



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: 736 Elbert
APPLICATION: CA3-19-424
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4A/Beltline Overlay

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Allene Avenue and East of Mayland Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Added Space

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-201.

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 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

PLANS

The Applicant proposes to add place to the existing principal structure. In doing this a site plan with setbacks and FAR information is needed. The Applicant has provided setback information on the site plan. However, the Applicant has not provided the FAR information required. Staff recommends the Applicant provide to-scale site plans with both setback information and FAR on the plans.

Chimney

Currently, on the plans an existing chimney is missing. Chimneys are an architectural feature for houses constructed during this period. Therefore, the chimney can not be removed. Staff recommends the chimney be placed on the plans and can not be removed from the principle structure.

Roof Brackets

The Applicant has not indicated on the plans the roof brackets on the gable roof over the porch. Staff recommends the Applicant not remove the brackets and put them on them final plans for submittal.

ADDITION

The 563 feet addition the Applicant proposes for interior renovations sits in the buildable area of the property. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Roofline

The proposed roofline will extend the existing roof line and will not pier over it. Additionally, the proposed roof will take the shape of the existing roof. The pitch will be 6:12. The Applicant has not indicated the pitch on the existing roof pitch. Staff recommends the Applicant indicate the pitch of the existing principle structure.

Windows

Right Elevation

On the right elevation, the Applicant proposes to install two one-over-one windows with trim that matches the other existing windows on the principle structure. District Regulations requires that new windows be compatible in scale, size, style, proportion and placement of the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Left Elevation

On the left elevation, the Applicant also proposes to install two one-over-one windows with trim that also matches the existing window on the principle structure. These windows will be compatible in scale, size, style, proportion and placement as the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Side Deck

The Applicant proposes to install a side deck on the new addition. District Regulations requires that decks not be visible from the public-right away. Being that the side deck will be visible, Staff recommends it not be constructed. If the Applicant wants to construct a side porch, the Applicant can do so by adding columns and a small gable porch over the railings and steps. Also, Staff

recommends the railings be constructed with a two-part construction with a head butt system, to match the railings on the front porch.

Siding

The proposed new siding appears to match the existing siding in direction. The Applicant does not indicate what material the existing siding or the proposed siding will be. Research indicates, the existing siding is possibly asbestos. Therefore, the Applicant cannot install asbestos. The Applicant can install cementitious siding to match the pattern of the asbestos. Staff recommends the Applicant do so.

Foundation

On the plans, the Applicant has shown the existing foundation as a brick foundation and plans to continue the brick foundation on the new additions. Staff is not concerned about this proposal.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to install a deck in the rear of the principle structure. Deck will not be seen from the public right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant only do window alterations on the existing structure. On the right elevation, the Applicant has proposed to remove a single window that went over the kitchen sink. District Regulations requires architectural significant windows to be retained. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the window on the right elevation.

On the left elevation, the Applicant has removed the window to make way for a door to enter and exit on the deck or porch. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the trim and detail of the window, for the door if a porch is constructed. If the Applicant does not construct a porch, Staff recommends the window be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide to-scale site plans with both setback information and FAR on them, Sec.16-20I.006();
2. The chimney shall be placed on the plans and cannot be removed from the principle structure, Sec.16-20I.006();
3. The Applicant shall not remove the brackets and put them on them final plans for submittal, per Sec.16-20I.006();
4. The Applicant shall provide information on the pitch of the existing principle structure, Sec.16-20I.006;
5. The side deck shall not be constructed, per Sec.16-20I.006(2)(4)(f);
6. If the Applicant wants to construct a side porch, the porch shall have columns and a small gable porch over the railings and steps, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(g)(4);
7. The railings shall be constructed with a two-part construction with a head butt system, to match the railings on the front porch, per Sec.16-20I.006;
8. The siding on the addition shall be cementitious siding, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(a)(4);

9. The Applicant shall retain the window on the existing right-side elevation, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);
10. The Applicant shall retain the trim and detail on the window for the door, if a porch shall be constructed on the left-side elevation, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);
11. If the Applicant does not construct a porch on the left elevation, the window shall be retained, per Sec.16-20I(4)(b)(1) and
12. The final plans shall be reviewed and approved by Staff

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: 541 Collier Ridge
APPLICATION: CA2-19-437
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1965

Property Location: Front facing Engle Road

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style** Split-level

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: June 07, 2019, a Stop Work Order was placed on this house for painted brick. However, from photos provide by the Applicant it appears as if the paint has been removed. Listed as Complied in Accela

February 25, 2019 a Stop work order was placed for doing exterior work with out the UDC Approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes to do the following alterations for the review: Replace support posts on the front porch, replace decorative trim, repair damage roof and replace shingles. The Applicant also proposes to some alterations in the rear of the main structure that will not be in the purview of the Commission.

Support posts

The original posts were removed and new 6x6 wood column were installed. District Regulations requires original ornamentations such as railings, columns and decorative attachment be retained. If these ornamentations can't be retained, the replacement much be in-kind to match the original. From photos submitted for the new support posts and the original, the photos indicate the Applicant replaced in-kind the posts. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Trim

As with the support posts, the Applicants has removed the decorative trim on the front porch of the principal structure. This decorative trim is a defining feature on houses built during this period. District Regulations as stated above requires such ornamentation and defining features to be retained. Since the Applicant has removed the trim, the Staff recommends either the Applicant retrieve the original trim and reinstall it back on the house or the new trim must match in-kind to the original trim.

Roof

The Applicant proposes to repair the roof but doesn't explain or provide photos of the damage roof. Staff recommends the Applicant explain the damages or provide photographic evidence of the damage and what does that repair consist of on the house.

Shingles

The Applicant proposes to re-shingle the roof. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall retrieve the original trim and reinstall it back on the house or the new trim shall match in-kind to the original trim, per Sec.16-20Q.006(18)(c);
2. The Applicant shall explain the damages or provide photographic evidence of the damage, and explain what the repair consist of on the houses, per Sec.-20Q.006 and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



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: 1091 Tucker Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-439 & CA3-19-440
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** RG-3-C / Beltline.

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: North block face of Tucker Ave, west of Lee St., east of Peoples St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New construction and Variances.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-439: Approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-440: Defer.

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.

Explanation of project and application of District regulations.

The project before the Commission at this time is non-standard for the largely single-family and duplex residential neighborhood. The intent of the project is to bring 23 permanently affordable residential units to a block face on the edge of the District that currently has no residential structures and which has a high degree of connectivity to public transit and the Beltline. The property received a rezoning from the ZRB that conditioned several aspects of the project on the approved site plan. Therefore, several requirements of Chapter 20M, such as setbacks, will not apply to the project. Staff will note specific areas where this relationship exists in the body of the analysis.

As the regulations themselves are written to ensure conformity with the historic single-family and duplex residential structures, several variances will be required in order for the project to be approved. At this time, three variances are proposed by the Applicant with the aim of ensuring the highest degree of conformity to the historic character of the neighborhood and permitting a project with a higher residential density than is anticipated by Chapter 20M.

Variance Requests

The requested variances are to allow the non-quantifiable compatibility comparisons to be based on the north and south block face of Lawton Ave. SW, to increase the maximum driveway width from 10' (required) to 26' (proposed), and to waive the requirement for front porch steps and front doors facing the street.

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

The Applicant states that there are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions of the property based on its size, shape, or topography. However, Staff finds that the subject property, which contains a frontage of 358' along the north block face of Tucker Ave., is among the largest contiguous and undeveloped properties in the District. Staff also finds that there is a lack of comparable properties on the block face. The one contributing property on the block, located at 1121 Tucker Ave., is a vacant Masonic Lodge. As such, Staff finds there is a hardship based on the size, shape, and topography of the lot.

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

The Applicant provides several responses in relation to these criteria. In general, Staff agrees with the Applicant's assessments.

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

In response to this criteria, Applicant cites the lack of comparable residential structures and the intent to build high-density affordable housing. The Applicant does cite the support of the Neighborhood organization; however, Staff would note that neighborhood support is not a criterion for the granting of a variance.

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 has not provided a response to this criterion. However, Staff finds that the introduction of new affordable housing units on a block face that is otherwise devoid of any residential uses outweighs the need for strict adherence to the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

In general Staff finds that the lot size and location are the primary factors creating unnecessary hardship for the project. As such, Staff supports the requested variances.

New Construction

The District regulations have both quantitative and qualitative requirements for new construction. If a project element is not discussed below, Staff found the related zoning requirements were met.

Building massing and height.

The one contributing structure on the block face from which the quantitative measurements will be taken is 1121 Tucker Ave. In looking at the comparable property, Staff finds that the massing of the proposed structure is largely similar to the historic institutional structure. However, no information detailing the allowable height based on the contributing structure at 1121 Tucker Ave. has been received. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide the allowable height of the structure based on the contributing property at 1021 Tucker Ave.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-439: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-440: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide the allowable height of the structure based on the contributing property at 1021 Tucker Ave, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(g); and,
2. 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: 1013 Peeples St.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-436
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West block face of Peeples St., south of Donnelly Ave., north of Lawton Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Pyramid Cottage / Double Shotgun Duplex

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: work on the rear façade

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: On March 26, 2019 the subject property received a permit for interior alterations with no work approved on the exterior of the structure. On May 9, Staff received complaints of exterior work being completed on the property without proper review by the Commission or proper permits.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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.

Photographs

Staff has received no photographs of the subject property from the Applicant. As the project involves work that did not receive the proper approvals prior to the work being done, Staff finds that photographs showing the existing conditions of both the structure and the site will be required in order for Staff to have a full understanding of the completed and proposed work. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographs showing all 4 sides of the structure and all 4 yards of the property.

Siding

The Applicant has replaced the previously existing siding with cement siding. From the inventory photographs, Staff finds that the house was previously clad in asbestos shingles. This cladding was typically installed over original wood siding to save on cost and labor. However, as the siding replacement did not receive the proper review, Staff cannot confirm whether historic siding was in place under the asbestos shingle siding. As Staff cannot perform the proper review of whether any historic siding was in place on the structure and the need for that siding to be replaced, Staff finds that requiring siding that is consistent with what would have originally been installed on the structure is appropriate. As such, Staff recommends wood horizontal lap siding be installed on the front and side façades with a 4" to 6" reveal.

Window and Door replacement/removal

The Applicant has replaced all windows on the structure with vinyl windows, has replaced one of the front doors with a new door of an unspecified material, and has removed the second front door on the front façade.

In comparing the window placement and sizes shown on the plans to the district inventory, Staff finds that the new windows match the size and placement of the previous windows on the side façades. However, Staff finds that the front façade elevations do not accurately reflect the window placement as shown on street view images of the property. Staff recommends the front façade elevations be corrected to show the correct height of the windows on the front façade. As the previous windows are no longer on site, and Staff cannot perform the proper review of the historic status of the windows and their need for replacement, Staff finds that requiring windows that are consistent with those that would have originally been installed on the structure is appropriate. As such, Staff recommends all vinyl windows on the front and side façades of the structure be replaced with unclad wood windows with a one over one style.

Staff finds that the two front doors on the structure are integral to both the historic character of the structure and the pattern of development on this block. As such, Staff recommends the second front door on the front façade be reintroduced. As Staff was not able to perform the proper review of the historic status of the front doors or their need for replacement, Staff finds that requiring doors that are consistent with those that would have originally been installed on the property would be appropriate. As such, Staff recommends the two front doors on the structure be unclad wood with a rectangular lite opening meeting the compatibility rule.

Porch

The previously existing columns have been replaced with new wood columns, and a new side nailed deck railing has been installed on the front porch. While Staff is not able to determine whether the previous columns were original to the structure or in need of replacement, Staff does find that the placement, materials, and style of the new columns match the previously existing columns. As such, Staff has no concerns with this portion of the project.

With regards to the side nailed deck railing, Staff finds that the dimensions and construction method of this element are not consistent with and do not reinforce the architectural character of the contributing structure. Porch rails on this structure would originally have been constructed using a two-part butt joint method and the top rail would have been placed no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows. Given that the front porch does not appear to be higher than 3' above grade, Staff finds that a porch railing would not be required for compliance with IRC. As such, Staff recommends the front porch railing either be removed or replaced with a new rail constructed using a two-part butt joint method with the top rail placed no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows.

Driveway and Sidewalk

Staff has received complaints from the neighborhood that the existing non-compliant driveway has either been replaced or is proposed for replacement. The District regulations prohibit parking in the front yard of properties in the District. The existing driveway terminates between the front porch and the street. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant clarify their plans for the driveway. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant, that any work on the driveway would require the driveway to comply with the requirement that driveways extend 20' past the front façade of the principal structure. As such, Staff recommends that any driveway replacement meet the District regulations.

The District regulations require sidewalks to be installed along the street frontage. In the past, the Commission has required projects involving significant alterations to provide a new sidewalk if the previous sidewalk is missing. As such, Staff recommends the site plan be revised to show a new hex-stamped concrete sidewalk being installed along the Peeples St. frontage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide photographs showing all 4 sides of the structure and all 4 yards of the property;
2. Wood horizontal lap siding shall be installed on the front and side façades with a 4" to 6" reveal, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
3. The front façade elevations shall be corrected to show the correct eight of the windows on the front façade, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
4. All vinyl windows on the front and side façades of the structure shall be replaced with unclad wood windows with a one over one style, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
5. The second front door on the front façade shall be reintroduced, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);

6. The two front doors on the structure shall be unclad wood with a rectangular lite opening meeting the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
7. The front porch railing shall either be removed or replaced with a new rail constructed using a two-part butt joint method with the top rail placed no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
8. Any driveway replacement shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
9. The site plan shall be revised to show a new hex-stamped concrete sidewalk being installed along the Peebles St. frontage, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
10. 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: 973 Oakland Dr.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-426
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: West block face of Oakland Dr., south of Richland Rd., north of Plaza Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vacant

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Subdivision of one (1) lot into two (2) lots.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition of the existing non-contributing accessory structure.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

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.

The Applicant proposes the subdivision of the existing 100' wide by 150' deep lot into two 50' wide by 150' deep lots. In reviewing subdivisions such as the one proposed for the subject property, the project must meet the requirements of the underlying R-4A zoning as well as the specific requirements laid out in the Oakland City Historic District zoning regulations. For subdivisions, the Oakland City Historic District zoning regulations specify that *"all subdivisions of lots shall conform to the historic platting pattern in the district established during the period of significance from 1867 to 1955 with regard to lot size, dimensions, and configurations (per Sec. 16-20M.010)."*

Staff was able to locate copies of the Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps produced for the City of Atlanta in 1933, with supplements for this area dating through 1959 for certain properties. The specific block for this property was not included in the maps, but much of the surrounding area is. Further, the majority of the properties shown in the District are unsupplemented which would indicate that for much of the neighborhood's history there were little to no significant changes in the lot configuration of the neighborhood at large, particularly for residential structures. The maps show a pattern of residential and commercial lots with variations in both depth and width that are repeated across several lots on a given block face. The lot widths that Staff was able to identify from the residential lots in the immediate vicinity range from 40' to 70' wide. Likewise the lot depths Staff was able to identify on residential lots range between 100' at the smallest and 175' at the deepest. Based on this analysis, Staff finds that the proposed lot configuration of two 50' wide by 150' deep lots meet the historic platting pattern in the District established during the period of significance from 1867 to 1955.

Staff would note that the proposed site plan notes the underlying R-4A zoning setbacks, which are supplanted by the Oakland City Historic District zoning regulations for this neighborhood. The specific regulations have specific setbacks for the front, side, and rear yard setbacks that any future structure would be required to conform to. Staff would further note that the only structures which may be used for compatibility comparisons such as height, architectural style, materials, and window/door pattern are the properties located at 903, 905, 911, 917, and 925 Oakland Dr. which all exhibit characteristics of the minimal traditional style.

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: 650 Gaskill St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-381
MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: Northwest corner of Gaskill St. and Powell St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Place of worship.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New single family residence.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral

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

Compatibility comparisons

The Compatibility rule in the Cabbagetown Landmark District specifies that compatibility comparisons are to be taken from contributing houses of the same style and use as the proposed structure. For the purposes of reviewing new construction in Subarea 3 shotguns and cottages are defined as the two styles that are to be considered. The Applicant has provided compatibility comparisons which include all contributing structures on the block face. As Staff finds the block face only contains two contributing shotgun style homes located at 167 and 169 Powell St., the information for these two properties will be used when reviewing comparisons based on the compatibility rule.

Site plan

The proposed structure contains a front yard setback of 13'4", a rear yard setback of 12', a left side yard setback of 3' 6 3/4" and a right side yard setback of 3' 3/4". The two comparable properties both contain a front yard setback of 23', rear yard setbacks of 15', a left side yard setback range of 1' 11" to 2' 6", and a right side yard setback range of 2' 6" and 10'. As such, Staff finds that the front, rear, and left side yard setbacks do not meet the compatibility rule.

Staff Recommends the proposed setbacks meet the compatibility rule.

Staff retains this recommendation.

Height and width

The proposed structure has a height of 23' and a width of 15' 6". Based on the compatibility information, the two comparable properties have a height range of 20' 6" to 21' 5". No information regarding the width of the comparable properties has been received. Staff finds that the proposed height does not meet the range set by the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the proposed height meet the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable building width range.

The Applicant has provided updated information showing the height range based on the two comparable structures is 22' 8 1/2" and 24' 3 1/2". As such, Staff finds the proposed height of 23' meets the compatibility rule.

With regards to the proposed building width, the Applicant has provided information showing the width of the comparable structures is between 16' 2" and 18' 2". Staff finds that the proposed building with of 15' 6" does not meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the proposed building width meet the compatibility rule.

Porch

Per the regulations a front porch is provided. The porch will contain a hipped roof matching the design of the comparable properties. Staff finds that the design of the front porch features is consistent with those of 167 Powell St. with the exception of a column placed in the middle of the front porch. As such, Staff

recommends the middle porch column be removed. Staff further recommends the porch flooring be installed perpendicular to the front façade.

The updated plans show both the middle porch column being removed and the porch flooring being installed perpendicular to the front façade. Staff finds these recommendations have been met.

Facades

The proposed structure has a window on the left side of the front façade and a door on the right side of the front façade. However, the comparable properties both have a door on the left side of the front façade and a window on the right side of the front façade. As such, Staff recommends the fenestration on the front façade match those on the comparable properties.

Staff finds the revised plans meet this recommendation.

The Comparable properties contain rectangular louvered attic vents. The proposed structure contains a rectangular casement window. Staff finds that the overall shape of the proposed window is consistent with the gable ornamentation on the comparable properties and has no concerns with the proposal.

The drawings appear to show no door on the side and rear facades. While this is outside the purview of the Commission, Staff suggests the Applicant confirm with Fire Safety Staff from the Office of Buildings that this configuration would be approved per their review.

Information detailing the allowable first floor height above street level has not been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable first floor height above grade.

The Applicant has provided information showing the first floor height of the comparable properties is between 1' 5" and 1' 9". The proposed structure contains a first floor height of 9". Staff finds the proposed first floor height does not meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the first floor height be between 1' 5" and 1' 9".

Roofs

The proposed structure is defined by a front facing gable roof. No information detailing the allowable roof pitch has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch.

Staff finds this recommendation has been met and finds that the proposed roof pitch meets the compatibility rule.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a parking pad in the rear of the property for use by neighboring structures, and a concrete strip driveway on the left side of the structure, which will straddle the property line. Staff has no concerns with the layout of these features, but recommends the Applicant confirm that all driveways and parking pads are at least 1/3 pervious as required by the District regulations.

The plans note that the proposed paving will be entirely comprised of pervious pavers. Staff finds this configuration meets the District regulations.

Per the regulations a walkway leading to the front door is provided.

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

1. The proposed setbacks shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20A.006(9);
2. *The proposed building width shall meet the compatibility rule., per Sec. 16-20A.009(7);*
3. *The first floor height shall be between 1'5" and 1'9, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(2); and,*
4. 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: 650 Gaskill St.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-384

MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: Northwest corner of Gaskill St. and Powell St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Place of worship.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New single family residence.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes. Deferred August 28, 2019. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral

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

Compatibility comparisons

The Compatibility rule in the Cabbagetown Landmark District specifies that compatibility comparisons are to be taken from contributing houses of the same style and use as the proposed structure. For the purposes of reviewing new construction in Subarea 3 shotguns and cottages are defined as the two styles that are to be considered. The Applicant has provided compatibility comparisons which include all contributing structures on the block face. As Staff finds the block face only contains two contributing shotgun style homes located at 167 and 169 Powell St., the information for these two properties will be used when reviewing comparisons based on the compatibility rule.

However, as the property in question is the result of a subdivision that is based on the historic platting pattern of the District, and given the lack of comparable properties on a block face which originally contained several shotgun style homes which would have impacted the comparison analysis if they were still extant, and given that strict adherence to the compatibility rule could result in a hardship for certain provisions of the District regulations, Staff finds it would be appropriate for the Commission to consider a variance from the design regulations which would allow for comparisons to be taken from the contributing structures of like use on the block face as opposed to the contributing structures of like style and use. As such, Staff suggests the Applicant apply for a variance to permit the compatibility comparisons to be based only on contributing structure of like use on the block face.

Site plan

The proposed structure contains a front yard setback of 13' 4", a rear yard setback of 12', a half-depth front yard setback of 3' 1", and a right-side yard setback of 4' 6". The two comparable properties both contain a front yard setback of 23', rear yard setbacks of 15', a left side yard setback range of 1' 11" to 2' 6", and a right-side yard setback range of 2' 6" and 10'. As such, Staff finds that the front, rear, and left side yard setbacks do not meet the compatibility rule.

Staff Recommends the proposed setbacks meet the compatibility rule.

Staff retains this recommendation.

Height and width

The proposed structure has a height of 23' and a width of 20'. Based on the compatibility information, the two comparable properties have a height range of 20' 6" to 21' 5". No information regarding the width of the comparable properties has been received. Staff finds that the proposed height does not meet the range set by the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the proposed height meet the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable building width range.

The Applicant has provided updated information showing the height range based on the two comparable structures is 22' 8 ½" and 24' 3 ½". As such, Staff finds the proposed height of 23' meets the compatibility rule.

With regards to the proposed building width, the Applicant has provided information showing the width of the comparable structures is between 16' 2" and 18' 2". Staff finds that the proposed building with of 20' does not meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the proposed building width meet the compatibility rule.

Porch

Per the regulations a front porch is provided. The porch will contain a wraparound shed roof that will tie in to an enclosed area that will simulate an enclosed side porch addition. While Staff finds that the comparable properties contain side entry additions placed in roughly the same place as the proposed enclosure, they are not associated with a wrap around front porch. As such, Staff recommends the wrap around porch be removed from the plans and changed to a hipped roof porch on the Powell St. façade only.

The plans have been revised to remove the wrap around porch and to place a side-saddle addition on the Powell St. façade. The proposed addition contains a shed roof, which Staff finds is compatible with the proposed structure and the block face. As such, Staff finds this condition has been met and withdraws the recommendation that the side addition contain a hipped roof.

Staff finds that the design of the front porch features is consistent with those of 169 Powell St. Staff recommends the porch flooring be installed perpendicular to the front façade.

The updated plans show the porch flooring installed perpendicular to the front façade. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Facades

The Applicant has provided information showing the first floor height of the comparable properties is between 1' 5" and 1' 9". The proposed structure contains a first floor height of 9". Staff finds the proposed first floor height does not meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the first floor height be between 1' 5" and 1' 9".

The proposed structure has two windows on the main portion of the front façade and a door on the left side façade bump out. However, the comparable properties both have a door on the left side of the front façade and a window on the right side of the main portion of the front façade. The one comparable property with a side addition uses the door on the bump out as a secondary entry. As such, Staff recommends the fenestration on the front façade match those on the comparable properties.

Staff finds the revised plans meet these conditions.

The Comparable properties contain rectangular louvered attic vents. The proposed structure contains a rectangular casement window. Staff finds that the overall shape of the proposed window is consistent with the gable ornamentation on the comparable properties and has no concerns with the proposal.

The drawings appear to show only one door on the property. While this is outside the purview of the Commission, Staff suggests the Applicant confirm with Fire Safety Staff from the Office of Buildings that this configuration would be approved per their review.

Information detailing the allowable first floor height above street level has not been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable first floor height above grade.

The Applicant has provided information showing the first-floor height of the comparable properties is between 1' 5" and 1' 9". The proposed structure contains a first-floor height of 9". Staff finds the proposed first floor height does not meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the first floor height be between 1' 5" and 1' 9".

Roofs

The proposed structure is defined by a front facing gable roof. No information detailing the allowable roof pitch has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch.

Staff finds this recommendation has been met and finds that the proposed roof pitch meets the compatibility rule.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a parking pad in the rear of the property for use by neighboring structures, and a concrete strip driveway on the left side of the structure, which will straddle the property line. Staff has no concerns with the layout of these features, but recommends the Applicant confirm that all driveways and parking pads are at least 1/3 pervious as required by the District regulations.

The plans note that the proposed paving will be entirely comprised of pervious pavers. Staff finds this configuration meets the District regulations.

Per the regulations a walkway leading to the front door is provided.

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

1. The proposed setbacks shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20A.006(9);
2. *The proposed building width shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20A.009(7);*
3. *The first-floor height above grade shall be between 1' 5" and 1' 9", per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(2); and,*
4. 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: 98 Huntington Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-19-435
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: West block face of Huntington Rd., south of Palisades Rd, north of Woodcrest Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: exhibits characteristics of colonial revival architecture.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work relating to a new swimming pool.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

The Applicant proposes the installation of a new swimming pool to the rear of the property, within the buildable area of the lot. This Address previously received comments from the commission on a large project which included the removal of portions of the structure and hardscaping/paving. Therefore, while the site plan notes the existing site has a lot coverage of approximately 63%, the resulting project including the swimming pool will have a conforming lot coverage of approximately 45%.

As the proposed swimming pool will not be visible from the street and is situated towards the rear of the lot, Staff has no concerns with the work having a negative visual impact on the historic structure or the public right of way. Staff suggests the Applicant consider using materials that conform to the architectural style of the principal structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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: 36 Northwood Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-428
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West block face of Northwood Ave., south of Palisades Rd, north of Huntington Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Foundation alterations.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

The Applicant proposes the removal of a portion of the foundation to allow for access into the crawl space for interior excavation work. In reviewing the plans, Staff finds that the only portion of the work which will affect the exterior would be the removal and replacement of a portion of the foundation wall on the right-side façade. While Staff has no general concerns with the proposed work, Staff does suggest the Applicant retain and replace as much of the brick as possible. Staff further suggests the Applicant use a mortar that matches the consistency of the original mortar to avoid issues with the historic brick in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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: 428 Edgewood Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-442
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin L. King, Jr Landmark District (Subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1954

Property Location: North block face of Edgewood Ave., east of Jackson St., west of Boulevard NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Industrial/Warehouse

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Special Use Permit for a Park for Hire accessory use.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission at this time is a request to permit a park for hire lot at the subject property via a Special Use Permit. As the property is located in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District, the Commission is asked to review the application and provide commentary about the potential impact on the Historic District and the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property sits on the north block face of Edgewood Avenue, directly south of the tomb of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Correta Scott-King. The request would extend the existing park for hire accessory use for 3 years. The Applicant has stated that the parking will be used by the Georgia Justice Project during regular business hours and will convert to paid parking for the surrounding businesses during transient hours. Per the Landmark District regulations, the Applicant has submitted a parking analysis showing the availability of parking within 2000 linear feet of the subject property. This analysis shows 178 available parking spaces with only 152 spaces available on Friday and Saturday evenings. The Applicant states that within 2000 linear feet of the subject property are several popular after-hours establishments and restaurants. The continuation of the existing park for hire lot accessory use would add 20 parking spaces that could service these businesses.

Staff finds that the proposed special use permit meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and would have no impact on the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

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: 428 Edgewood Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-442
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin L. King, Jr Landmark District (Subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1939

Property Location: North block face of Edgewood Ave., east of Jackson St., west of Boulevard NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Industrial. Formerly a service station and auto repair shop.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Special Use Permit for a Park for Hire accessory use.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission at this time is a request to permit a park for hire lot at the subject property via a Special Use Permit. As the property is located in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District, the Commission is asked to review the application and provide commentary about the potential impact on the Historic District and the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property sits on the north block face of Edgewood Avenue, directly south of the tomb of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Correta Scott-King. The request would extend the existing park for hire accessory use for 3 years. The Applicant has stated that the parking will be used by the Georgia Justice Project during regular business hours and will convert to paid parking for the surrounding businesses during transient hours. Per the Landmark District regulations, the Applicant has submitted a parking analysis showing the availability of parking within 2000 linear feet of the subject property. This analysis shows 178 available parking spaces with only 152 spaces available on Friday and Saturday evenings. The Applicant states that within 2000 linear feet of the subject property are several popular after-hours establishments and restaurants. The continuation of the existing park for hire lot accessory use would add 20 parking spaces that could service these businesses.

Staff finds that the proposed special use permit meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and would have no impact on the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

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: 97 Edgewood Ave. (Hurt Park)
APPLICATION: RC-19-416
MEETING DATE: September 11, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (Subarea 1).

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: The property comprises the entire triangular city block created by Edgewood Ave., Courtland St., and Gilmer St.

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

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)?: Yes. Deferred September 11, 2019. *Updated text in italics.*

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 Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Charter.

The Applicant is proposing several site work projects and general improvements to the site. The Park itself is owned by the City of Atlanta but is operated by Georgia State University. In looking at the photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the park has suffered from deferred maintenance and neglect. The proposals would include repaving of the walkways, repairs to the currently drained fountain, and the installation of a perimeter fence around the property.

Staff has concerns only with the installation of the perimeter fencing with locking gates. Staff finds that this approach to the chronic homeless issues experienced by the Park would result in a net negative for the urban environment surrounding the park. Firstly, Staff finds that the inclusion of a perimeter fence with locked gate around public open space would result in an area that is uninviting to users and would lead to general disuse of the space. The Applicant cites Centennial Olympic Park as the design inspiration for the fencing, but Staff would note that this park is owned by the State of Georgia and is not subject to approval by any department of the City of Atlanta's government. Staff finds that Parks that are owned by the City should be held to a higher standard of urban design best practices. As such, Staff strongly encourages the Applicant to pursue alternative designs which do not include a perimeter fence with locked gates.

In consulting with the Department of Parks and Recreation, Staff has learned that fences have been approved as part of the preliminary design for this project. The specific design of the fences will be subject to final approval by the Parks Design team at a later date.

Staff finds that operational changes to how the park functions such as increased security patrols and the programming of activities and events throughout the day could aid in getting more eyes on the park which could become a deterrent to nuisance activities. Staff also finds that design changes such as landscaping, and hardscaping could increase both foot traffic through the park and visibility into the park which could also aid in getting more eyes on the park. Staff suggests the Applicant provide information on potential design and operational changes which could result in higher visibility and foot traffic through the park.

The Applicant has provided information showing daily programming of the site along with information on planned events, more detailed site plans of the property, and information on the proposed lighting upgrades.

Lastly, Staff finds that the impact of including physical barriers to entering the park would result in the homeless persons who currently occupy the park moving to neighboring spaces and spreading the issue throughout the city without directly addressing it. The issue of chronically homeless people gathering in disused and underused parks is a condition experienced across the country. Many cities are exploring methods of addressing the condition by using it as an opportunity to connect homeless persons with services and organizations that can assist in meeting the needs experienced by those who are chronically homeless. Staff would strongly encourage the Applicant to research these methods and consider their use as part of the operational programming for the park.

The Applicant has provided information at the September 11, 2019 meeting regarding the H.O.P.E. Lab outreach. This information is also included in their operational programming summary.

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

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: 649 Woodward Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-452
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location: South block face of Woodward Ave., east of Berean Ave., west of Cameron St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the structure that face the public right of way.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the structure which do not face the public right of way.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: N

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission has previously reviewed CA2-17-466 and CA2-18-416 for alterations at this property. Application CA2-17-466 was denied without prejudice due to a lack of response by the Applicant. CA2-18-466 was approved with conditions at the December 12, 2018 Commission meeting.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission for comment is a request to rezone the property from the existing R-5 zoning to the R-4B zoning category. The proposed zoning change would allow for a subdivision of the existing double frontage lot, to create one lot along Woodward Ave. and one lot along Narrow St. The Commission is tasked with providing comments and recommendations to the Zoning Review Board on the proposed change and its impacts on the Historic District as well as the Commission's ability to enforce the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations.

In reviewing the proposal, Staff finds that the resulting change would not impact the District other than allowing for a subdivision and new principal structure on the resulting vacant lot. Staff would note that in addition to the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, the subdivision of the lot is required to conform to the historic platting pattern of the District, and would require a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness in order to be approved. Additionally, any new structure on the resulting Narrow St. lots would be required to conform to the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations for setbacks, height, and design and would require an additional Type III Certificate of Appropriateness in order to be approved.

Staff would recommend to the Zoning Review Board that no conditions on the proposed rezoning be added that would impair the Commission's ability to enforce the subdivision, setback, height, and design requirements of Chapter 20K of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

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: 929 Charles Allen Dr. (Grady High School).
APPLICATION: RC-19-360
MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: R-5 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1925 with additions/renovations performed in the 1930's, 50's, and 70's.

Property Location: The school facilities comprise the entire block created by Charles Allen Dr., 8th St., Monroe Dr., and 10th St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Institutional/Educational

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New school building and 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.

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 involves the addition of a new school building, alterations to the historic Charles Allen Dr. school building, and the expansion of parking on site via the formalization of an existing turf/gravel lot and the installation of a new parking lot between the historic school building and Charles Allen Dr. Repairs and various modifications are planned for several other buildings but are minor in scope relative to the other changes noted by Staff. Staff will limit the scope of this response to the more substantial changes to the site.

In general Staff has few concerns regarding the design of the proposed school building. Staff finds the design of the proposed structure is compatible with the historic materials and fenestration pattern of the historic structure while clearly expressing itself as a modern addition. Staff additionally finds the use of a curtain wall to provide connection between the historic structure and the new addition to be appropriate. The resulting hyphen will allow the new addition and the existing structure to coexist without imposing on one another and will provide a clear distinction between the old and new buildings. Staff does find that the positioning of the new structure on the site will interrupt the viewshed of the historic structure from the north end of the block. Staff suggests the Applicant provide information detailing the different site layouts that were studied, particularly those that could have preserved the viewshed of the historic school building, and why the proposed site plan was chosen over those alternate designs.

The Applicant has not provided design alternatives but has provided photographs which show the site the addition would be located. The Applicant states that the viewshed of the historic building would be unchanged due to the view already being obscured.

Staff has multiple concerns with the proposed parking lot between the historic structure and Charles Allen Dr. as well as the proposed expansion of on-site parking. Staff has not received copies of the parking studies for this project in order to properly review the site's parking demand. Likewise, no information relating to the planned programming of the existing student parking lot has been provided. The introduction of the new parking lot would remove a large portion of the historic lawn and interrupt the otherwise intact spatial relationship of the historic structure to Charles Allen Dr. and the surrounding neighborhood. The resulting spatial relationship conveys the message that cars are to be the primary mode of accessing the campus. Staff is also concerned that the installation of a new parking lot on Charles Allen Dr. could increase traffic flow on the street and create a dangerous pedestrian/cyclist environment. Staff finds that there is opportunity to create a more formal on-street parking configuration with striped spaces and signage detailing the area is for school parking only during certain hours. The parking could then be used for other purposes after school hours and for special events.

Department of City Planning Staff visited the subject property to investigate the site and potential alternatives to a new parking lot. The observed on-street parking, except for two ADA parking spaces, is largely informal with no striping and minimal signage. At the time Staff visited the site, approximately 13 vacant on-street parallel parking spaces were counted. A rough measurement of the right of way showed that additional parking, likely more than the 19 spaces currently proposed for inclusion in the lawn area, could be accommodated by converting the parallel parking along the

school frontage to angled parking. At the September 11, 2019 meeting and in their updated narrative, the Applicant states that they do not have purview over on street parking, however, Staff finds this is an opportunity for the Department of City Planning and APS to coordinate a more urban solution to the desired parking.

Staff finds that the Applicant's narrative does not sufficiently explain the need for additional on-site parking or why the parking lot could not be reasonably located elsewhere on site other than to state that finding the entrance to the structure is confusing for visitors. Staff finds that confusion regarding the entrance to the structure could be solved using wayfinding signage and through architectural changes which could visually communicate the hierarchy of entrances. This approach could also be a more cost-effective solution to addressing the site planning issues. Staff suggests the Applicant provide design alternatives that include architectural articulation and wayfinding signage that could address confusion regarding the entrances to the school building without introducing a parking lot to the historic lawn area.

The school itself is situated in an easily walkable area that is serviced by adequate public transit options, is within walking distance of the Beltline, and is located in an urban area which is actively committed to reducing the use of cars as a primary mode of transportation. Staff finds that the removal of passive greenspace in favor of a large area dedicated solely to cars does not meet the expectation for urban design on public property which is promoted by the Commission. Staff suggests the Applicant provide traffic studies used in the design of the proposal which detail peak parking demand on the property. Staff also suggests the Applicant provide information showing the effect that promoting and incentivizing the use of transit, carpooling, school busses, and walking/cycling for students, staff, and visitors would have on parking demand during peak hours. Staff also suggests the Applicant provide information detailing the plans for the existing student parking lot. Staff also suggests the Applicant provide information showing why the proposed visitor parking could not be located elsewhere on site and why the existing on-street parking in this along Charles Allen Dr. would be insufficient if it were formalized.

The Applicant has provided APS and County parking policies regarding parking. Staff finds a more appropriate means of determining needed parking on an urban lot as walkable and accessible as the subject property would be through a formal traffic study which identifies peak and off-peak need for vehicle accommodation. Staff would also encourage the Applicant to explore ways to incentivize transportation alternatives to personal automobiles.

Of lesser concern to Staff is the formalization of an existing gravel lot on 10th street into a new student parking lot. While the location of this lot is between a principal building and the street, the area itself has a topography which could allow a future building to be massed over the parking area. Staff suggests the Applicant consider the space over the proposed student parking lot for a future building location.

The Applicant stated at the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting that a structure over the proposed student parking is infeasible due to underground sewer lines which would prevent the massing of a structure.

Lastly, the Applicant proposes alterations to the historic school building which involve the removal of doors and steps leading to the existing entrances. From the photographs provided, it is not clear whether the existing doors are original to the structure, however Staff finds that the entrances and steps themselves are original features to the Charles Allen Dr. façade. While it is not stated in the design narrative Staff finds that these changes are likely due to the abovementioned confusion in locating the front entrance to the school. Again, Staff finds that a less intrusive method of resolving the entrance confusion is to make architectural changes to the new addition which clearly convey the hierarchy of the entrances and provide wayfinding signage which could assist visitors in finding the entrance. In addition to assisting with clarity, this method could also allow for the intact preservation of the existing entrances. Staff Again suggests the Applicant study approaches that could preserve historic features of the existing structure.

The Applicant has provided clarification regarding the doors, which are non-historic, and stated at the September 11, 2019 meeting that the historic steps would be retained. Staff retains the suggestions regarding the use of architectural changes to the proposed structure, wayfinding signage, and landscaping changes to address confusion in visitors finding the front entrance other than locating a parking lot close to the front entrance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments.

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: 649 Woodward Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-452
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location: South block face of Woodward Ave., east of Berean Ave., west of Cameron St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the structure that face the public right of way.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the structure which do not face the public right of way.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: N

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission has previously reviewed CA2-17-466 and CA2-18-416 for alterations at this property. Application CA2-17-466 was denied without prejudice due to a lack of response by the Applicant. CA2-18-466 was approved with conditions at the December 12, 2018 Commission meeting.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission for comment is a request to rezone the property from the existing R-5 zoning to the R-4B zoning category. The proposed zoning change would allow for a subdivision of the existing double frontage lot, to create one lot along Woodward Ave. and one lot along Narrow St. The Commission is tasked with providing comments and recommendations to the Zoning Review Board on the proposed change and its impacts on the Historic District as well as the Commission's ability to enforce the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations.

In reviewing the proposal, Staff finds that the resulting change would not impact the District other than allowing for a subdivision and new principal structure on the resulting vacant lot. Staff would note that in addition to the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, the subdivision of the lot is required to conform to the historic platting pattern of the District, and would require a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness in order to be approved. Additionally, any new structure on the resulting Narrow St. lots would be required to conform to the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations for setbacks, height, and design and would require an additional Type III Certificate of Appropriateness in order to be approved.

Staff would recommend to the Zoning Review Board that no conditions on the proposed rezoning be added that would impair the Commission's ability to enforce the subdivision, setback, height, and design requirements of Chapter 20K of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

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: 98 Huntington Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-19-435
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: West block face of Huntington Rd., south of Palisades Rd, north of Woodcrest Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: exhibits characteristics of colonial revival architecture.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work relating to a new swimming pool.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

The Applicant proposes the installation of a new swimming pool to the rear of the property, within the buildable area of the lot. This Address previously received comments from the commission on a large project which included the removal of portions of the structure and hardscaping/paving. Therefore, while the site plan notes the existing site has a lot coverage of approximately 63%, the resulting project including the swimming pool will have a conforming lot coverage of approximately 45%.

As the proposed swimming pool will not be visible from the street and is situated towards the rear of the lot, Staff has no concerns with the work having a negative visual impact on the historic structure or the public right of way. Staff suggests the Applicant consider using materials that conform to the architectural style of the principal structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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: 428 Edgewood Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-442
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin L. King, Jr Landmark District (Subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1954

Property Location: North block face of Edgewood Ave., east of Jackson St., west of Boulevard NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Industrial/Warehouse

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Special Use Permit for a Park for Hire accessory use.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission at this time is a request to permit a park for hire lot at the subject property via a Special Use Permit. As the property is located in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District, the Commission is asked to review the application and provide commentary about the potential impact on the Historic District and the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property sits on the north block face of Edgewood Avenue, directly south of the tomb of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Correta Scott-King. The request would extend the existing park for hire accessory use for 3 years. The Applicant has stated that the parking will be used by the Georgia Justice Project during regular business hours and will convert to paid parking for the surrounding businesses during transient hours. Per the Landmark District regulations, the Applicant has submitted a parking analysis showing the availability of parking within 2000 linear feet of the subject property. This analysis shows 178 available parking spaces with only 152 spaces available on Friday and Saturday evenings. The Applicant states that within 2000 linear feet of the subject property are several popular after-hours establishments and restaurants. The continuation of the existing park for hire lot accessory use would add 20 parking spaces that could service these businesses.

Staff finds that the proposed special use permit meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and would have no impact on the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

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: 428 Edgewood Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-442
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin L. King, Jr Landmark District (Subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1939

Property Location: North block face of Edgewood Ave., east of Jackson St., west of Boulevard NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Industrial. Formerly a service station and auto repair shop.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Special Use Permit for a Park for Hire accessory use.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission at this time is a request to permit a park for hire lot at the subject property via a Special Use Permit. As the property is located in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District, the Commission is asked to review the application and provide commentary about the potential impact on the Historic District and the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property sits on the north block face of Edgewood Avenue, directly south of the tomb of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Correta Scott-King. The request would extend the existing park for hire accessory use for 3 years. The Applicant has stated that the parking will be used by the Georgia Justice Project during regular business hours and will convert to paid parking for the surrounding businesses during transient hours. Per the Landmark District regulations, the Applicant has submitted a parking analysis showing the availability of parking within 2000 linear feet of the subject property. This analysis shows 178 available parking spaces with only 152 spaces available on Friday and Saturday evenings. The Applicant states that within 2000 linear feet of the subject property are several popular after-hours establishments and restaurants. The continuation of the existing park for hire lot accessory use would add 20 parking spaces that could service these businesses.

Staff finds that the proposed special use permit meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and would have no impact on the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20C of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

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: 97 Edgewood Ave. (Hurt Park)
APPLICATION: RC-19-416
MEETING DATE: September 11, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (Subarea 1).

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: The property comprises the entire triangular city block created by Edgewood Ave., Courtland St., and Gilmer St.

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

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)?: Yes. Deferred September 11, 2019. *Updated text in italics.*

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 Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Charter.

The Applicant is proposing several site work projects and general improvements to the site. The Park itself is owned by the City of Atlanta but is operated by Georgia State University. In looking at the photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the park has suffered from deferred maintenance and neglect. The proposals would include repaving of the walkways, repairs to the currently drained fountain, and the installation of a perimeter fence around the property.

Staff has concerns only with the installation of the perimeter fencing with locking gates. Staff finds that this approach to the chronic homeless issues experienced by the Park would result in a net negative for the urban environment surrounding the park. Firstly, Staff finds that the inclusion of a perimeter fence with locked gate around public open space would result in an area that is uninviting to users and would lead to general disuse of the space. The Applicant cites Centennial Olympic Park as the design inspiration for the fencing, but Staff would note that this park is owned by the State of Georgia and is not subject to approval by any department of the City of Atlanta's government. Staff finds that Parks that are owned by the City should be held to a higher standard of urban design best practices. As such, Staff strongly encourages the Applicant to pursue alternative designs which do not include a perimeter fence with locked gates.

In consulting with the Department of Parks and Recreation, Staff has learned that fences have been approved as part of the preliminary design for this project. The specific design of the fences will be subject to final approval by the Parks Design team at a later date.

Staff finds that operational changes to how the park functions such as increased security patrols and the programming of activities and events throughout the day could aid in getting more eyes on the park which could become a deterrent to nuisance activities. Staff also finds that design changes such as landscaping, and hardscaping could increase both foot traffic through the park and visibility into the park which could also aid in getting more eyes on the park. Staff suggests the Applicant provide information on potential design and operational changes which could result in higher visibility and foot traffic through the park.

The Applicant has provided information showing daily programming of the site along with information on planned events, more detailed site plans of the property, and information on the proposed lighting upgrades.

Lastly, Staff finds that the impact of including physical barriers to entering the park would result in the homeless persons who currently occupy the park moving to neighboring spaces and spreading the issue throughout the city without directly addressing it. The issue of chronically homeless people gathering in disused and underused parks is a condition experienced across the country. Many cities are exploring methods of addressing the condition by using it as an opportunity to connect homeless persons with services and organizations that can assist in meeting the needs experienced by those who are chronically homeless. Staff would strongly encourage the Applicant to research these methods and consider their use as part of the operational programming for the park.

The Applicant has provided information at the September 11, 2019 meeting regarding the H.O.P.E. Lab outreach. This information is also included in their operational programming summary.

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

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: 36 Northwood Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-19-428
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West block face of Northwood Ave., south of Palisades Rd, north of Huntington Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Foundation alterations.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

The Applicant proposes the removal of a portion of the foundation to allow for access into the crawl space for interior excavation work. In reviewing the plans, Staff finds that the only portion of the work which will affect the exterior would be the removal and replacement of a portion of the foundation wall on the right-side façade. While Staff has no general concerns with the proposed work, Staff does suggest the Applicant retain and replace as much of the brick as possible. Staff further suggests the Applicant use a mortar that matches the consistency of the original mortar to avoid issues with the historic brick in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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: 2533 Godfrey Dr.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-434
MEETING DATE: September 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: North block face of Godfrey Dr., west of Hamilton E. Holmes Dr., east of Hutton Pl.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Ranch.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition to the principal structure.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-434: Approval with conditions.

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

Additions to principal structure.

The Applicant is proposing an addition to the principal structure located in the rear of the building. Staff finds that the proposed addition is secondary to the principal structure and will be easily recognized as a later addition. The use of different materials from the original, maintaining the same roof style, and having the original roof height remain as the highest point contribute to the differentiating factors between the new addition and the primary structure.

Staff finds that the right side of the building would be more susceptible to being viewed from the public right of way. Staff is concerned that the blank wall along the side of the addition is not compatible with the original window pattern of the primary structure. Therefore, Staff recommends a window be added along the right side of the new addition to maintain the consistency of the window pattern of the house. This new window shall be compatible in scale, size, style, and proportion to the current windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. A window shall be added on the right side of the new addition that is compatible in scale, size, style, and proportion to the current windows, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(21).
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File