



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, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1111 Austin
APPLICATION: CA2-23-049
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: West of Euclid Ave. and East of Moreland.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Review dormer

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: Previous Application CA3-22-148

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 20l of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

COMPATIBILITY RULE:

The intent of the mayor and council in establishing the regulations of the Inman Park Historic District is to ensure that alterations to existing structures, and new construction, in Subarea 1 and alterations to existing contributing structures in Subarea 2 and Subarea 3 are compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district as it existed in 1945, of the contributing structures in each subarea, and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face; and further, to ensure that lot platting in Subarea 1 is compatible with the historic platting pattern of Subarea 1 and of a particular block face as it existed in 1945.

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.) it shall be compatible with that which predominates in contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.

DORMERS

In the prior application CA3-22-148, the Applicant was approved for shed dormers on each side of the house. The Applicant now wishes to install gable dormers that will allow for additional head height. The new proposed dormers will not exceed the existing roofline, nor will the proposed dormers go over the side setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Rear Addition

Staff doesn't find the proposal in the rear problematic. The proposed roofline meets the addition's roofline. As with the first proposal, the Applicant has added a bump out (**new bay**). As stated with the CA3-22-148 proposal, that bump out meeting the compatibility for additions. The District regulations state, "...the front and side yard setbacks of the addition shall not be less than the respective setback, at its closest point, of the existing structure." The site plan and elevation show the addition is sitting closer to the side yard setback than the existing house. Staff recommends the Applicant remove what appears to be a bump out to create an interior master closet suite and create a space that will bring the house into compliance with the existing house.

Windows

Windows are subject to the compatibility rule. On the addition, the Applicant proposes 6-over-1 double hung windows and one fix window that will set into the proposed bay area, the Staff had requested to be pushed back for setback compliance. While the proposed windows are not exactly the same windows as the existing, they are compatible in trim and orientation. Since the Applicant has not stated what material, these proposed windows are, Staff recommends the windows match in material to the existing windows to allow for increase compatibility.

Siding

The propose siding is cementitious lap siding. Cementitious siding is permissible, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Dormers Addition

On each side of the existing house, the Applicant has proposed shed dormers. Each dormer engages the roof line correctly. Staff is not concerned with the dormer additions.

Windows

The purposed windows on the dormers are matching in size and orientation as the windows on the addition. Same recommendation set for overall windows, stands here.

Roof material

On the new proposed dorms, the Applicant once proposed shingles to match the existing roof material. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

On the left side elevation, the Applicant proposes to replace an existing twin window with a twin casement window. Photo provide shows the window appear to be in very good shape. The Applicant has not indicated why this replacement. Therefore, Staff recommends the Applicant retain this window unless, photographic evidence is provided demonstrating the need for replacement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall remove the bmp out (bay window) so that the right side aligns with the existing house to comply with the District regulations, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(b) and
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: Matt Adams- Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 782 Magna Carter
APPLICATION: CA2-23-050
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1964

Property Location: East of Peek Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window replacement and Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Fire occurred 2020

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The windows are proposed for replacement by the Applicant, no new windows are proposed. The Applicant proposes the new windows to be vinyl. District regulations states, "Original or historic windows and exterior doors shall be retained. Replacement windows or exterior doors shall be permitted only when the original or historic windows and exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated. If original or historic windows or exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated, replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size." Photos provided by the Applicant, show the windows to be boarded. So, it is hard for Staff to know the original material of the windows or get a good feel as the condition of the windows. A 2015 photo show the front facing windows had an intricate time pattern and lite design on the bay window and the material to be metal; all would have been significant. Staff recommends, the Applicant removes the board send photographic of each window to verify the 2015 photo. If the windows are deemed to be not functional or in horrible conditions, the Applicant shall replace and match in-kind the original windows in light design, function, material and shape and size.

Doors

The Applicant proposes to replace the front door. The Applicant has not specified a particular type door. Staff recommends, the Applicant follow the District regulations, and install a door would be reflective of that time period and style of house.

The Applicant also proposes to replace the basement door and the patio door. Staff is not concerned with either of these proposals. Staff does recommend the Applicant abide by the district regulations that govern door for the side basemen door, since this door is on the side of the house.

Porch

The Applicant has not indicated any porch alterations. Photo shows the concrete porch and iron railings is in shape. No work is needed on. Therefore Staff recommends the iron railings remain.

Deck

A rear deck is proposed to the rear of the house, that will not go beyond the side of the existing house. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

Siding

The Applicant has not specified siding replacement. Photos show the siding need repairing or replacing. Staff recommends the siding be repaired or replaced in-kind.

Roof material

The proposed roof material is architectural shingles, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Painting

This current bricks on the house are not painted. Staff recommends the Applicant not paint the bricks. Painting unpainted masonry is not permitted in the District.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall remove the boards from the windows, provide photos. If the windows are shown to not be operable or in back condition, the new replacement windows shall match the original in light design, function, materials and shape and size, per Sec.16-20Q.006(3)(c)(d);
2. The front and side basement door shall abide by the District regulations regarding doors. Front door shall be a door reflective of the time and style of the house, per Sec.16-20Q.006 (3)
3. The siding shall be replaced or repaired in-kind to match the original siding, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(1)(h);
4. The front porch iron railings shall remain, per Sec.16-20Q.006 (10);
5. The masonry shall not be painted, per Sec. 16-20Q.005(1)(b)(i) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1585 S. Ponce De Leon Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-23-052
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location: South block face of South Ponce De Leon Ave. west of the Clifton Rd. intersection. Property also has frontage along the north block face of Clifton Ter. west of the Page Ave. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Original house, known as “Pinebloom” is contributing.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Tudor Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revisions to previously approved plans.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously approved CA3-21-037, CA3-21-036, & CA3-21-190 for alterations, additions, and variances at this address. The current proposal is for changes to the original approval that relate to fenestration and dormers.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with conditions.

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

The Applicant has proposed a series of changes to the previously approved plans as follows:

Carriage house:

- Removal of windows
- Changing a windows into a door
- An addition to the right side

Pinebloom Mansion:

- Removal of southwest addition
- Added 2 shed dormers on the south elevation
- Revised the position of the previously proposed dormers on the south addition

Villas

- Removal of chimneys
- Revised window and door placement
- Changed the multiple garage doors per unit into single entry garage doors

Manor (cottage) 1 & 2

- Additional changes to increase the unique appearance of each while still conforming to the style of the principal structure.

In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposed revisions. While there are many alterations from the original approval, the alterations still conform to the character of the existing principal and accessory structures. As such, Staff supports the proposal. Staff would, however, recommend that all previous conditions from CA3-21-037, CA3-21-036, & CA3-21-190 be retained as part of this approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. All previous conditions from CA3-21-037, CA3-21-036, & CA3-21-190 shall be retained as part of this approval; and,
2. 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: 310 Peters Street NW
APPLICATION: CA2-23-054
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Castleberry Hill Landmark District, Subarea1 **Other Zoning:** n/a

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: South side of Peters Street NW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rooftop Deck

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20N

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CA2-23-054 310 Peters Street NW

March 22, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant proposes installation of a wooden rooftop deck on the existing second story of the building. This space is currently a walk-out patio area accessed from the second story office space. The only alteration would be the addition of decking. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

The floorplans state that doors and windows on the exterior will be replaced; however, the Applicant has clarified that this proposal has been removed from the scope of work.

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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1037 Sparks St.
APPLICATION: CA2-23-057
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: North block face of Sparks St., east of the Peoples St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional cottage.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revisions to previously approved plans

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously approved CA3-20-253 at the 09/23/2020 hearing. On 01/28/2023 an inspector from the Office of Buildings noted that work had occurred which deviated from the approved plans and increased the scope of the project. The current review is for the revisions to the previously approved plans.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: 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.

Plans

The plans provided do not accurately reflect the changes to the approved plan set. Namely, the addition on the left side of the plans are not accurately depicted. Staff recommends the plans be altered to show the condition of the existing structure and the proposed plans showing compliance with any condition placed on the structure by the Commission.

Addition

The largest deviation from the original approval is the addition between the existing left gable wing and the previously approved addition. In the original approval, a gap between the gable wing and the rear of the property was proposed to retain the original roof form of the gable wing. The current proposal encloses this space to create a single massing and alters the roof to have a single uniform roof form. Staff has no general concerns with the additional square footage, but finds that the alteration of the roof form is inappropriate. As such, Staff recommends that the plans be changed to show the original gable wing roof form in its original pitch and height.

Site Work

The original plans showed no changes to the driveway, which originally terminated in the front yard. The driveway has since been replaced and it is unclear whether it extends 20' past the front façade of the structure to allow for two cars to be parked outside of the front yard. As such, Staff recommends the site plan be amended to show the footprint of the driveway that was constructed, and that the driveway be extended if necessary for compliance with the District regulations.

The Applicant has installed two 6' high privacy walls along the side of the front yard. As these features are not permitted in the front yard, Staff recommends that the 6' high privacy walls be removed from the sides of the front yard and replaced with 4' high picket fences.

The original walkway was removed and re-routed to connect with the replacement driveway. The Applicant has provided updated plans which show the walkway being re-installed as separate from the driveway and connecting to the public right of way as required by the District regulations. Staff has no concerns with this revision.

Alterations

The original chimney has been removed from the roof. Staff recommends that a brick chimney matching the size and location of the original chimney be installed.

The front porch railing has been installed using side nailed pickets instead of butt jointed rails and balusters. As such, Staff recommends the front porch railing be changed to meet the district regulations.

The Commission's previous approval required the double grouped window to be removed from the plans and all windows to be kept in their original locations. Staff would recommend that all windows meet the conditions of the original approval.

CA2-23-057– 1037 Sparks St.

March 22, 2023

Page 3 of 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The plans shall be altered to show the condition of the existing structure and the proposed plans showing compliance with any condition placed on the structure by the Commission;
2. The plans shall be changed to show the original gable wing roof form in its original pitch and height;
3. The site plan shall be amended to show the footprint of the driveway that was constructed, and that the driveway be extended if necessary for compliance with the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.012(4);
4. A brick chimney matching the size and location of the original chimney shall be installed
5. The front porch railing shall be changed to meet the district regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
6. All windows shall meet the conditions of the original approval, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a) and CA3-20-253;
7. 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: 943 White Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-042
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District **Other Zoning:** R4-A

Date of Construction: 1923

Property Location: North side of White Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes construction of five new dormers on the side and rear elevations of the house. The side dormers would be gabled and installed on the rear portion of the hipped roofline. The rear-facing dormer would also be gabled and would be constructed above a rear-screened porch. A skylight is proposed between the two dormers on both side elevations. As the proposed dormer would limit visibility from the public right-of-way, Staff is not concerned with this proposal. It is not clear from the plans if there is an existing chimney on the roofline, as one is not shown. Staff would note that the proposed dormers should be positioned to not disturb or remove any historic features, including a chimney on the roofline. The Applicant will clarify if there is an existing chimney present on the roofline, and if so, mark its location on the proposed plans and clarify the scope of work in relation to this feature.

The proposed rear roofline design would be wide enough that it extends the full width of the building and will be supported by a free-standing brick pier, which would not be visible as it is behind the existing structure.

Each of the proposed dormers would have one new window for egress, with the exception of the rear dormer on the right elevation, which would have two new windows for egress. The proposed windows would be wood-framed, double-hung with true divided lights that match the existing on the house. Staff is not concerned with the proposed windows. The proposed dormers would be clad I smooth-face cementitious siding, which matches the historic siding in reveal. Staff is not concerned with the proposed cladding material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify if there is an existing chimney present on the roofline, and if so, mark its location on the proposed plans and clarify the scope of work in relation to this feature.
- 2.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of the proposed project.

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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 935 Woodmere Dr.
APPLICATION: CA3-22-312
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** MR-3

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: East block face of Woodmere Dr., south of the DL Hollowell Pkwy intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Principal use of the property and the approval of CA3-23-313.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20Q **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: On February 22, 2023, the Commission approved CA3-23-313 for new construction at this location. Staff would note that the approval of CA3-23-313 is not considered in this review.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval.

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 District regulations contain both qualitative and quantitative requirements for new construction. If an item is not listed below, Staff found that the related requirements were met.

Interaction between the MR-3 zoning and the Collier Heights Historic District zoning

The subject property is dual-zoned as MR-3 with the Collier Heights Historic District overlay. As these regulations conflict with one another in several areas, the interpretation clause located in Sec. 16-20.011(c) applies. This section specifies that whenever the requirements of Chapter 20 conflict with any other statute, rule, regulations, ordinance, or code, that the most restrictive requirement or that which imposes the higher standard will govern. As the Collier Heights Historic District regulations are a subchapter of chapter 20, they are included in this provision. With this in mind, Staff finds that the Collier Heights Historic District regulations would govern the height, setbacks, and general architectural and site design of the project as specified in Sec. 16-20Q.005 and Sec. 16-20Q.006. The use, lot coverage, and allowable floor area for the project would be governed by Sec. 16-35.

While Staff is aware of concern from the neighborhood regarding the proposed use of the property, Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission, Applicant, and the Neighborhood that the property is entitled to the allowable uses specified in Ch. 35 of the Zoning Ordinance provided that the project meets the requirements of that chapter. For this reason, the Commission could not consider the proposed use of the project in their review and could not place restrictions, conditions, or additional requirements on the project that are governed by said chapter.

Variance Request

When reviewing variances, the Commission is required to find that the request meets all 4 of the variance criteria. The requested variance would be to allow an increase in the allowable driveway width from a maximum of 10' (allowed) to 20' (proposed).

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

The Applicant states that multiple site restraints including trees and sloping topography are requiring the increased width of the driveway. Staff finds, however, that the placement of the driveway is secondary to the conversation of the zoning of the site. As the site is zoned MR-3, and the type of construction will be classified as “commercial” for the purposes of the building permit reviews, the structure would be required to meet several criteria that a single family structure would not. For this reason, it would not be possible to construct a use that is otherwise permitted by the zoning while also meeting the site work requirements of the Historic District regulations. –MET

How would the application of the zoning ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property create an unnecessary hardship?

CA3-22-312 – 935 Woodmere Dr.
March 22, 2023
Page 3 of 3

The Applicant cites the conflict between the various regulatory requirements, namely the requirement that the driveway be 10’ wide, the transitional buffer required by the MR-3 Zoning, and the requirements for fire and life safety access. - **MET**

What conditions are peculiar to this particular piece of property?

The Applicant cites the non-conforming condition of the property as it relates to the placement of the contributing structure on the lot and the front lot line. This coupled with the rear parcel which was severed before the District was designated create a unique condition for the lot. – **MET**

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

The Applicant states that relief would allow them to meet the requirements for life safety requirements. Staff further finds that the variance would allow the project to be built as previously approved by the Commission. – **MET**

Staff finds that the Applicant’s responses meet the criteria for granting a variance. As such, Staff supports the variance request.

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: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1185 Arlington
APPLICATION: CA3-22-567
MEETING DATE: March 22nd, 2023, deferred since January 11, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R4-A

Date of Construction: 1949

Property Location West of Selwin and East of Oakland Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M.

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.

Edits in RED

PLANS

The Applicant has provided plans that do not portray the features on the house correctly. For example, a 2012 Google search shows the bump to be much bigger than the original bump out. Also, a window was missing on the bump out which is shown in 2012. The other windows appear not be the right size. Staff recommends the drawing accurately be depicted to what is representative on the original house.

ADDITION

The site plan provided by the Applicant shows the addition is meeting the required setbacks. It sits behind the existing structure and the roofline for the addition will be behind the existing roofline. The 6/12 pitch matches the existing pitch. The addition on the house also meets the lot coverage and FAR. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Porch

The Applicant proposes to construct a full-length porch with additional columns and a small gable roof over the porch. The Applicant provided block compatibility of other houses to support this proposal. While the Applicant has provided supporting evidence, that evidence is not needed or even acceptable evidence. Photographic evidence shows the house was never designed with a small gable or full porch with columns. Relying on the District regulations that states, “Alterations and additions shall be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations set forth in subsection 16-20M.013(2) above..” Staff recommends the columns nor a full porch and small gable over the porch be built. Instead, the small stoop with the flat/shed roof and two columns be retained.

The Applicant has edited the initial proposal for the porch. The proposed porch will have a shed roof and the flooring will not be a raise porch but be a flat concrete platform. Both the shed roof and the platform flooring will extend further than the original shed roof or flooring, Staff recommends, the Applicant construct the shed roof and the flooring underneath the shed roof in-kind to match the original porch configuration.

Siding

The Applicant has indicated wood as the siding on the house. A past photo also show the siding to be wood and a more recent photo shows the siding to be in good shape. Staff recommends if the siding needs repairing or replacing, the siding be done in-kind to match the existing.

Same recommend.

Windows

The Applicant has provided a detailed window schedule indicating the existing material and proposed material and existing size of the windows. On some of the windows, the existing material information is missing. The Applicant also proposes 4-inch trim on all the windows. From the photo of the existing house, it is difficult to determine the exact size of trim on the windows. The Applicant proposal to install 4-inch trim around each windows. This is not problematic to Staff. What is problematic is the Applicant proposal to change the material of

windows that were labelled wood. Since we know the windows are originally wood, the vinyl proposal is problematic. Our past ruling is once the material is known any, replacement must return to the original material. Staff recommends all windows be repaired or replaced with the original material, size, shape, and placement of the original window.

This recommendation stays the same. The windows should be replaced with wood, same size, shape, and placement.

Corner Boards

The Applicant proposes all corner boards to be 1x6 trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Same recommendation

Faux Gable Roof

A faux gable roof is proposed on the existing front roof. Staff recommends this gable roof not be constructed.

Same recommendation

Door

Two exterior doors are proposed. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District regulations which states, “the size and type of exterior doors. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame.”

Same recommendation

Chimney

The Applicant has not shown the chimney on the revised plans. Chimneys are essential to the house. Staff recommends the chimney remain on the house and be shown on the final plans.

Driveway

The proposed driveway is too wide. 12ft is not permitted. District regulations requires driveways to only be 10ft wide minus the flair and it must be 20ft past the front. Staff recommends abide by the District regulations and make the driveway 10 ft wide and 20 feet past the front of the house.

Walkway

The Applicant is proposing a walkway that is too close to the driveway and doesn't appear to have nay distinguishing boarder so that the walkway is not considered apart of the driveway. Staff recommends the walkway be placed in the center of the yard or constructed in a manner that clear distinguishes from the driveway.

Painting

The Applicant proposes to paint the CMU on the house. Staff cannot determine if the foundation is CMU or brick. If the foundation is CMU painting is not problematic. If there is masonry on the house, painting unpainted masonry is. Unpainted masonry can not be painted. If the masonry was

painted prior to designation of the District, the masonry can be repainted. However, it is up to the Applicant to show this proof.

Same recommendation

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The original style stoop porch shall be constructed: small shed roof with a concrete flat flooring underneath the shed, per Sec.16-20M.017(1)(a);
2. If the siding needs repairing or replacing, the siding repair or replacement shall be done in-kind (wood) to match the existing, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(p);
3. All windows shall be repaired or replaced with the original material, size, shape and placement of the original window, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o) (1);
4. The faux gable roof in the front shall not be constructed, per Sec.16-20M.017(1)(a);
5. All exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass in wood frame, per Sec.16-20M.013.002(r)(5);
6. The chimney shall remain on the house and be shown on the final plans, per Sec 16.20M.
7. The driveway shall only be 10ft wide minus the flair and extended 20 ft from the front of the house, per Sec.16-20M.12(4)(c);
8. The walkway should be constructed in a manner that distinguished from the driveway or install the walkway in the middle of the yard, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(d);
9. Unpainted masonry shall stay unpainted. If the masonry was painted prior to designation, the Applicant shall show photographic evidence and can then repaint the masonry, per Sec. 16-20M.002(3) and
10. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

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 22, 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: Denial without Prejudice

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.

As no new materials have been submitted and the Applicant has reached the maximum permissible deferral cycles, Staff has recommended denial without prejudice of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

- 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. 16-20I.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

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: 661 Brookline Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-021 & CA3-22-022 (variance)
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R4-A

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: North side of Brookline Street Sw.

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)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

CA3-23-021: Deferral until the April 26, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission
CA3-23-022: Denial

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

The Applicant proposes significant alterations to the existing structure including a full second story addition, redesign of the front porch, full window and door replacement, removal of the historic chimneys, and a rear garage addition. No existing elevations have been provided, as a result is difficult for Staff to determine the exact extent of the proposed alterations. The only elevations that have been provided are proposed elevations. No documentation of the existing conditions has been provided with the application, neither photographs nor elevations. Given the substantial changes proposed to the structure Staff needs to understand the existing conditions present on the house. The Applicant will provide existing elevations. The Applicant will provide existing photographs of all four elevations and all features proposed for replacement so Staff may assess their condition. The Applicant specifically states that the existing siding will be retained, if it is determined that it is in good condition. Without photographs Staff cannot determine the appropriateness of this proposal. In addition, the complete redesign of the façade will necessitate the addition of new siding, regardless of condition (as the historic siding is no longer extant due to the enclosure of the partial width porch). The Applicant will provide photographs detailing the current conditions of the siding. The Applicant will clarify where new siding will be required due to the opening of the porch. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement siding.

Given the significant amount of missing information, Staff is only able to comment on certain features with the present submitted materials.

Second-Story Addition

Staff has recommended denial of **Variance CA3-22-022**. As such, Staff cannot support a second-story addition, which would not be permitted per Sec. 16-20I.006 (1)(b) which states, “Additions to existing structures shall not be subject to the compatibility rule but shall be no higher than the main ridgeline of the existing structure.” In addition, the proposed addition would significantly alter the historic roofline and remove the historic chimneys, in direct violation of, Sec 16-20I.005 (9) which states, “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.” The Applicant will not construct the proposed second-story addition. The Applicant will not alter or remove the historic chimneys present on the house.

Rear Garage Addition

Per Sec. 16-20I.006 (5)(b) garages should be located as independent accessory structures to the rear of the principal structure. As such, Staff cannot support the proposed rear garage addition. The Applicant will not construct the proposed garage addition. The Applicant will redesign the proposed garage as a freestanding accessory structure.

Windows and Doors

It is unclear what the proposal for the existing windows is based on the submitted materials. The application states that the historic windows will be kept, but a window schedule has also been provided. This window schedule is not linked to a diagram, so it is unclear where they will be placed. In addition, no specifications have been provided for any replacement windows or doors. This is concerning because it appears that there are two-over-two horizontal, aluminum-framed windows present on the front elevation and that the original three-over-one, wood-framed windows are present on the side elevations. The proposed plans show four-over-four windows of unknown material on all elevations. There has been no compatibility data submitted to justify this proposed window design. No details regarding the doors has been provided anywhere in the Application. This is particularly concerning given that the door would be placed in a new location on the façade. The Applicant has not provided supporting documentation illustrating that the plan for the structure was originally a center hall plan. The existing door on the structure appears to be original to the structure. Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(1) states, “Architecturally significant windows and doors including details, trim, and framing shall be retained. Original window and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed in whole or in part.” Staff cannot approve alteration of the original opening without documentation. Given that the door appears to be original, Staff also cannot support its replacement. The Applicant will provide a door and window schedule, keying all proposed replacement features to their location on the elevations. The Applicant will provide compatibility data for any proposed non-historic replacements where the original specifications remain unknown. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement materials. The Applicant will provide documentation supporting the proposed moving of the front door.

Porch

The proposed house shows a full porch, with the door in a different location and the historic steps removed, with the steps being reoriented from side-facing to front-facing. There is no data regarding the need for this alteration, which would remove a character-defining feature of the house. The existing front door appears to be original to the house. The positioning of the brick pier porch supports, though partially enclosed, also appear to not have been altered since the time of construction. Sec 16-20I.005 (9) states, “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.” The changes to the porch represent a direct violation of the code. There has been no information regarding why this design of the porch is proposed. No historic data on the house was provided to inform the proposed design. Photos of the house show that there was originally a window in the porch gable as well as distinctive brackets. These features are not shown on the proposed elevation. The porch supports also appear to be a completely different design than the existing, and the brick piers with the redesign of the porch are completely removed from the porch foundation. There are significant issues with the proposed design and no justification had been provided for the drastic changes. The Applicant will clarify the proposed porch design and provide documentation for the historic justification of the proposed changes. The Applicant will

update the existing (still required) and proposed elevations to accurately depict the porch and all historic features.

Site Plan

The site plan submitted shows only the existing conditions, not the proposed. In addition, no data regarding lot coverage was included on the site plan. It is the burden of the Applicant to illustrate that they are conforming to the requirements in terms of setbacks and maximum permissible lot coverage. The Applicant will submit a proposed site plan. The Applicant will update the existing and proposed site plan to show all features and include calculation of lot coverage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 26, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission (CA3-23-021) to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will provide existing elevations.
- 2.) The Applicant will provide existing photographs of all four elevations and all features proposed for replacement so Staff may assess their condition.
- 3.) The Applicant will provide photographs detailing the current conditions of the siding.
- 4.) The Applicant will clarify where new siding will be required due to the opening of the porch.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement siding.
- 6.) The Applicant will not construct the proposed second-story addition.
- 7.) The Applicant will not alter or remove the historic chimneys present on the house.
- 8.) The Applicant will not construct the proposed garage addition.
- 9.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed garage as a freestanding accessory structure.
- 10.) The Applicant will provide a door and window schedule, keying all proposed replacement features to their location on the elevations.
- 11.) The Applicant will provide compatibility data for any proposed non-historic replacements where the original specifications remain unknown.
- 12.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement materials.
- 13.) The Applicant will provide documentation supporting the proposed moving of the front door.
- 14.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed porch design and provide documentation for the historic justification of the proposed changes.
- 15.) The Applicant will update the existing (still required) and proposed elevations to accurately depict the porch and all historic features.
- 16.) The Applicant will submit a proposed site plan.
- 17.) The Applicant will update the existing and proposed site plan to show all features and include calculation of lot coverage.
- 18.) The Applicant will provide all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

Variance CA3-23-022

The requested variance is to permit a second story addition higher than the main ridgeline of the existing structure where otherwise restricted.

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 existing house, which does not have a second story, not features of the size, shape, or topography of the lot are cited.

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

The Applicant states that no unnecessary hardship is created.

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

The Applicant states that there are no conditions peculiar to this piece of property.

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 does not make any statement in response to this inquiry.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request does meet the criteria for granting a variance. The Applicant has not cited any existing extraordinary conditions present on the lot which justify the second story addition. The proposed design, which incorporates two additions, one to the rear, in addition to the second story addition shows that a rear addition, which would be permitted by the code is possible. The Applicant has failed to respond to the majority of the variance criteria, and it appears that the variance is requested for personal design preference, rather than evidence of hardship imposed based on physical conditions related to the size, shape, and topography of the lot. Staff finds that these are not grounds for granting a variance to the code. As such, Staff supports denial of the requested variance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial (CA3-23-022)

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: 898 North Avenue NE

APPLICATION: CA3-23-040

MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Poncey Highland Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1953

Property Location: North side of North Avenue NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, Addition/enclosure, window replacement

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20V

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 22CAP-00001440

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant is applying for retroactive approval of alterations to the structure. These alterations include painting of historically unpainted masonry, removal of an exterior staircase, and enclosure of an exterior porch. Staff finds that the paint used on the exterior of the structure does not meet the requirements of Section 16-20V.006 (1)(e) which states, “The coating or painting of uncoated/unpainted masonry surfaces is permitted with the use of a paint product specified for use on exterior masonry surfaces. The color of the coating/paint is not regulated. Except for allowed coating/painting, original or historic masonry surfaces may not be covered, sheathed over, or coated in any other way.” The Applicant has used latex paint, which while it is marketed as an exterior paint is damaging and causes water retention in historically unpainted masonry. The Applicant will remove the unpermitted paint using architecturally appropriate methods, which do not damage the historic masonry. Once the non-compliant paint has been removed, Staff will determine if the paint removal has structurally damaged the historic masonry. Once that determination has been made, the Applicant may submit proposed replacement paint to Staff for review if their preference is to paint the masonry.

Staff notes that it does not appear that the exterior stairs which were removed, and the porch, which was enclosed were not original to the structure. Section 16-20V.006 (1)9f(ii), states: Existing non-original or non-historic stoops and porches may be repaired, replaced, or otherwise maintained to retain their previously existing appearance and components.” Staff does have concerns with the design of the enclosure, which features trim of a far larger scale than exists on the remainder of the structure. Staff also has concerns about a fixed vinyl window installed on the street-facing elevation of the enclosure, which is inconsistent with the design of the historic windows on the house. Section 16-20V.006 (1)(a) (ii) states, “Replacement windows must match the size, light pattern, and appearance of the original or historic windows; be a design consistent with the architectural style and age of the building or have the same design and appearance as the existing windows.” Staff notes that there are two sizes and style of existing windows on the structure, and would support use of either of these styles as a replacement for the non-compliant window. The Applicant will replace the trim on the enclosed stoop to match the existing trim on the house in scale and design. The Applicant will remove the non-compliant fixed vinyl window installed on the front elevation of the stoop enclosure. The Applicant will provide specifications for a compliant window which matches the existing historic windows present on the house.

The Applicant notes that two additional windows were replaced on the rear elevation. The replacement of these windows does not fall under the purview of the Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted paint using architecturally appropriate methods, which do not damage the historic masonry.
- 2.) The Applicant will replace the trim on the enclosed stoop to match the existing trim on the house in scale and design.

CA3-23-040 898 North Avenue NE

March 22, 2023

Page 3 of 3

- 3.) The Applicant will remove the non-compliant fixed vinyl window installed on the front elevation of the stoop enclosure.
- 4.) The Applicant will provide specifications for a compliant window, which matches the existing historic windows present on the house.
- 5.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

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: 977 Blue Ridge Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-041
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Poncey Highland Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: South side of Blue Ridge Avenue NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20V

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes a second story addition. This addition would remove the existing shed dormers, and reframe the roof to add a dormer, as well as a large central second story. This second story would have a hipped roof with a hipped dormer on the right elevation. Staff has concerns with the proposed design of the second story addition. While the addition is setback from the front plane of the house, and is largely outside the lot compatibility zone, Staff has concerns about the consistency of design in relation to where the addition begins, and in particular with the overall height. The historic home has undergone a significant number of alterations over time, including three previous dormer additions. Staff does note that the proposed roof, which would extend the overall height from 25 feet (measured at the top of the gabled porch) to approximately thirty feet overall, introduces a proposed roof with a pitch that is very different from the historic roofline (though this was not noted on the elevations, Staff has noted the pitch from the photographs provided). The dormer of the right elevation is lower than the overall proposed roofline. It is not clear to staff why the overall addition roofline is not consistent. The proposed pitch is 5/12 and Staff would like data regarding how this is compatible with the existing roofline and design of the house, particularly the seven feet above the proposed ceiling height of the second story. As this impacts the overall roofline of the structure, Staff wishes to establish that the proposed pitch is compatible and necessary. The Applicant will supply data regarding the necessity for the change in roof pitch on the proposed second-story addition.

Staff also has concerns with the proposed window on the left elevation, located within the lot compatibility zone. The window is a fixed, wood-frame window. This alteration is existing, but the window does not meet district regulations. Section 16-20V.006 (1)(a) (ii) states, "Replacement windows must match the size, light pattern, and appearance of the original or historic windows; be a design consistent with the architectural style and age of the building or have the same design and appearance as the existing windows." The fixed window is not an appropriate design. The Applicant will revise the proposed window design to meet the requirements of Section 16-20V.006 (1)(a) (ii).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant supply data regarding the necessity for the change in roof pitch on the proposed second-story addition.
- 2.) The Applicant will revise the proposed window design to meet the requirements of Section 16-20V.006 (1)(a) (ii).
- 3.) 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

Janide Sidifall
Interim Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams Interim- Executive Director

ADDRESS: 746 Woodson

APPLICATION: CA3-23-43

MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2015

Property Location: Corner of Bill Lucas Road and 740 Woodson Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Accessory Structure in rear of the property

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: The Applicant sought a variance to reduce the required rear yard from 7 to 3 and sought the special exception for an active recreation in the yard adjacent to the public right of way. Both were applied to the BZA

SUMMARY CONCLUSION: Approval

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

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

The Applicant proposes to install a 145-sf pool. In addition, to the pool installation, the Applicant proposes to replace several existing timber walls with 3 ft, stacked stone wall and 2 ft beam walls. Currently, there is an existing 5 feet metal fence that the Applicant apparently will retain. The existing driveway will be demolished; half to be replaced with 4x4 concrete squares the other half with turf around the pool. District Regulations states, “Accessory structures, such as carriage houses, smoke houses, tenant and alley houses, private garages, carports, electric vehicle charging stations equipped with Level 1 and/or Level 2 EVSE, and mechanical equipment shall be located to the side and/or rear of the principal structure within the buildable area of the lot and shall not project beyond the front of the principal structure. If mechanical equipment is visible from a public street, screening with appropriate plant or fence materials is required.”

The Applicant is seeking a variance for the reduction of the rear setback from 7 to 3 feet and the special exception for an active recreation in the yard adjacent to a public street. In this case, the property sets on a corner lot and is adjacent to a public street. The variance and the special exception were sought through the BZA as required. So, for this review, Staff will only focus on whether the Applicant has met the District regulations. Staff deems the Applicant has met the District regulations. The proposed pool be located at the rear of the principal structure within the buildable area and will not project beyond the front of the principal structure. The pool equipment will be blocked by the existing 6 feet pricy fence. Staff is not concern with the pool 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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 898 Lullwater Rd. NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-047
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: Southwest corner of Lullwater Rd. and The Byway

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Colonial Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The property has split jurisdiction, with the northwest corner of the property lying outside of the City of Atlanta's boundaries. The property was also subdivided before the District was designated.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval.

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

When reviewing variances, the Commission is required to find that the request meets all 4 of the variance criteria. The requested variance would be to allow a reduction in the rear yard setback from 100 feet (required) to 70 feet (proposed).

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

The Applicant cites the polygonal shape of the lot, the location of two jurisdictions (City of Atlanta and Unincorporated Dekalb), both of which contain separate requirements for construction based on the separate historic districts, and the topography of the site which creates a visual barrier for the site. - **MET**

How would the application of the zoning ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property create an unnecessary hardship?

The Applicant states that without relief from the setback requirements, the home could not be added to in a way that is both sensitive to the historic fabric of the contributing structure and in line with the Landmark District regulations - **MET**

What conditions are peculiar to this particular piece of property?

The Applicant cites the non-conforming condition of the property as it relates to the placement of the contributing structure on the lot and the front lot line. This coupled with the rear parcel which was severed before the District was designated create a unique condition for the lot. – **MET**

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

The Applicant states that given the site constraints and the other requirements of the Landmark District regulations, the proposed relief would allow for an addition that better protects the historic fabric of the contributing structure and better conforms to the development pattern of the neighborhood as a whole. – **MET**

Staff finds that the Applicant’s responses meet the criteria for granting a variance. As such, Staff supports the variance request.

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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1368 Ponce De Leon Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-053
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1915

Property Location: North blockface of Ponce De Leon Ave., west of Oakdale Rd., east of Springdale Rd.

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously approved CA3-18-511, CA3-20-296, & CA3-20-297 at this site. CA3-20-297 allowed for a special exception to increase the allowable fence height from 6' (maximum) to 8'.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with conditions.

CA3-23-053 – 1368 Ponce De Leon Ave.

March 22, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

Unlike variance requests, Special Exceptions for fence height are only required to meet one (1) of four (4) criteria in order for the Commission to approve the exception. Staff would note that while the Applicant has provided responses to the variance criteria, those are not applicable to the application and will not be considered in this review.

Based on the Applicant's responses, Staff finds that the first of the special exception criteria is appropriate for use on this request. This criterion states the following: Such wall or fence is justified by reason of security or privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoin

The Applicant notes that the increase, which will consist of netting on top of the 8' tall fence, will prevent play objects travelling from the play area onto neighboring properties. The Applicant also states that as the netting will be transparent, it will not unduly prevent the passage of light or air on to neighboring properties. The Applicant further states that the netting will be transparent which will allow it to not impact the visual character of the District.

As such, Staff supports the request for a special exception to increase the height of the fence from 8' to 12'. Staff would note that this approval would only apply to the netting currently proposed by the Applicant and would not transfer to an opaque material which would change the analysis used in this request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

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: 1144 Merrill Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA4PH-23-037
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R4-A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: Southwest corner of Merrill Avenue and Cordova Street SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition due to threat to Public Health and Safety

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

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

The Applicant has submitted a structural analysis of the building by Lawrence A. Martin, PE dated April 21, 2021. The analysis notes that the second floor and roof have experience almost full collapse due to fire damage, which extends through the substructure to the crawl space. Though exterior walls remain intact, they are not structurally sound, as the foundation and substructural joists were extensively damaged by fire. This coupled with the deterioration of a structure left at least partially open to the elements even after closing, has undermined the potential for rehabilitation.

As such, Staff finds that a major and imminent threat to public health and safety has been established.

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

The Applicant has provided the findings of the engineering report in response to this comment. The structural engineer does not see repair as an option given the level of damage and deterioration present, and that to repair would still require removal virtually all historic materials, which would be tantamount to reconstruction.

As such, Staff finds this criterion has been met.

The photographs provided by the Applicant illustrate the level of damage and deterioration present. As noted above, Staff finds that any rehabilitation of the structure would require wholesale replacement of much of the original portions of the property, which would result in either a partial or full demolition.

Staff finds that the existing building has suffered a fire and much of the original structure has been destroyed. The remaining portions have been compromised by exposure to the elements during the approximately three-year period that the building has been unoccupied and fire damaged. Repairs of the structure in its current condition would likely cause further collapse and loss of the remaining historic materials, all of which show damage from the fire. While Staff understands the impact that the loss of a historically contributing structure can have on the District, this building presents a significant threat to public health and safety. The Applicant proposes reconstruction of the structure to match the existing historic dimensions and design, though at this time no plans have been submitted, only an application which states this intent. Staff sees no reasonable alternative to the demolition of the structure. As such, Staff supports the request.

Staff supports the proposal to rebuild the structure to the historic specifications once demolition is completed. The Applicant shall provide detailed architectural plans, specifications for all proposed materials to be used on the house, and a site plan for the proposed reconstruction.

CA4PH-23-037 1144 Merrill Avenue SW

March 22, 2023

Page 3 of 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide detailed architectural plans, specifications for all proposed materials to be used on the house, and a site plan for the proposed reconstruction.
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: Matt Adams-Interim, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 122 Brighton Road
APPLICATION: RC-23-038
MEETING DATE: March 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills

Other Zoning: Conservation

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: Intersection across from Wakefield Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** English Tudor Inspired

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Replace Driveway and walk to front door

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20(B)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance the Atlanta Land Development Code as amended.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Commission confirm and send a letter with comments.

Accessory Dwelling

The Applicant proposes to replace the drive and walkways and steps in-kind. From reviewing the photos, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File