



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 973 Oglethorpe
APPLICATION: CA2-22-597
MEETING DATE: February 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location East of Peoples and West of Gordon Place

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order was applied 12/8/22 for porch ceiling removed and not replaced with non-compliant, non-tongue and groove porch floor.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

Porch

Flooring

The Applicant was cited for removing tongue and groove perpendicular wood floor boarding. Photos taken by the Code enforcement officer show perpendicular flooring, which appears to match the existing perpendicular flooring on the porch. Staff can't determine what is the issue then possibly the new flooring is not tongue and groove. Staff recommendations, the Applicant clarify if the new method of implementation is tongue and groove. If the method is tongue and groove, Staff is not concerned with this proposal. If the implementation is not tongue and groove, then Staff recommends, the Applicant reinstall any new piece to match the tongue and groove pattern of the existing flooring.

Ceiling

Staff need clarification on whether the ceiling was replaced. Code enforcement cited porch ceiling removal as non-compliant. However, the Applicant has not provided information on this citation.

Painting

The Applicant has proposed painting to match original porch repairs. Staff is not concerned; painting is not the purview of the UDC unless painting is on unpainted masonry.

Routine Repair

Pressure washing is proposed for the house, Staff is not concerned with pressure washing; it is a routine repair.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The new flooring shall be constructed as tongue and groove , Sec.16-20G.009;
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2769 Baker Ridge Dr.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-016
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: North block face of Baker Ridge Dr., east of the Collier Ridge Dr. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and site work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20Q **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The property was investigated by the Office of Buildings Zoning Inspection Staff in December of 2021, where it was discovered that the structure was altered and a fence was constructed without proper permits.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deferral.

CA2-23-016 – 2769 Baker Ridge Dr.

March 8, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant has submitted only for a fence installation. However, it is clear from the inspection photographs that other alterations occurred including window and door replacement, and the installation of a new front stoop. Without information showing the extent of the work, Staff finds that it is not possible to review the proposal in its current submitted form. As such, Staff recommends that photographs of all 4 sides of the structure and site be provided. Staff further recommends that information detailing the material of the replacement doors and windows be provided. Lastly, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide a narrative describing how the front stoop was installed and whether the original brick stoop is still existing.

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

1. Photographs of all 4 sides of the structure and site be provided.
2. Information detailing the material of the replacement doors and windows be provided.
3. The Applicant provide a narrative describing how the front stoop was installed and whether the original brick stoop is still existing
4. All updated documentation shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 726 Brookline St.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-017
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: Southeast corner of Brookline St. and Mayland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman

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. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20I **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The property was investigated by the Office of Buildings Zoning Inspection Staff in December of 2022, where it was discovered that a non-compliant fence was built in the half-depth front yard without proper permits. The design of this fence was revised and approved under CA2S-22-394. The revised design moves the 6' tall portion of the fence out of the half-depth front yard. The work currently proposed by the Applicant will need to meet the design of this approval to receive permits.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with conditions

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

The Applicant is proposing a rear parking area and walkway. While no compatibility information has been received for the proposed driveway material, Staff finds that publicly accessible street-view imagery will be sufficient for this review. The proposal shows a driveway that extends from the half-depth front yard to the rear yard as required by the District regulations. The Applicant proposes a gravel driveway that is 10' in width at the apron, but appears to widen to 16' immediately thereafter. Staff recommends that the site plan be revised to show a driveway that is no wider than 10' for its entire length. In looking at the comparable properties on the block face, Staff finds that the predominate building material for driveways is concrete. As such, Staff recommends that the proposed driveway be made of concrete.

Regarding the fence, Staff recommends that the fence be altered to comply with the conditions of approval for CA2S-22-394.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The site plan shall be revised to show a driveway that is no wider than 10' for its entire length, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(c);
2. The proposed driveway shall be made of concrete, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b);
3. The fence shall be altered to comply with the conditions of approval for CA2S-22-394; and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1037 Metropolitan Parkway SW
APPLICATION: CA3-22-591
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: West side of Metropolitan Parkway.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition, Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: n/a

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred February 8, 2023

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 22CAP-00000876

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the March 22, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

A stop-work order was placed on the property on May 27, 2022, for construction without permits. The property currently has a half-completed second story addition. Staff is concerned with the plans submitted, as they show the property before the alterations were made, not the current condition. Staff acknowledges that the proposal is to return the house to the pre-alteration design, but the existing does not accurately depict all features. For example, prior to the unpermitted work there was a shed dormer on the front elevation, which is not shown. The amount of porch supports is greater than what previously existed. The Applicant will update the existing elevations using historic images of the property to accurately depict the state prior to the unpermitted work. The framing of the second story has removed the original porch roof, including the distinctive rafter tails. The proposed elevation does not show this detail. The Applicant will update the proposed elevations to illustrate an exact reconstruction of the porch roof, which was removed. The Applicant will remove the framing for the non-compliant second story addition that was added to the property unpermitted. The Applicant will re-build the hipped roof to the original scale, complete with the historic exposed rafter tails.

Foundation

Images of the property show that a significant portion of the left side foundation is missing. Nowhere in the scope of the project is this addressed. It is not clear if the foundation was removed as part of the unpermitted work. The Applicant will clarify the reason for the brick foundation removal. The Applicant will submit a scope of work for the proposed foundation repair.

Siding

The Applicant proposes use of wooden lap siding on all elevations. There is no extant siding present on the structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. It appears that several varieties of siding were used over time to clad the exterior, many in the non-historic period. The Applicant will install wooden lap siding, with a reveal between 4-6 inches. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement siding.

Windows

Photos show that all the windows on the structure are either no longer extant or are non-historic vinyl, without exterior muntins. No specifications have been provided for the proposed replacement windows; however, they must meet the compatibility rule. It is not clear if the extant, non-compliant windows (which are boarded over in the photos submitted by the Applicant are also proposed for replacement), but Staff strongly encourages that all windows should be replaced and brought into compliance. The windows are depicted as six-over-six, double-hung windows, with a four-over-four window in the gable. Staff requires compatibility data to determine the appropriateness of this design (the non-compliant vinyl windows are not original and cannot be used for compatibility purposes). The Applicant will provide compatibility data for the proposed window replacements. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed window

replacements, once compatibility data has been confirmed. The windows on the front elevation are also not original. The proposed window replacements should match the size of the original openings present on the remaining elevations for consistency of design. Staff would also note that the windows should be placed so that they do not interfere with the original placement of the porch posts on the porch. The Applicant will match the size of the window openings on the front elevation to the historic scale present on the side elevations.

Doors

No information has been provided regarding exterior door replacement. Staff does note that in the photos from the stop-work order it appears as though two historic doors were removed from the house and stored inside the house. The Applicant will restore and replace the doors that were removed from the structure.

Dormer

Historic photos of the property show that there was a shed dormer above the porch. The proposed elevations show this dormer replaced by a single egress window. This feature does not appear to be original to the structure, and Staff is not concerned with its replacement.

Porch

The front porch on the resource has been enclosed at least since 1991, when the Adair Park Historic District was initially designated with the city. Staff is not concerned with the continued enclosure of the porch; however, when originally enclosed the historic square porch supports remained in place on the front façade of the house, retaining a record of the original appearance. Since that time, it has again been enclosed with an additional layer of siding hiding those supports. Staff is in support of restoring those columns (now enclosed within the wall) and adding the proposed lap siding between, to reference the original porch form. The positioning of windows on the front façade should also be referential to the historic porch supports. The proposal also adds additional square columns directly adjacent to the steps, Staff has reviewed historic photos of the house, which show only one support on each side of the steps. In addition, there was an opening between this support and the beginning of the enclosure wall. The Applicant's plans show this being enclosed as well. Staff cannot support the extension of the wall further, and the knee wall has been removed. The Applicant will not further enclose the front entry. The Applicant will expose the historic square porch supports to illustrate the original porch design on the front façade. The Applicant will not add additional non-historic porch supports to the front elevation.

Driveway/ Parking Pad

The current driveway/parking pad is non-complaint, extending almost the full width of the property, and covering the entire front yard. No site plan has been included in the application, so it is not clear to Staff, what the Applicant's is to bring the parking into compliance. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the non-compliant driveway/parking pad. The Applicant will supply a site plan for the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the March 22, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will update the existing elevations using historic images of the property to accurately depict the state prior to the unpermitted work. **No new elevations have been submitted.**
- 2.) The Applicant will update the proposed elevations to illustrate an exact reconstruction of the porch roof, which was removed. **No new elevations have been submitted.**
- 3.) The Applicant will remove the framing for the non-compliant second story addition that was added to the property unpermitted. **This needs to be shown on the plans. The existing plans need to show the property as is, not just what is proposed. A massive change was made to the historic structure, so the plans must show the existing conditions, and the framing plans for how the original conditions will be reconstructed.**
- 4.) The Applicant will re-build the hipped roof to the original scale, complete with the historic exposed rafter tails. **Staff needs to see plans depicting this to ensure accuracy. Simply stating this in your responses is not concrete evidence, and you will need these plans when you apply for your building permit.**
- 5.) The Applicant will clarify the reason for the brick foundation removal. **Staff understands that this was the existing condition when the Applicant purchased the property.**
- 6.) The Applicant will submit a scope of work for the proposed foundation repair. **This needs to be specific, including the proposed materials. When Staff requests specifications that means we need the exact manufacturers specifications on the materials, not just a promise to try and match. Staff also needs a drawing showing the proposed repairs. There is a gaping hole in the foundation. Will the brick just be repointed? Is there going to be any other structural support work?**
- 7.) The Applicant will install wooden lap siding, with a reveal between 4-6 inches. **No specifications have been provided. When Staff requests specifications that means we need the exact manufacturers specifications on the materials.**
- 8.) The Applicant will provided specifications for the proposed replacement siding. **No specifications have been provided. When Staff requests specifications that means we need the exact manufacturers specifications on the materials.**
- 9.) The Applicant will provide compatibility data for the proposed window replacements. **No compatibility data has been supplied. The Applicant must show how the proposed replacement windows meet the compatibility rule. The compatibility rule states, "The compatibility rule is a method of ensuring that alterations to existing structures and the design of proposed new construction are sensitive to and sympathetic toward existing elements of design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The elements in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same block face, or where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), shall be no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same block face." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in these regulations by reference to**

"compatibility rule." As the original windows are no longer extant, the compatibility rule must be used to determine the appropriate window style.

- 10.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed window replacements, once compatibility data has been confirmed. As no data has been provided, Staff cannot determine the appropriateness of the proposed replacements. In addition, the Applicant has stated the proposed windows would be wood. The submitted window design appears to be vinyl, which would not meet district regulations.
- 11.) The Applicant will match the size of the window openings on the front elevation to the historic scale present on the side elevations. No new elevations have been supplied, so this condition has not been satisfied.
- 12.) The Applicant will restore and replace these doors that were removed from the structure. Historic doors were present in the house at the time the stop work order was issued (see attached photos). The Applicant states that no historic doors were present on the structure, this appears to be false as two historic doors are clearly visible in the photos that were provided by the code enforcement team. If retained these doors must be replaced on the structure. If the doors are no longer extant, they must be replaced with doors of wood construction that match the historic in design and dimensions.
- 13.) The Applicant will expose the historic square porch supports to illustrate the original porch design on the front façade. Staff is extremely confused by the response to this question. As no new elevations have been submitted Staff cannot confirm that this condition will be complied with. This must be shown on the proposed elevations.
- 14.) The Applicant will not add additional non-historic porch supports to the front elevation. The Applicant has agreed to this condition in their responses; however, this must be shown on the proposed elevations.
- 15.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the non-compliant driveway/parking pad. **Driving is not allowed in the front yard** per Sec. 16-201.006 (5)(a). **The existing parking conditions are non-compliant and cannot remain.** The Applicant must propose an alternate parking arrangement that meets the requirement of the code.
- 16.) The Applicant will supply a site plan for the property. The site plan has been submitted, but per Condition 15, must be updated to show a compliant parking proposal.
- 17.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission. Revised materials have been submitted; however, as annotated above, Staff finds that a significant number of items remain outstanding.
- 18.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doung Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim- Executive Director
ADDRESS: 907 Oakhill
APPLICATION: CA3-22-596
MEETING DATE: March 08, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Lillian and East of Pearce

Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

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.

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The compatibility rule is a method of ensuring that alterations to existing structures and the design of proposed new construction are sensitive to and sympathetic toward existing elements of design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The elements in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same block face, or where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), shall be no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same block face." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in these regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct a 2,108 sft house in Historic Adair Park. The Applicant has provided the following houses to represent the side of the block for the front and side setbacks required by the District regulation.

- *875 Oakhill
- *881 Oakhill
- *885 Oak hill
- *891 Oak hill
- *897 Oak hill
- *901 Oak hill
- *913 Oak hill
- *917 Oakhill
- *923 Oakhill

NOTE: The Appliant also submitted information for Tift Ave due to an error by Staff in reading the regulations. Staff will not use Tift for the comparisons.

DEVELOPMENT

Setbacks, Lot Coverage and FAR

The setback requirements are

“Front Yards: Front yard setbacks of new principal structures shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; or ii) **shall be no closer to the street than the closest and no farther from the street than the farthest contributing structure of like use on that side of the block.**

Side Yards: Side yards of new principal structures or additions shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; ii) conform to the setback of the existing building; iii) **conform to any existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks previously established by a majority of the contributing buildings of like use on that side of the block;** or iv) be of a width of not less than seven feet.

Rear Yard: Rear yard setbacks of new principal structures or additions shall be a distance no less than fifteen feet. On double frontage lots, the secondary frontage shall be treated as the rear yard.”

Staff is not concerned with the front yard setback, the proposed 19’ and 5” inches meets the compatibility of no higher than 22’9” which is the longest and 14’and 9” the shortest. Nor is Staff concerned with the side yards setback proposal of 8’and 2”for the left and 13 for right. Both setbacks are not less than 7 feet. The rear setback is no concern to Staff as well.

Lot coverage and FAR:

While the Applicant has shown the underlying zoning as R3, the actual underlying zoning is R4-A. Staff recommends the Applicant make that correction on the final plans. The allowable lot coverage is 55 percent of the net lot area. The maximum is .50 for FAR and 55% for the net lot area. The Applicant proposes 34 percent of the lot coverage and 34% of the FAR. Both would be in compliance. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

Roof line, Height, pitch

The proposed roofline is a front gable that extends to a rear gable in the rear of the house. The predominate roofline on the blockface, consist of some form of front gable. Staff is not concerned with the proposed roof line.

The roof fascia is proposed to be 1x8 wood. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The proposed height is 21 ft. Staff is not concerned with the height proposal, it is meeting compatibility. It is not higher than the highest of 28ft or lower than 20ft.

The proposed pitch is 6:12 with the predominate roof pitches on the blockface are 6:12. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Porch and porch elements and Trim.

The Applicant proposes a fully covered porch. The predominate porch on the blockface is a fully covered porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

In additional to a full porch, the Applicant proposes wood railings w 1x1 pickets by using two-part butt joint method that will not be higher than the front window sill and any need to meet code, a simple plan extension is shown. Staff is not concerned with this and the columns. The proposed wood columns are 3x3 wrapped with 1x10 trim. Staff is not concern with this proposal. Staff does recommend the Applicant state on the elevation that the railings will be employed with a two-part joint system so there is no confusion in the field.

The proposed trim on the front porch is 1x10 cementitious on a 2-2x10 Header. Staff is not concernd with this proposal.

While the Applicant has not shown this on the elevations, Staff recommends the porch flooring be wood and be perpendicular in orientation with a tongue and groove installation. As well, Staff recommends the porch ceiling be installed as a beadboard pattern.

The Applicant has not indicate what kind of steps are being proposed. It appears to be wood. Staff recommends the Applicant clearly identify the material of front steps and place that on the final elevations. It can be CMU or wood.

Siding

A cementitious siding is being proposed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, however Staff does recommend the cementitious siding be smooth face and have a 4 to 6 inch reveal.

Windows

The proposed windows are double hung with insulate glazing with trim. The Applicant has not indicated the material of the new windows. District regulations state, "replacement windows and windows on new construction shall be a wood or wood fiber composite product. Vinyl, PVC, aluminum, or clad windows are not permitted." Staff recommends to comply with the District regulations, the Applicant install wood, or wood fiber composite windows.

Deck

The Applicant proposes a deck that will be constructed in the rear of the house that does not exceed the side or rear setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

The proposed foundation is CMU. In the front a vinyl lattice with wood grain textured with be applied. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Doors

The Applicant has not specified the material of the doors. Staff recommends the Applicant comply with the District regulations which states, "new or replacement doors shall be made of wood and may contain a rectangular light opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion, placement, and style." Staff also recommends the Applicant state this on the final elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall put on the final plans the railings will be employed with a two-part joint system, per Sec.20I.006(2)(g)(4)
2. The porch flooring shall be wood and be perpendicular in orientation with a tongue and groove installation, per Sec.20I.006(2)(g)(5);
3. The porch ceiling shall be installed as a beadboard pattern, per Sec.20I.006(2)(g)(5);
4. The material of the front steps shall be identified and placed on the final elevations. It can be CMU or Wood., per Sec.20I.006(2)(g);
5. The siding shall be smooth face and have a 4 to 6 reveal, per Sec.16-20I.006(2)(a)(2);
6. The windows shall be wood or wood fiber composite, per Sec.16-20I.006(2)(b)(3);
7. The door shall be wood and contain a rectangular light opening and noted on the final elevations, per Sec.16-20I.006(2)(b)(8) and
8. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 453 Waldo Street SE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-020 & CA3-23-036
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, SA1 **Other Zoning:** R-5

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West side of Waldo Street SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Gabled-El Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: n/a

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

CA3-23-020 & CA3-23-036 453 Waldo Street SE

March 8, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

Staff has determined that the proposed project is identical to a previously approved project and variance (CA3-17-076 & CA3-17-078) which were approved with conditions March 22, 2017. As there have been no alterations to the approved plans, not the code of the Grant Park Historic District, the approval stands, and the additional applications are not needed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim-Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adam, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 349 N. Highland
APPLICATION: CA3-23-022
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5/Beltline

Date of Construction: 2002

Property Location: East of Carmel and West of Copen hill Avenue

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

SCOPE OF WORK

Addition

The Applicant proposes dormers to finish out the attic for added height. The roofline of the dormers will be added in a fashion so that it does not exceed the existing roof line and is in the rear of the house. While the Applicant has not shown how the dormers will sit on the site plan, that exercise is not needed. The dormers are not sitting over the sides of the existing structure, which is meeting the sides setbacks, therefore the dormers are also meeting the side setbacks. As well, the added dormers still meet FAR. Staff is not concerned with the dormers.

Alterations

Windows

On the rear elevation, the Applicant propose new wood double hung sash window with a 1-1/2 mullions and wood trim that will match the existing windows on the house. Staff is not concerned the proposed windows.

Screen porch and Deck

The proposed screen porch and deck will sit in the rear of the property. The material and screening proposed by the Applicant doesn't concern staff. The site plan shows the porch nor deck will exceed the side or rear setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 870 Inman Village Pkwy
APPLICATION: CA3-23-023
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 3) **Other Zoning:** PD-MU/Beltline

Date of Construction: 2003

Property Location: Southwest corner of Inman Village Pkwy and North Highland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20QL **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The property was investigated by the Office of Buildings Zoning Inspection Staff in August of 2022, where it was discovered that an addition to the structure was completed without proper permits or entitlement reviews, including the review by the Commission. Staff will include the analysis of this work in the findings below.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval.

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

Relationship of the PD-MU zoning and the Beltline Overlay to the project

The PD-MU zoning requires a review by the Office of Zoning and Development as part of the permitting process. Since these rezonings are site-plan specific, Staff has discussed the proposal with the OZD Staff prior to writing this analysis. After said discussion, it was the opinion of OZD Staff that the proposal would not require a site plan amendment based on the plans submitted for this project. Staff would note that this determination is not subject to review or comment from the Commission or Staff of the Office of Design. Staff would also note that several of the metrics contained in the Subarea 3 Regulations for the Inman Park Historic District would be superseded by the various requirements of the PD-MU rezoning legislation. These items include Open Space requirements, Building Height, Parking Requirements, Bulk Limitations, and loading requirements.

The Beltline Overlay zoning will likely require an SAP to be filed for the work to be reviewed against those regulations. Staff would note that the determination as to whether this review is required will be made by the Office of Zoning and Development, and that their determination is not subject to review by the Commission or Staff of the Office of Design.

Staff would encourage the Applicant to consult with the Office of Zoning and Development Staff on both of these reviews to determine the correct applications that will need to be filed as well as the procedures required for said reviews. Staff would also encourage the Applicant to discuss the feasibility of the proposed design given both the requirements of the PD-MU zoning and the Beltline Overlay zoning.

Proposal

The Applicant is proposing two additions to the structure. At this time, Staff has only received one elevation for the addition taking place along the Inman Village Pkwy frontage. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide the North Highland Ave. frontage elevations so that they can be included in this review. Staff further recommends that the term “existing” be removed from the floorplans when referring to the unpermitted addition along North Highland Ave.

In general, Staff has no concerns with the overall design of the North Highland Ave. portion of the proposal. Staff would note, however, that the proposal would reduce the sidewalk along the Inman Village Pkwy. Frontage to 10 feet wide. While the District regulations specify that the sidewalks must be a minimum of 12 feet wide, Staff finds that the Beltline Overlay zoning requirements would supersede this requirement based on previous conversations with DCP stakeholders as to the application of Sec. 16-20.011 regarding the application of the Historic District and Beltline Overlay zoning requirements, Staff finds that the Beltline Overlay zoning regulations would apply to the sidewalks. Staff would encourage the Applicant to consult the Office of Zoning and Development Staff regarding the requirements for the sidewalk based on the Beltline Overlay.

CA3-23-023 – 870 Inman Village Pkwy.

March 8, 2023

Page 3 of 3

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

1. The Applicant shall provide the North Highland Ave. frontage elevations so that they can be included in this review;
2. The term “existing” shall be removed from the floorplans when referring to the unpermitted addition along North Highland Ave.; and,
3. All updated plans and materials shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 331 Sinclair Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-026
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District, SA1 **Other Zoning:** R-5

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: East side of Sinclair Avenue SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: American Small House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work, deck

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: n/a

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions,
Approval

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

The Applicant proposes installation of a swimming pool and a deck, both located on the right (west) side of the property. The pool would be surrounded by a six-foot metal fence. Staff does note that there is a small 20” retaining wall along portions of the area where fencing is proposed. Staff would note that the height of the fence may not exceed six feet, and that installation must be considered from grade. The Applicant will install a fence not exceeding six feet in height from grade in the side yard.

The deck would be positioned behind an existing (original) screened porch on the house. The Applicant is proposing installation of a new set of French doors between existing windows on this elevation. The Applicant has submitted compatibility data for the proposed doors. The Staff is not concerned with this proposal; however, specifications for the doors have not been submitted. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed French doors to ensure compliance with district regulations.

The placement of the deck would require a variance from the code which requires placement of decks only behind the principal structure. Due to the placement of the lot, with a public alley located to the west, the pool would be located between the structure and the public right of way, which would require a special exception from the code.

Variance CA3-23-026

The requested variance is to permit installation of a deck on the side of the house, where it would otherwise be prohibited.

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

The Applicant cites the unusual pentagon shape and dimensions of the lot (varying in width from a minimum of 45.86’ along the street to a maximum of 78.1’ at the rear) and on the sides (varying between 71.46’ on the right and 132.22’ on the left) as well as the position of the lot on a public alley, which gives the property two frontages. These factors limit the placement of the deck to the side of the house, which while this is behind the house in terms of the street frontage, is adjacent to the public-right-of-way.

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

The Applicant cites the inability to place the deck in another location due to the existing structures present on the lot. Staff notes that there is a small existing deck to the rear of the house; however, the deck is surrounded by the existing driveway and cannot be expanded. This area is also not adjacent to the active recreation area proposed and would not be within the fenced enclosure required for life safety. Failure to grant the variance and strict application of the requirements for such structures to be located only behind the principal structure would deny the homeowners full as-of-right use of their property.

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

The Applicant cites the size and shape of the lot, proximity to the public alley, and limitations placed by existing structures and features present on the lot.

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

The Applicant states that proposed area is already used for active recreation space by the homeowner's children, and that the continued use, in a different capacity (through the inclusion of a swimming pool) would not cause further detriment to the public good. In addition, the Applicant states that the deck was placed behind the existing (original porch) limiting its visibility from the street elevation.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request meets the criteria for granting a variance. The data submitted supports the fact that deck cannot be placed in a location that is not adjacent to a public right-of-way due to the position of the public alley.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

- 1.) The Applicant will install a fence not exceeding six feet in height from grade in the side yard.
- 2.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed French doors to ensure compliance with district regulations.
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

Special Exception CA3-23-026

The requested special exception is to permit installation of active recreation (a swimming pool) between the house and a public street, where it would otherwise be prohibited.

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

The Applicant cites the unusual pentagon shape and dimensions of the lot (varying in width from a minimum of 45.86' along the street to a maximum of 78.1' at the rear) and on the sides (varying between 71.46' on the right and 132.22' on the left) as well as the position of the lot on a public alley, which gives the property two frontages. These factors limit the placement of active recreation space to the right-side yard, which is adjacent to the public-right-of-way.

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

The Applicant cites that the restrictions of placement in the code create an unnecessary hardship. Due to the unusual shape of the lot and the positioning of the public alley placement of the active recreation behind the main house is not possible. Failure to grant the special exception and strict application of the requirements for such structures to be

located only behind the principal structure would deny the homeowners full as-of-right use of their property.

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

The Applicant cites the unusual lot size, shape, and proximity to the public alley as conditions which are peculiar to this lot.

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

The Applicant states that proposed area is already used for active recreation space by the homeowner's children, and that the continued use, in a different capacity (through the inclusion of a swimming pool) would not cause further detriment to the public good. In addition, the Applicant states that the proposed design does place the active recreation at the furthest possible distance allowable from the public right-of-way as a mitigation.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request meets the criteria for granting of a special exception to allow for active recreation between the structure and the public right-of-way. The Applicant has established that the unusual size, shape, and placement of the lot preclude the installation of the swimming pool in any other location on the lot. As such, Staff supports the requested special exception.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 551 Culberson
APPLICATION: CA3-23-028
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location East of Ralph David Abernathy and West of Oak Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

PLANS

The Applicant provided information on setbacks and lot coverage, but Staff did not see information regarding FAR. Staff recommends the Applicant provide FAR information to make sure the addition is meeting FAR.

On the elevations or renderings, the Applicant has not shown the house details such as the roof rafters which are important. Staff recommends the Applicant put the house details on the existing and proposed elevations so there is no confusion in the field.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to add 550 sf on the rear of the existing house for added living space. The roofline will continue the existing roofline ending as a rear gable roof line. The added space meets the setbacks and lot coverage. Staff is not concerned with the addition if it meets the FAR for R4-A.

Siding

The Applicant proposes wood siding on the addition. Staff is not concerned with the siding proposal.

Windows

The new windows proposed appears to match the existing windows on the house. Staff is not concern with this proposal. The proposal meets District regulations which states, “new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.

Foundation

District regulations states, “foundation materials, including infill materials, shall replicate the original materials in. size, shape, color, texture and mortar, and shall be installed using construction techniques similar to the original.” The existing foundation on the house is brick. On the elevation, the Applicant proposes has stated brick but have shown lines which might be seen as siding. Staff is not concerned, while the Applicant has not been consistent with marking, Staff does recommend the Applicant be consistent in relaying the message of brick on the foundation and place on the final elevations and anywhere the foundation can be shown.

Deck

The Applicant also proposes a rear deck on the existing house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; the deck will meet the side and rear setbacks.

ALTERATION

Front Porch

The Applicant has not specified these alterations; however, the elevations and rendering show the front porch was enclosed and the Applicant is going to open it back up. Staff has no problem with the Applicant reopening the front porch. However, Staff does recommend some porch specifications so that the original porch remains intact. Photos show that original lower half of the columns still exist. Staff recommends these columns remain. It appears the porch flooring is either concrete or brick. Staff recommends all the original elements of the porch remain or repaired in-kind, the porch flooring concrete or brick. Staff also recommends the front gable roof not be altered. Right now on the rendering specifically the front gable porch roof is not depicted correctly. Staff recommends, the front gable porch roofline be shown exact as the house on the elevations and renderings, so that no confusion will happen in the field.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. FAR information shall be added to the final elevations and renderings, per Sec.16-20G.005;

2. All house details shall be drawn on the final elevations and renderings, such as roof rafters, Sec.16-20G.005;
3. The addition's foundation shall be brick and stated everywhere the foundation is shown, per Sec.16-20.006(5)(a);
4. All the original elements of the front porch shall remain or repaired in-kind. This would include the columns, flooring, per Sec.16-20.006(9)(a);
5. The gable roof over the front porch shall remain and be depicted correctly on the elevations and renderings, per Sec.16-20.006(9) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 573 Westend Place
APPLICATION: CA3-23-030
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location East of Ralph David Abernathy and West of Eggeston

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PLANS

The Applicant has provided setbacks and floor area information on the plans; however the Applicant has not provided lot coverage. Staff recommends the Applicant provide lot coverage for the proposal.

ADDITIONS

The Applicant proposes 15ftx11inches addition to the rear of the property for added living space. The roofline will continue the existing roofline of the existing house. The addition also meets the setbacks. Staff is not concerned with the addition if the Applicant has met lot coverage. The Applicant proposes wood lap siding in direction. Staff recommends the siding on the addition match the original siding in reveal. The elevation show the foundation on the addition will continue the brick material on the original. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

Deck

The Applicant is also proposing a deck on the rear of the house, that meets, setbacks and doesn't extend pass the side of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal if it meets lot coverage.

ALTERATIONS

Front Stoop Porch

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing flat roof over the stoop and install a small gable roof with three 8x8 columns. The existing flat roof is probably not original to the house along with the rod iron railings. However, Staff does believe a flat roof probably was installed over the original stoop. This renovation would be considered a compatibility issue; however, the Applicant doesn't have any comparables on the blockface with this stoop porch for comparisons. Staff will lean on additional information from the District regulations to guide with recommendation. District regulations states, "new or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns, and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code". Examining the houses on the block, only one house showed a stoop, the rest were full porches. That house had a flat roof over the steps with no columns. Staff recommends the Applicant construct a flat roof over the stoop, and not install columns or the small gable roof. This would keep the originality of the house.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to replace several windows on the house and has provided a window schedule and photos showing the condition of the windows. District regulations states, "architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained." And "Replacement windows and doors shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated. Replacement windows and doors shall match the original in style, materials, shape and size, with no more than a one-inch width or height difference from the original size. The use of simulated divided lite windows is permitted." In looking at the photos, all seven windows look fairly good visually but Staff fully understand these wood windows may not be functional. The Applicant has proposed all the windows and trim replacements be wood. Staff is not concerned with the material proposal. The window schedule indicates, several windows are double hung, and several are double hung. Staff is not concerned with this. What the Staff does recommend is all windows comply with the District Regulations which relies on the new windows match **in-kind the style, shape, and size with no more than a one-inch width or height difference of the original windows**. Staff also recommends the Applicant show the specific **trim size on the plans and install trim to match in-kind the original trim**. Right now, it appears the elevations are showing a trim that is not consistent with the original trim while the Applicant has indicated a 1x4 trim.

Facia, Soffit and Paint.

1x8 facia and 3/8 soffit is being proposed. Staff is not concerned with the facia and soffit proposal. The Applicant has also proposed to paint the wood lap siding. Staff is not concern with this. Painting is not a

purview regulated; only non-painted masonry is regulated. **No painted is permitted on non-painted masonry.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. Lot Coverage shall be added to the final elevations and renderings, per Sec.16-20G.005;
2. The wood lap siding shall match the original wood siding in reveal, Sec.16-20G.006(2)(d);
3. A flat roof over the stoop shall be constructed to meet District regulations. The Applicant shall not construct a small gable roof over the stoop with columns, per Sec.16-20.006(9)(d);
4. All windows shall comply with the District regulations which relies on the new windows match in-kind the style, shape and size with no more than one-inch width or height difference of the original windows, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(c);
5. The Applicant shall show the specific trim size on the elevations and install trim to match in-kind the original trim, per Sec.16-20.006(3)(a) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 779 Joseph E. Lowery
APPLICATION: CA3-23-031
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1926

Property Location East of Beecher Street and West of Mathews Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Accessory structure, Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 12/12/22 a Stop Work Order was placed on the property. Working without a permit.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PLANS

With the Applicant proposing to enclose the rear, the Applicant must account for heated space with FAR. The Applicant has not provided any information regarding FAR. Staff recommends the Applicant provide FAR information on the final plans.

ADDITIONS

Accessory Structure

The Applicant proposes a 14x13 outdoor storage shed locate in the rear of the property, that will not exceed the setback, or be visible from the public right-of-way. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Parking Slab

The Applicant proposes a parking slab that will set directly behind the existing house. Staff is not concerned with the parking slab proposal.

The Applicant meets the lot coverage for both the accessory structure and the parking slab.

ALTERATIONS

Enclose Deck

The Applicant proposes to enclose the rear deck, to allow for added space in the house. Staff has no problem with the added space if it meets FAR.

There is a non-original addition to the house. Staff has no information as when this was placed on the house. And the Applicant has no intention to remove this addition. This addition aligns with the original house footprint which exceeds the setbacks. Being that Applicant isn't proposing to remove this addition, the Addition is grandfathered as regarding setback compliance.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to replace several windows on the house and has provided a window schedule and photos showing the condition of the windows. The Photos show many of these windows are vinyl. District regulations states, "architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained." And "Replacement windows and doors shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated. Replacement windows and doors shall match the original in style, materials, shape and size, with no more than a one-inch width or height difference from the original size. The use of simulated divided lite windows is permitted." In looking at the photos, all nine windows looked to be recently replaced, possibly by the Applicant. Staff is concerned with the vinyl windows and size of the replacement shown in the photos. The window schedule indicates, most of the windows are double hung, and one single. Staff is not concerned with this. Staff recommends all windows comply with the District Regulations which state that new windows shall match **in-kind with the original windows in material, style, shape, and size with no more than a one-inch width or height difference of the original windows**. Staff also recommends the Applicant comply with the **trim match in-kind the original trim**.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to remove the cementitious and vinyl siding and replace with wood siding to match in-kind the existing wood siding underneath. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Porch

The Applicant has not provided intentions for renovating the front porch. Photos provided and research shows most of the original porch has been altered. A photo from July 2011, shows the porch is in its original state for the most part. What this means for the Applicant is, he will be responsible to correct the none complied elements on the porch. Staff will set the recommendations for the porch below.

- The original railings have been removed and now a board or siding has been applied where the railings once were. Staff recommends the Applicant install railings that employs a two-part rail system where the height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code.
- Staff can't get a clear picture of the porch flooring. Staff recommends the porch flooring be perpendicular with a tongue and groove construction.
- Staff also recommends the porch ceiling be beadboard.
- Staff can't tell clearly if the front porch steps have closed risers and end. So, Staff recommends the porch steps have closed risers and end to comply with the District regulations

Chimney

In 2018, the house had two chimneys: one in the center⁴ of the house and one on the left side of these house. Recent photos show the left chimney had been removed. The Applicant did not indicate this scope of work. Staff recommendation the chimney be reconstructed to match the original chimney in-kind.

Facia, Soffit, trim

Staff recommends the facia, trim and soffit be repaired in-kind and restored to the original width.

Driveway

The current driveway is in despair. Staff recommends if the Applicant plans to restore the driveway, the driveway cannot be more than 10 feet wide minus the flair.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. Lot Coverage shall be added to the final elevations and renderings, per Sec.16-20G.005;
2. The wood lap siding shall match the original wood siding in reveal, Sec.16-20G.006(2)(d);
3. All windows shall comply with the District regulations which relies on the new windows match in-kind the style, shape and size with no more than one-inch width or height difference of the original windows, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(c);
4. The Applicant shall show the specific trim size on the elevations and install trim to match in-kind the original trim, per Sec.16-20.006(3)(a);
5. The right-side chimney shall be replaced in-kind to match the original, per Sec.16-20.006 (6)(a) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

JAHNEE PRINCE
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1062 Peoples St SW
APPLICATION: CA2-22-581
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: North block face of White Oak Ave SW and the East block face of Peoples St SW at the intersection of White Oak Ave SW and Peoples St SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A – Vacant Lot

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revisions to previously approved new construction of a single-family dwelling on a vacant lot.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Previously approved and unaltered elements of the single-family dwelling and accessory structure.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Y, January 25th, February 8th

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA3-22-342

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

ORIGINAL STAFF REPORT:

Property Information

The subject property is a vacant site. The previous structure located there was likely demolished before 2002. The Urban Design Commission previously approved the proposed new construction of a single-family dwelling (CA3-22-342) on August 24, 2022. The Urban Design Commission shall only consider elements that are changing from the previously approved plans with conditions. All outstanding conditions shall remain in effect unless this approval alters the original element or condition. Staff's review is therefore only based on the proposed changes from the previously approved plans with conditions. The following changes staff has identified:

1. Front Elevation – Stairs to be concrete with closed risers and ends (from brick).
2. Left Elevation – Patio window and door configuration altered. Applicant indicates this is not visible from the public road.
3. Left Elevation – Rear Dormer has been eliminated and incorporated into the structure as a whole featuring fish scale siding. Four double-hung windows remain.
4. Left Elevation – Skylight added to “hyphen”
5. Left Elevation – Rear first floor windows have been increased in size, maintaining approximately square dimensions.
6. Right Elevation – Rear first floor windows have been eliminated.
7. Right Elevation – Rear Dormer has been eliminated and incorporated into the structure as a whole featuring fish scale siding. The two vertical double-hung windows and square window have been replaced with three 48-inch by 48-inch square fixed glass windows.
8. Rear Elevation – The previous gable roof and dormers have been eliminated and incorporated into a single roof structure with fish scale siding.
9. Rear Elevation – The first floor double-hung window has been eliminated for a fixed 48-inch by 48-inch square window.
10. Rear Elevation – The ground floor ribbon (three) double-hung windows has been altered to a paired double-hung window.
11. Site Plan – The following setbacks have been altered:
 - a. Half-Depth (4.5 feet to 5.9 feet)
 - b. Front Yard (19.9 feet to approximately 11.16 feet)
 - c. Side Yard (12.5 feet to 11.2 feet)
 - d. Rear Yard (approximately 98.53 feet to 108.4 feet)
 - e. Proposed Primary Structure Footprint area (1,830 square feet to 1,680 square feet)

Compatibility Rule

Sec. 16-20M.005. - Compatibility rule.

The intent of the mayor and council in establishing the regulations of the Oakland City Historic District is to ensure that all work requiring a certificate of appropriateness is compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face. To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows: **Where quantifiable** (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), **the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest** such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be **no greater than the greatest** such element or

*building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. **Where not quantifiable** (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the **element or building characteristic in question** shall be **compatible with that which predominates** in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be **internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.***

Definition: Compatible – “capable of existing together in harmony”

Site Plan

Sec. 16-20M.012(1) Front yards: Front yard setbacks shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; or ii) comply with the compatibility rule.

DOES NOT COMPLY

The proposed setback is 11.16 feet. The applicant has not provided an updated compatibility study indicating the revised setback is in compliance. Staff shall recommend a condition to ensure compliance.

Sec. 16-20M.012(2) Side yards: Side yards shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; ii) conform to the setback of the existing building; iii) conform to any existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks previously established by a majority of the contributing buildings of like use on that side of the block; or iv) be of a width of not less than seven feet.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed left (east) side setback is 11.2 feet. The compatibility study submitted indicated the range was from 4 feet to 13 feet. However, the study is flawed as the measurements are based on identifying features of the comparable properties such as fences and driveways, which may not be located near or at the property line.

Sec. 16-20M.012(1) Front yards: Front yard setbacks shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; or ii) comply with the compatibility rule.

DOES NOT COMPLY

The Half-Depth Front Yard is a secondary Front Yard. The proposed setback is 5.9 feet. The applicant has not provided an updated compatibility study indicating the revised setback complies. Staff shall recommend a condition to ensure compliance.

Sec. 16-20M.012(3) Rear yard: Rear yard setback shall be seven feet.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed rear yard is approximately 108.4 feet.

Sec. 16-20M.012(5) Floor area ratio shall not exceed 0.50.

DOES COMPLY

The estimated floor area ratio (FAR) is proposed to be .24.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2) (d) A paved walkway from the front sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure shall be provided.

DOES COMPLY

The applicant is proposing a concrete walkway of approximately 6.8 feet wide to connect the sidewalk to the porch steps.

Elevations

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(a) No individual house design shall substantially repeat a design of a new principal structure on the block face that was approved by the commission since the adoption of this district.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed new primary structure does not substantially repeat the design of a new principal structure previously approved by the commission based on the compatibility study and street photos.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(f) The compatibility rule shall apply to the form and pitch of the primary roof of the primary structure.

DOES COMPLY

A roof plan has been submitted by the applicant. The proposed primary roof pitch is 9/12. The proposed primary roof form is a cross-gable. The compatibility study indicated that the roof pitch range was between 6/12 and 9/12. A predominant roof form cannot be determined. However, the use of the cross-gable maintains a predominant front facing gable element on the block face. The rear portion of the structure is not a primary roof.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(g) The compatibility rule shall apply to the height, scale, and massing of the principal structure. In no case shall the height of a structure exceed 35 feet.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed height of the building is 23.25 feet. The compatibility study submitted indicates a range of approximately 17.58 feet to 26 feet.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i) The compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.

DOES COMPLY

The front porch steps are proposed to be concrete with closed risers and ends.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o) Fenestration, if visible from a public street upon completion, shall meet the following requirements:

- ~~1. Replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening.~~
2. *The compatibility rule shall apply to the following aspects of fenestration:*
 - a. *The size and shape of individual window openings.*
 - b. *The overall pattern of fenestration as it relates to the building façade.*
 - c. *The style of the individual window.*

PARTIALLY COMPLY

The proposed left elevation rear windows on the first and second floor comply with the compatibility rule. The proposed openings of W09, W11, and W13 are compatible with the size and shape of individual openings, the overall pattern of fenestration as it relates to the building façade, and the style of the individual window. W11 and W13 are not specifically indicated as fixed or casements, however either would be appropriate.

The proposed W05 located on the rear and right elevations is not compatible with the block face due to an excessively large square size of 48-inch by 48-inches. The first-floor right elevation also features a significantly large blank wall, which is inconsistent with building facades on the block face. Staff shall recommend a condition to ensure that W05 is altered in size and shape and windows are added to the first floor, thus bringing this provision of code into compliance.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q) Subject to the compatibility rule, wood or smooth-finish cementitious lap siding, wood shingles, brick, stone, and true stucco are permissible building materials for the façades of the principal structure. Corrugated metal, aluminum siding, and vinyl siding are not permitted.

PARTIALLY COMPLY

The applicant is proposing fiber cement lap siding, corner board and trim on most of the structure. The siding is proposed to have a six-inch reveal. Product information was not provided. Based on the elevations and compatibility study the profile proposed is a bevel profile. The applicant is proposing wood fish scale shingles on the second floor contemporary “addition” on a minimum of three elevations. The proposed use of fish scale shingles it not architecturally consistent. Shingles in this regard are commonly architectural accents on gable faces, an example of a property using cedar shake (or similar) is 1050 Peeples. However, this portion of the structure has a 5/12 and a 4/12 roof pitch, preventing a clear cutoff for a gable face. Staff shall propose a condition to ensure compliance.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r) In addition to all other applicable regulations, the compatibility rule shall apply to the following building materials and design elements, if visible from a public street upon completion:

- 1. The dimensions of the exposed face of lap siding and wood shingles.*
- 2. ~~The type of brick and pattern of brickwork.~~*
- 3. ~~The type of stone and pattern of stonework.~~*
- 4. ~~The material and texture of stucco.~~*
- 5. ~~The size and type of exterior doors. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame.~~*
- 6. ~~The materials and pattern of roofing.~~*
- 7. ~~Gables and gable returns.~~*
- 8. ~~Dormers~~*
- 9. Paving materials for walks and drives.*
- 10. ~~Above grade foundation materials. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade's exterior material and exposed concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface.~~*
- 11. ~~Exterior portions of chimneys. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, chimneys shall be faced with masonry and siding on chimneys is not permitted.~~*
- 12. The location and design of skylights. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, when practical, skylights should be located where least visible from the public street. If skylights are visible from the public street, the glass shall be tinted to match the surrounding roof area. Protruding "bubble" skylights are prohibited.*

PARTIALLY COMPLY

The proposed principal structure consists of three parts. The first part is traditionally designed. The second part is a hyphen that acts as a connector. The third and final part is contemporary influenced to act as an “addition”.

(9) The submitted compatibility study does not call out paving materials for walks and drives. However, based on street photos and the submitted photos the predominant drive material is concrete. The predominant walk material is concrete, with at least one brick pavers. The applicant is proposing concrete for the proposed driveways and brick pavers for the proposed walkway. (10) The proposed foundation material above grade is smooth stucco and therefore complies with the compatibility rule. (12) The applicant is proposing a skylight on the interior of the hyphen connector. The skylight is not visible, specific product information has not been provided.

The following recommended conditions shall bring the project into full compliance.

ORIGINAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

~~STAFF RECOMMENDATION:~~ *Approval with the following condition(s):*

1. *All outstanding conditions in Application # CA3-22-342 shall remain in effect unless this approval alters the original element or condition.*
2. *The applicant shall provide a revised compatibility study providing the front yard, half-depth front yard, and side yard setbacks from property line to structure per Sec. 16-20M.012(1) and (2).*
3. *The applicant shall provide the proof of calculations on the site plan for floor area ratio (FAR) per Sec. 16-20M.012(5).*
4. *The applicant shall revise the size, shape, and style of W05 on the Right and Rear elevations to be consistent with the compatible rule per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).*
5. *The applicant shall add a minimum of two windows of double-hung vertically oriented windows on the first-floor right elevation per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).*
6. *The applicant shall provide product information for all siding per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q).*
7. *The applicant shall provide product information for the skylight per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(12).*
8. *The applicant shall revise the addition in with one of the following options per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q):*
 - a. *Eliminate the fish scale shingles and revert to using the fiber cement bevel siding on the rest of the structure.*
 - b. *Revise the roof by increasing or decreasing the roof pitch to ensure both sections are consistently creating an even gable face. Restrict the use of the fish scale shingles to the gable face and revert the rest of the siding to fiber cement bevel siding on the rest of the structure.*
9. *The applicant shall provide revised final plans and documentation in one (1) PDF. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.*

UPDATED STAFF REPORT:

Property Information

The subject property is a vacant site. The previous structure located there was likely demolished before 2002. The Urban Design Commission previously approved the proposed new construction of a single-family dwelling (CA3-22-342) on August 24, 2022. The Urban Design Commission shall only consider elements that are changing from the previously approved plans with conditions. All outstanding conditions shall remain in effect unless this approval alters the original element or condition. Staff's review is therefore only based on the proposed changes from the previously approved plans with conditions. The following changes staff has identified specific to the plans and supporting documentation submitted for the hearing on **March, 8, 2023**:

1. Front Elevation – Stairs to be concrete with closed risers and ends (from brick).
2. Front Elevation - Front entry door trim has been added to match windows.
3. Front Elevation - Front door has been changed out.
4. Front Elevation - Front Porch railing has been modified.
5. Front Elevation - Corner Trim has been eliminated.
6. Left Elevation – Patio window and door configuration altered. Applicant indicates this is not visible from the public road.
7. Left Elevation – Rear Dormer has been eliminated and incorporated into the structure as a gable roof.
8. Left Elevation – Rear first floor windows have been altered, eliminating a series of fixed paired and ribbon windows for a single double-hung window and a ribbon (3) square fixed windows.
9. Right Elevation – Rear first floor square fixed windows have been eliminated and two-paired double-hung windows with a center fixed window added.
10. Right Elevation – Rear Dormer has been eliminated and is now a gable roof.
11. Right Elevation – Ground floor ribbon (three) fixed square windows have been added.
12. Rear Elevation – The previous gable roof and dormers have been eliminated and incorporated into a single roof structure.
13. Rear Elevation – The first floor double-hung window has been eliminated for a paired double-hung window.
14. Rear Elevation – The ground floor ribbon (three) double-hung windows has been altered to a paired double-hung window.
15. Site Plan – The following setbacks have been altered:
 - a. Half-Depth (4.5 feet to 5.9 feet)
 - b. Front Yard (19.9 feet to approximately 13.91 feet)
 - c. Side Yard (12.5 feet to 10.1 feet)
 - d. Rear Yard (approximately 98.53 feet to 102.78 feet)
 - e. Proposed Primary Structure Footprint area (1,830 square feet to 2,002 square feet)
 - f. Removal of the Proposed Accessory Structure

The Urban Design Commission approved CA3-22-342 with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall repair or replace in-kind all sidewalk and planting strips. The applicant shall make all efforts to complete the sidewalk along the property frontages. All repairs, replacements, and new installations must be completed before Certificate of Occupancy is issued. Per Sec. 16-20M.013(2) (c). (Staff)
2. The applicant shall work with staff to minimize and ensure that all grading and accessibility is within the provisions and intent of the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Atlanta. (Staff)
3. All paired and ribbon windows shall feature a mullion with a reveal. The mullion may be added after market with a plank made of pressured treated wood, aluminum, or vinyl. The mullion shall be approximately 1.5 inches to 2.5 inches in width and project from the window framing a minimum of one-half inch. The applicant shall provide a project specific window sections (horizontal, top-down) to indicate installation and specifications. Per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n) and (o). (Staff)
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation. (Staff)

5. Roof slopes be coordinated with the roofing materials to ensure that the materials called out for will support that slope of the roof form. (Commission)
6. That the front porch including steps and brick piers be coordinated with the compatibility rule, confirming materiality, heights, extents, everything with the front porch needs to be reviewed with the compatibility rule and revised, as necessary. (Commission)
7. All setbacks to be confirmed and respected. (Commission)
8. Sidewalks be stamped concrete. (Commission, **Applicant has indicated a request for the Commission to consider amending this condition.**)
9. The height of the house be identified on the plans and confirm that the house is from the existing grade and not the proposed grade. (Commission)
10. That Commission get confirmation of the exact windows and doors proposed to be used. Cut sheets or doors and windows. (Commission)

Compatibility Rule

Sec. 16-20M.005. - Compatibility rule.

The intent of the mayor and council in establishing the regulations of the Oakland City Historic District is to ensure that all work requiring a certificate of appropriateness is compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face. To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows: **Where quantifiable** (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), **the element or building characteristic in question** shall be **no less than the smallest** such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be **no greater than the greatest** such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. **Where not quantifiable** (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), **the element or building characteristic in question** shall be **compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.**

Definition: Compatible – “capable of existing together in harmony”

Site Plan

Sec. 16-20M.012(1) Front yards: Front yard setbacks shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; or ii) comply with the compatibility rule.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed setback is 13.91 feet. The applicant has provided information indicating compliance in an appendix to the compatibility study.

Sec. 16-20M.012(2) Side yards: Side yards shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; ii) conform to the setback of the existing building; iii) conform to any existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks previously established by a majority of the contributing buildings of like use on that side of the block; or iv) be of a width of not less than seven feet.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed left (east) side setback is 10.1 feet. The compatibility study submitted indicated the range was from 4 feet to 13 feet. However, the study is flawed as the measurements are based on identifying features of the comparable properties such as fences and driveways, which may not be located near or at the property line.

Sec. 16-20M.012(1) Front yards: Front yard setbacks shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; or ii) comply with the compatibility rule.

DOES COMPLY

The Half-Depth Front Yard is a secondary Front Yard. The proposed setback is 5.9 feet. The applicant has provided information indicating compliance in an appendix to the compatibility study.

Sec. 16-20M.012(3) Rear yard: Rear yard setback shall be seven feet.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed rear yard is approximately 102.78 feet.

Sec. 16-20M.012(5) Floor area ratio shall not exceed 0.50.

DOES COMPLY

The estimated floor area ratio (FAR) is proposed to be .196.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2) (d) A paved walkway from the front sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure shall be provided.

DOES COMPLY

The applicant is proposing a concrete walkway of approximately 6.8 feet wide to connect the sidewalk to the porch steps.

Elevations

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(a) No individual house design shall substantially repeat a design of a new principal structure on the block face that was approved by the commission since the adoption of this district.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed new primary structure does not substantially repeat the design of a new principal structure previously approved by the commission based on the compatibility study and street photos.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(f) The compatibility rule shall apply to the form and pitch of the primary roof of the primary structure.

DOES COMPLY

A roof plan has been submitted by the applicant. The proposed primary roof pitch is 9/12. The proposed primary roof form is a cross-gable. The compatibility study indicated that the roof pitch range was between 6/12 and 9/12. A predominant roof form cannot be determined. However, the use of the cross-gable maintains a predominant front facing gable element on the block face. The rear portion of the structure is not a primary roof.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(g) The compatibility rule shall apply to the height, scale, and massing of the principal structure. In no case shall the height of a structure exceed 35 feet.

DOES COMPLY

The proposed height of the building is 20.9 feet. The compatibility study submitted indicates a range of approximately 17.58 feet to 26 feet.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i) The compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.

DOES COMPLY

The front porch steps are proposed to be concrete with closed risers and ends.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o) Fenestration, if visible from a public street upon completion, shall meet the following requirements:

~~3. Replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening.~~

4. The compatibility rule shall apply to the following aspects of fenestration:

- a. The size and shape of individual window openings.
- b. The overall pattern of fenestration as it relates to the building façade.
- c. The style of the individual window.

MOSTLY COMPLY

The proposed elevation window changes (W09, W11, and W05) comply.

A previous condition of approval remains valid to ensure mullion details are consistent for paired and ribbon windows.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q) Subject to the compatibility rule, wood or smooth-finish cementitious lap siding, wood shingles, brick, stone, and true stucco are permissible building materials for the façades of the principal structure. Corrugated metal, aluminum siding, and vinyl siding are not permitted.

MOSTLY COMPLY

The applicant is proposing fiber cement lap siding. **Trim and Corner board details have not been provided.** The siding is proposed to have a six-inch reveal. Product information has been provided for the siding.

Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r) In addition to all other applicable regulations, the compatibility rule shall apply to the following building materials and design elements, if visible from a public street upon completion:

1. The dimensions of the exposed face of lap siding and wood shingles.
- ~~2. The type of brick and pattern of brickwork.~~
- ~~3. The type of stone and pattern of stonework.~~
- ~~4. The material and texture of stucco.~~
- ~~5. The size and type of exterior doors. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame.~~
- ~~6. The materials and pattern of roofing.~~
- ~~7. Gables and gable returns.~~
- ~~8. Dormers~~
9. Paving materials for walks and drives.
- ~~10. Above grade foundation materials. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade's exterior material and exposed concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface.~~
- ~~11. Exterior portions of chimneys. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, chimneys shall be faced with masonry and siding on chimneys is not permitted.~~
- ~~12. The location and design of skylights. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, when practical, skylights should be located where least visible from the public street. If skylights are visible from the public street, the glass shall be tinted to match the surrounding roof area. Protruding "bubble" skylights are prohibited.~~

DOES COMPLY

The proposed principal structure consists of three parts. The first part is traditionally designed. The second part is a hyphen that acts as a connector. The third and final part is contemporary influenced to act as an “addition”.

(9) The submitted compatibility study does not call out paving materials for walks and drives. However, based on street photos and the submitted photos the predominant drive material is concrete. The predominant walk material is concrete, with at least one brick pavers. The applicant is proposing concrete for the proposed driveways and brick pavers for the proposed walkway.

The following recommended conditions shall bring the project into full compliance.

ORIGINAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

~~STAFF RECOMMENDATION:~~ Approval with the following condition(s):

1. *All outstanding conditions in Application # CA3-22-342 shall remain in effect unless this approval alters the original element or condition.*
2. *The applicant shall provide a revised compatibility study providing the front yard, half-depth front yard, and side yard setbacks from property line to structure per Sec. 16-20M.012(1) and (2).*
3. *The applicant shall provide the proof of calculations on the site plan for floor area ratio (FAR) per Sec. 16-20M.012(5).*
4. *The applicant shall revise the size, shape, and style of W05 on the Right and Rear elevations to be consistent with the compatible rule per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).*
5. *The applicant shall add a minimum of two windows of double-hung vertically oriented windows on the first-floor right elevation per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).*
6. *The applicant shall provide product information for all siding per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q).*
7. *The applicant shall provide product information for the skylight per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(12).*
8. *The applicant shall revise the addition in with one of the following options per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q):*
 - a. *Eliminate the fish scale shingles and revert to using the fiber cement bevel siding on the rest of the structure.*
 - b. *Revise the roof by increasing or decreasing the roof pitch to ensure both sections are consistently creating an even gable face. Restrict the use of the fish scale shingles to the gable face and revert the rest of the siding to fiber cement bevel siding on the rest of the structure.*
9. *The applicant shall provide revised final plans and documentation in one (1) PDF. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.*

UPDATED STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following condition(s):

1. All outstanding conditions in Application # CA3-22-342 shall remain in effect unless this approval alters the original element or condition.
2. The applicant shall provide the proof of calculations on the site plan for floor area ratio (FAR) per Sec. 16-20M.012(5).
3. The applicant shall revise the elevation to include corner board and provide product information for all trim, and corner board per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q).
4. The applicant shall provide an updated Window and Door Schedule per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).
5. The applicant shall provide a detailed customer proposal (proposed order form) prior to ordering Windows and Doors, such information shall be indexed to the updated Window and Door schedule and comply with all applicable conditions per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).
6. The applicant shall provide revised final plans and documentation in one (1) PDF. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 58 Camden Road NE
APPLICATION: RC-23-019
MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: North side of Camden Road NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Dutch Colonial Revival

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. 16-20.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments at the March 8, 2022 hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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 site work, including a change in the existing design of the driveway, removal of an existing walkway, and installation of a new retaining wall.

The proposed driveway design would remove the existing concrete drive in favor of driveway strips with an open cutout to allow verge between. Staff would note that existing drive is directly adjacent to the property line and the neighboring driveway, separated only by a stone border, and that the proximity of the proposed work should be undertaken with care and coordination with the adjoining property to ensure that access is not limited by the proposed alteration.

The removal of the rear walkway to allow for open lawn space is not clearly shown in the photos submitted by the Applicant; however, the location is noted on the site plan. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed site work.

The location of the new retaining wall is also noted on the plans and the dimensions and materials noted in the application; however, no additional information was given. It does not appear that there is an existing wall that is being replaced. The materials are noted as concrete block, coated with a parge coat of stucco. It appears that the proposed retaining wall will vary in height, extending to a maximum height of 48". Staff does not have any comments on the proposed design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments at the March 8, 2022 hearing of the Urban Design Commission

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matthew Adams, Interim Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1625 MLK Jr. Drive (FL Stanton Elementary School)

APPLICATION: RC-23-066

MEETING DATE: March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1928, Additions in 1958 and 1993

Property Location: Northeast corner of MLK Jr. Drive and Browning St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Institutional

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, additions, site work.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 6-4043 of the City of Atlanta Code of Ordinances.

The Applicant is proposing a series of changes to the structure and the site which will make the property more secure and functional. The Applicant has provided detailed analysis including photographs, original building plans, and narratives describing the work and the need for the work to take place. The work proposed will mainly be interior changes to existing spaces which will relocate various uses within the building into an arrangement that makes sense for the overall function of the structures. The Applicant then proposes to remove the non-historic windows and replace them with new windows matching the original design for the structure shown in the original building plans. Lastly, the Applicant proposes several additions to the rear of the structure as well as several site changes which would allow for better circulation and functionality of the school.

In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposed work and finds the proposed changes to be appropriate for use on the historic buildings.

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

Cc: Applicant
File