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Type IV and In-Rem Process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a public threat to health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the application. In this particular case, the property has gone through the In Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta.

Notices were sent to the owner on record on October 13, 2017 regarding the public hearing scheduled on October 26, 2017. Notices for the In-Rem hearing were advertised on September 18, 2017 and September 25, 2017. On October 26, 2017, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. In looking at the sign-in sheets for the meeting, there was no one present to speak in favor or opposition to the proposed demolition. A registered letter regarding the demolition decision was delivered to the owner on record sometime after the October 26th hearing.

The Applicant is not the owner and the In Rem process does not allow for repair, renovations or sale of the property. Staff finds the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values are useful for informational purposes but do not always apply in City of Atlanta In Rem cases. Staff finds the most relevant two questions in these cases are the following:

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists; and

The Applicant provided the following answer to this question:

“The first complaint received to the OCC in January 11, 2016 for Sec 19. Property was noted as extremely overgrown with junk, trash, and debris. Highly hazardous structure conditions were noted at the time of the inspection. Open and vacant.”

2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.

The following is the Applicant’s answer to this question:

“There are no alternatives feasible to rectify the threat to public safety and welfare. The owner is deceased, and the Guardian is non-responsive; no response to any certified letters sent to the owner’s guardian nor did the owner/Guardian attend the Public In Rem hearing [on] April 19, 2018.”

Photography

A review of the District Inventory photograph of the building taken in 2008, shows this dwelling to be inhabited and in relatively good condition. The current photographs submitted by the Applicant date from July 2018, show the property to be severely overgrown with vegetation and downed trees. Due to the extensive vegetation, it is difficult to discern the structural condition of the house from the submitted photographs, although it does appear to be vacant and in a state of disrepair. According to a photograph of the house on Google Street View that dates from November 2017, the lot is overgrown and littered with refuse, although the house appears to be in a relatively stable condition. Based on the submitted photography, Staff cannot determine the current condition of the dwelling. While exterior and interior

renovations and site cleanup are clearly needed, the pictures do not clearly demonstrate if there are any structural issues.

Documentation

In the package submitted by the Applicant, there are several documents regarding the demolition request. There was a notice sent on April 3, 2018 regarding a public hearing held on April 19, 2018. On April 19, 2018, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. According to the Applicant and in looking at the sign-in sheets for the meeting, it does not appear that a representative for the owner of the property was in attendance to speak at the meeting. A registered letter regarding the demolition decision was sent to the owner on April 19, 2017. It has been four months since the decision of the board was sent.

A review of the inspection form shows there are several interior and exterior items that need to be renovated, repaired or replaced. The form indicates the total cost for repairs as \$24,450.70. The bulk of the exterior repairs pertain to repair of roof decking, reroofing, and siding. The Office of Code Compliance estimates the building is 313% deteriorated based on the current value of the property versus how much it would cost to bring it into compliance. Despite these needed repairs, the basement and rear windows are specified in the report as open to the elements, not the roof or damaged exterior walls.

Findings

Based on the documentation and photographs submitted by the Applicant, it is unclear to Staff if the existing building has suffered substantial structural damage or if it is largely intact. As such, Staff is unable to determine if the cost to demolish the existing house and build a new house would far exceed the estimated repair and renovation costs. Based on the information we have at this time, Staff recommends a deferral of the demolition application to allow the Applicant time to provide additional photographic documentation that clearly illustrates the current structural condition of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following concerns:

1. The Applicant shall provide additional photographs of all four sides of the building that clearly illustrate the structural condition of the property; and,
2. The supporting documentation shall be submitted to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the scheduled meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance-Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2590 Godfrey Drive SW

APPLICATION: CA4PH-18-289 (demolition due to a threat to public health and safety)

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: Inventory: 1950

Property Location: Interior lot on south side of Godfrey Dr. between Hutton Pl. and Hamilton E. Holmes Dr.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** No Type/Style

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20Q.005 and Section 16-20.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Type IV and the In Rem Process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a public threat to health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the application. In this particular case, the property has gone through the In Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta.

Notices were sent to the owner on record on April 3, 2018 regarding the public hearing scheduled on April 19, 2018. Notices for the In-Rem hearing were advertised on April 4, 2018 and April 12, 2018. On April 19, 2018, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. In looking at the sign-in sheets for the meeting, there was no one present to speak in favor or opposition to the proposed demolition. A registered letter regarding the demolition decision was delivered to the owner on record sometime after the April 19th hearing.

The Applicant is not the owner and the In Rem process does not allow for repair, renovations or sale of the property. Staff finds the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values are useful for informational purposes but do not always apply in City of Atlanta In Rem cases. Staff finds the most relevant two questions in these cases are the following:

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists; and

The following is the Applicant's answer to this question:

"The first complaint received to the OCC on October 24, 2016 for Sec 19. Highly hazardous structure – Open and vacant, deferred maintenance, overgrowth, junk, trash, and debris in the yard; Refer to the attached Inspection Form dated March 27, 2018 to see the detailed repair estimates which elaborate on violations from most recent activity."

2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.

The following is the Applicant's answer to this question:

"There are no alternatives feasible to rectify the threat to public safety and welfare. The owner is non-responsive; no response to any certified letters sent to the owners nor did the owner attend the Public In Rem hearing [on] April 19, 2018."

Photographs and Documentation

A review of survey pictures taken in 2008, show the existing dwelling as occupied and in good condition. The Applicant submitted pictures taken in July 2018. In looking at the pictures submitted by the Applicant, the lot is overgrown and the building has suffered some interior (walls, ceilings) and exterior (broken window panes) damage; however, the house appears largely intact and retains a high degree of its original architectural character and material fabric. While renovations and site cleanup are clearly needed, the pictures do not indicate there are any structural issues with the building. It appears the house can be easily boarded and secured and that the overgrown lot can be trimmed and maintained.

The inspection form shows there are several items both interior and exterior that need to be renovated, repaired or replaced. The form states the total cost for repairs, including permit fees is \$27,555.85. The Office of Code Compliance estimates the building is 121% deteriorated based on the current value of the property versus how much it would cost to bring it into compliance. Staff finds the cost of building an identical new house would far exceed the costs of repairing the existing structure. Staff finds the cost to repair the building is not unreasonable. Staff finds that demolishing the building as opposed to repairing it would be a detriment to the District.

Notwithstanding Staff's findings regarding the condition of the building, as an open and vacant property, is by definition a threat to public health and safety. Despite the fact the house is intact, its status as an open a vacant property makes it a public threat to health and safety. However, Staff finds the threat could be eliminated if the house were cleaned and closed or properly rehabilitated and occupied.

Findings

Staff finds the existing building has not suffered a fire or other substantial structural damage and is largely intact. Staff finds the cost to demolish the existing house and build a new house would far exceed the estimated repair and renovation costs. Staff acknowledges the City cannot repair, renovate or sell the property. While Staff finds that an open and vacant building is a threat to public health and safety, Staff finds that properly boarding and securing the building should be the first step to rectifying the threat before demolition can be considered.

Staff finds demolishing a building that is in good condition and could potentially be renovated is a detriment to the Historic District. Based on the information we have at this time, Staff cannot support the proposed demolition. Staff recommends the existing property be properly cleaned and secured.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

**KEISHA LANCE
BOTTOMS
MAYOR**

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

**TIM KEANE
Commissioner**

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: Cabbagetown Landmark District – Subarea 5

APPLICATION: RC-18-338 – Text Amendment to Subarea 5 permitted uses (Z-18-65)

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbagetown Landmark District Zoning Overlay **Other Zoning:** SPI-22 (Memorial Drive) Beltline

Date of Construction: NA

Property Location: NA

Contributing (Y/N)?: NA **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** NA

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Text amendment

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: None

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043(e)(6)

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Property rezoned in February 2018 from Subarea 2 to Subarea 3 of District.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

As proposed, the text amendment would add the following uses to those that are explicitly excluded by the District regulations: service stations, secured-storage facilities, car washes, funeral homes, body shops, and sales lots for automobiles. In general, as currently outlined the Subarea 5 uses are those permitted in the “Light Industrial” (I-1) zoning category with several additions and exclusions. This text amendment would add to the exclusions.

In general, the Staff would note that most uses (when viewed in isolation) do not affect the historic or physical character of the District given that all renovations, alterations, additions, etc. must meet the same design standards regardless of the type of use. However, the Staff finds that the uses that are proposed for exclusion are uses that are more suited to a true “Light Industrial” area, not a low density commercial corridor that is the connecting link between several single-family and low density residential neighborhoods, including Cabbagetown. Also, a portion of Subarea 5 is in the northern portion of the District making access for these types of uses problematic. Further, the Staff would note that *Atlanta City Design* and the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) do not indicate the Memorial Drive corridor and the northern portion of Cabbagetown as industrial areas, but rather areas that are transitioning to a more mixed-use, urban development pattern. The exclusion of the proposed uses would reinforce that transition.

The Staff supports the text amendment to the Subarea 5 regulations.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission delivers its comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board regarding the Review and Comment (RC-18-338) on Z-18-65 (text amendment) to the **Cabbagetown Landmark District**. Properties zoned Cabbagetown Landmark District.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 312 North Highland Ave.

APPLICATION: RC-18-308

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

Other Zoning: C-1 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1904

Property Location: North blockface of N. Highland Ave., at the northeast corner of the Elizabeth St. Intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Parking reduction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the BZA.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 and Sec 16-20L of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is requesting a reduction in the required on-site parking spaces from 41 spaces to 11 spaces. In looking at the site in question, the building takes up the majority of the site. Parking is provided in the portion of the property along Elizabeth St. which is not taken up by the building. The property is approximately 300 to 400 feet directly south of the Elizabeth St. entrance to the Beltline. It is anticipated that the majority of the traffic to the new business and the existing businesses will be from patrons utilizing the beltline and alternative transportation methods. Due to this proximity to the beltline, lack of additional space for parking at the establishment, Staff has no concerns with the proposed parking reduction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 0 Griffin St. (John F. Kennedy Park)
APPLICATION:R RC-18-269
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: SPI-11 (Subarea 7)

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: At the southwest corner of Griffin St. and Orr St.

Contributing (Y/N)?:N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code.

The project before the Commission at this time involves the complete renovation of the existing John F. Kennedy Park in Vine City. The renovated park will contain 45,000 sf of artificial turf which will allow for both flag football and soccer fields, a new playground, a new basketball court, a shade pavilion, and stadium seating. In general Staff has no concerns with the layout or programming of the area and finds the overall design to be appropriate. As Staff has only been provided a master plan for the review of the project, it is unclear whether the proposed landscaping will include the retention of the existing mature trees or whether the existing trees will be removed. Staff suggests the Applicant discuss the landscaping for the project. Staff also notes that the master plan does not show any bicycle parking being provided. Staff suggests the Applicant clarify whether any bicycle parking will be provided. If no bicycle parking is provided, Staff suggests the Applicant consider adding parking to encourage alternate transportation to the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: Confederate Avenue, SE, East Confederate Avenue, SE and Confederate Court, SE

APPLICATION: RC-18-331

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: Properties zoned variously.

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Confederate and East Confederate Ave. east of Boulevard SE, and west of Moreland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Renaming of the public right of way.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 138-8

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with the comments and findings of the Commission and Staff (as noted in the Staff Report) to the Applicant and the appropriate City agencies.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 138-8 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

The proposal before the Commission at this time is the renaming of Confederate and East Confederate Ave., and Confederate Ct. to as yet undetermined names. The renaming would apply to the entirety of Confederate and East Confederate Ave. between Boulevard SE to the east and Moreland Ave. to the west, and the entirety of Confederate Ct. from East Confederate Ave. to its northern terminus.

The earliest written record of the name Confederate Ave. which Staff could locate is in an 1892 Atlanta Constitution advertisement for the sale of a 50' x 150' lot at the corner of Confederate Ave. (now East Confederate Ave.) and Walker St. (now Walker Ave.) for \$400. The Advertisement notes the proximity of the lot as being one block from the "Confederate Soldier's Home of Georgia". It is unclear whether the name for this street was derived from the association of the Confederate Soldier's Home being located along it. It is likely that the road which is now known as Confederate Ave. and East Confederate Ave. was an unpaved farm to market road which was not formalized until the early 20th century or shortly after the construction of the Confederate Soldier's Home. This would have been during the "Lost Cause" period of Civil War and Confederate memorialization efforts. The report issued in November, 2017 by the City of Atlanta's "Advisory Committee on City of Atlanta Street Names and Monuments Associated with the Confederacy" ("the Committee") describes the "Lost Cause" period as follows:

At the same time, local, city, and state officials throughout the South began to limit the ability of African Americans to participate in social and civil society through ordinances and legislation commonly referred to as "Jim Crow" laws. The monuments erected during the height of the Jim Crow era were often heroic in stature, featuring Confederate generals on horses, elaborate pillars and pedestals, and other grandiose details. They were often placed in strategic, well-traveled locations, such as public squares, courthouses, and institutions of higher education. A reenvisioned explanation of the cause and outcome of the Civil War, termed the Lost Cause, was vigorously circulated throughout the South and is exemplified in these monuments. The mythology of the Lost Cause is an alternative justification for the Civil War that explains the Confederacy's military loss as a moral victory, claiming, in essence, that the Confederacy was fully justified in its action.

Regardless of the association with the Soldier's Home, there is no doubt that the name is linked to the Confederacy.

While it is unusual for the Commission to comment on a street renaming without a replacement name having already been selected, the name change proposal is directly related to the report issued by the Committee. The Committee issued several specific recommendations to the City Council and the Mayor. Of those recommendations, number 6 states as follows:

"... the committee makes the following specific recommendations to the City Council and Mayor: ...Immediately change Confederate Avenue, East Confederate Avenue, and any street named after Nathan Bedford Forrest, John B. Gordon, Robert E. Lee, Stephen Dill Lee, or Howell Cobb. The aforementioned were significant Confederate military leaders and actively involved in white supremacist activities after the war, making them undeserving of the honor of a street name in Atlanta."

Staff agrees with the Committee's findings and finds that the name of the Confederacy is equally undeserving of the honor of a street name in Atlanta. As such, the Staff fully supports the proposal to change the name of Confederate and East Confederate Avenues and Confederate Court.

RC-18-331 for
Renaming of Confederate and East Confederate Ave., and Confederate Ct..
August 22, 2018
Page 3 of 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with the comments and findings of the Commission and Staff (as noted in the Staff Report) to the Applicant and the appropriate City agencies.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Various Addresses
APPLICATION: RC-18-332
MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Zoned Variously **Other Zoning:** Zoned Variously

Date of Construction: Dates of construction range between 1920 and 1961

Property Location: Various Locations

Contributing (Y/N)?: No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Various

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: In Rem Review Board Demolition Orders Programmatic Agreement (executed 9/10/98).

Review of Proposed In-Rem Demolition Actions for July 19, 2018:

16 Historic / Contributing Properties – Per Stipulations II and IV

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The subject properties were recommended for demolition by the City of Atlanta's In Rem Review Board at its July 19, 2018 meeting. The properties are located across the City in Atlanta Landmark Districts, National Register of Historic Places-eligible neighborhoods and National Register-listed neighborhoods. Fifteen of the properties are single-family houses. One is an apartment complex.

Through the Administration In Rem proceeding set forth in Article III, Section 30 of the Atlanta Housing Code, the Atlanta Police Department-Code Enforcement Section can proceed with demolition or clean and close action against private property. When a property owner fails to bring his/her property into compliance with the Atlanta Housing Code or the Atlanta Commercial Institutional Building Maintenance Code, a review/inspection of such property is conducted by the Code Enforcement staff to determine if the property (structure) is eligible for demolition or clean and close abatement.

Generally, properties that are unsecured, fire damaged, collapsing, or severely dilapidated are eligible for In Rem proceedings. However, the Atlanta Housing Code states any property (structure) that cannot be repaired at cost less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundation and lot) it can be demolished. If the structure can be repaired at less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundations and lot) it can be cleaned and closed.

Once the inspection assessment (determination of demolition or clean and close) of such properties is completed, an In Rem hearing is scheduled and evidence is put forth before the In Rem Review Board. Evidence includes, but not limited to, the number of complaints filed with the APD-Code Enforcement Section, the types of violations noted, the progression of notification to property owner(s), photographs, and the inspection assessment.

When an Order of demolition or clean and close is issued by the In Rem Review Board, the APD-Code Enforcement Section has authorization to access that private property and abate the nuisance. Once the abatement is completed, a lien is filed against the property for the cost of the abatement.

While the Staff is always concerned about the loss of historic or potentially historic buildings in the City of Atlanta, the properties in the In Rem review process are either in very poor condition, the City is unable to find the legitimate property owner, or the property owner cannot or will not address the situation. Further, the properties have often been in the City of Atlanta's code compliance system for some time meaning that there are been additional opportunities at which the property was made aware of the problems and given an opportunity to address the situation.

Regardless, the Staff finds that given the volume of properties proposed for demolition, digital images of a representative sample of the properties in the best condition should be prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Section of the Atlanta Police Department and the Office of Design's historic preservation staff.

Based on the information provided to date by the Code Enforcement Staff, the Staff would suggest the following five properties have digital images prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Staff:

1089 Coleman Street SW
1943 Conrad Avenue SE
575 James P. Brawley Drive NW
730 Lillian Avenue SW
1162 McDaniel Street SW

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission deliver comments at the meeting regarding Review and Comment (RC-18-332) for In-Rem demolition applications from July 19, 2018.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 285 Sheridan Dr. (Garden Hills Elementary Park)

APPLICATION: RC-18-359

MEETING DATE: August 22, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** R-4.

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: The parcel of land bordered by Sheridan Dr. (aka Loop Rd.) to the east, south, and west and bordered by Delmont Dr. to the north. .

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work, new walking/running path, new amphitheater, new play courts, new playground, new outdoor classroom.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code.

The existing multi-use field will be regraded, landscaped, and have drainage/irrigation installed to serve as an updated multi use field. Surrounding this field, a new walking/running path will be installed. The path appears to be concrete and will be ringed by benches, fitness stations, and playground equipment. In general Staff has no concerns with the proposed projects.

Staff noted that the plans appear to show plans for entry paths connecting to the western frontage along Sheridan Rd. (aka Loop Rd.). However, it does not appear that a sidewalk will be installed along the border of the property. Staff suggests the Applicant consider the installation of a sidewalk around the border of the park to aid in pedestrian ingress/egress from the property and to encourage alternate forms of transportation to and from the site.

With regards to the Amphitheater, play courts, playground, and outdoor classroom Staff has no general concerns with the design of the structures as shown by the plans provided by the Applicant. Staff would suggest the project utilize high-quality sustainable materials for the projects and that a regular maintenance schedule be created to ensure the longevity of the proposed improvements.

While the project is associated with Garden Hills Elementary School, it is unclear whether the project will be publicly accessible outside of school hours as a community/neighborhood amenity. It would appear that as the plans call for a fence and gate to be installed at the southwest corner of the property that the plans may be for this park to be an amenity intended only to be utilized by the School. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether the property associated with the project will be publicly accessible outside of school hours. Staff further suggests the Applicant clarify whether the proposed improvements are associated with a master plan for either the School at large or for the park itself.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting:

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File